

AMERICAN JEWS AND ISRAEL: HAS THE ROMANCE ENDED?¹

Charles S. Liebman

Israel is dear to the hearts of the vast majority of American Jews. It continues to evoke a sense of Jewish pride, it continues to generate a sense of commitment and along with the Holocaust it serves as a central symbol around which Jews throughout the world unite. Nevertheless, there is a sense among informed observers that a growing number of American Jews feel increasingly distant from Israel. The anecdotal evidence is most impressive² and there is quantitative evidence which supports this impression: for example, the drop in the proportion of Federation allocations to Israel or opinion surveys of American Jews such as the 1998 survey by the Los Angeles Times³ which noted that the percentage of American Jews reporting close ties to Israel dropped from 75 percent in 1988 to 58 percent in 1998. The annual surveys conducted by the American Jewish Committee are another indicator.

AJC, to the best of my knowledge, began publishing these surveys in 1983 under the direction of Steven M. Cohen. Cohen asked his respondents if they agreed, disagreed or were not sure that "caring about Israel is a very important part of my being a Jew". Between 1983 and 1989 the percentage who agreed dropped from 78% to 73% although there were ups and downs.⁴ At least

since 1993 when Market Facts Inc. directed the surveys the relevant question became "How close do you feel to Israel?". Respondents were asked to choose between "very close", "fairly close", "fairly distant", "very distant" or "not sure". If we collapse "very close" and "fairly close" we get a response which is somewhat less intense than Cohen's "caring" question. Nonetheless, in 1993 the collapsed percentage was 75%, and it declined to 69% in 1997. The percentage who reported feeling "fairly distant" or "very distant" increased (though not in every year), from 24 percent in 1993 to 31 percent in 1997.⁵

The impression that growing numbers of American Jews are distancing themselves from Israel is confirmed by other sources, for example, Chaim Waxman's study of baby boomers whose title "Weakening Ties: Jewish Baby-Boomers and Israel," says it all.⁶ No less significant is the recent monograph on British Jews by the London based Institute for Jewish Policy Research.⁷ That study points to a declining attachment to Israel among British Jews concluding on the stark note that "the attachment of British Jews to Israel can no longer be taken for granted"⁸, and that this attachment "... could be in the process of returning to be the concern of a minority, although now a minority with a mostly Traditional or Orthodox religious outlook".⁹ I will return to some of the detailed findings of that study because I see no reason why conclusions with regard to British Jews are not

applicable to American Jews as well.

I attribute the distancing from Israel to three factors: the declining security threat to Israel, differences between younger and older age cohorts, and changing conceptions of Judaism among American Jews. However, before I turn to each of these factors I will discuss another factor which some, in my opinion mistakenly, believe is a major cause for declining American Jewish attachment to Israel; policies of the Israeli government and statements by Israel leaders

Israeli Policies

Israelis, leftist Israelis when the right is in power, rightist Israelis when the left is in power, focus on Israel's public policies as a major cause for the decline in attachment. It seems to me that neither dovish nor hawkish policies, the controversy over "who is a Jew?" or even the recent conversion controversy explain the steady decline in the attachment which American Jews feel toward Israel. They may account, at most, for blips in the trend line but they are of secondary significance. The survey of British Jews, referred to earlier, was conducted prior to the Rabin assassination when it appeared as though Israel was firmly committed to the Oslo accords. The survey of British Jews showed that Orthodox Jews were most critical of the peace process and the Oslo agreement. Nevertheless, they felt the

greatest attachment to Israel. AJC surveys in the United States, conducted during that same period, arrive at the same results.

I don't mean to suggest that Israeli policies or statements of Israeli leaders are entirely irrelevant to Jewish relationships to Israel. One can certainly point to counterproductive statements by Israeli leaders; especially during the Rabin administration. In his first visit to the U.S. after his 1992 election as Prime Minister, Yitzhak Rabin told AIPAC officials that Israel no longer needed their help lobbying Congress and the Administration. He announced that, from now on, Israel would handle her lobbying by herself. Shortly thereafter, Finance Minister Avraham Shochat commented that Israel no longer needed over-priced Israel Bonds -- that Israel could (and soon would) borrow more cheaply on the open markets. Yossi Beilin, while serving as Shimon Peres' Deputy Foreign Minister, observed on several occasions, that Israel no longer needed Diaspora contributions for social needs. And, in repeated statements, President Ezer Weizmann announced that Israel needs nothing at all from the Diaspora, with the single exception of young Jewish bodies coming on aliyah¹⁰. But the insensitivity of Israeli leaders to western Jewry in general and American Jewry in particular are hardly new. Neither Ben-Gurion or Golda Meier, both extraordinarily popular among American Jews, were attuned to American Jewish sensitivities. Israeli prime ministers never

sought the advice of American Jewish leaders. They lectured them; they hardly ever listened. The fact that statements by Israeli leaders now seem especially egregious stems from the fact that American Jewish leaders listen to what Israeli leaders have to say from a critical rather than an adulatory posture.

According to fund raisers with whom I have spoken, the recent conversion controversy and the insensitivity of Israeli spokesmen to American Jewish opinion served as an excuse for some large contributors who already felt distant from Israel to cut their Federation contributions. But those who demonstrated the greatest concern with the controversy were those most attached to Israel and with some exceptions have remained so. The threat of a new conversion law in Israel generated a major and successful effort by American Jewish groups to influence Israeli policy activity which strengthens rather than weakens ties. It also tightened bonds between many American Jews and their Conservative and Reform counterparts in Israel.

Growing Confidence in Israel's Security

I suggested that Israeli policies are not an important cause of American Jewish disaffection with Israel. But Israel's improved security condition is an important factor. The more overt the threat to Israel's survival the readier American Jewry has been to rally to Israel's cause and the stronger the sense of

attachment as every fund raiser knows. The decline of threats to Israel's security dampens concern for Israel on the part of many American Jews. I would speculate, though I cannot demonstrate this, that the images of Israeli soldiers beating Palestinians during the intifada effected American Jewish relations to Israel in a manner quite different than we ordinarily think. It wasn't the revulsion at what Israelis were doing that had the greatest impact. This revulsion was balanced by Israeli apologists who pointed to each incident as an exception which Israeli authorities would punish, as an unfortunate by product of war, as the fault of the Palestinians themselves who supported terror and whose stone throwing was life threatening. Most important of all, it reinforced the American Jewish perception of media bias. Its affect on American Jewish relations to Israel was indirect. The pictures of Israeli soldier beating the young Palestinian civilians reversed the classic American Jewish conception of Israel -- a small and beleaguered population threatened by stronger Arab enemies determined to drive the Jews into the sea.

Age Cohorts

When we look at the pattern of attachment to Israel we find that it is weaker among the younger population cohorts and stronger among the older. This is not at all surprising. Part of the reason is explained in the next section which describes the

growth of new conceptions of Judaism; conceptions which are correlated with age cohort. Not unrelated to that is the fact that younger age cohorts have no memories of the two most dramatic events in Jewish life in the twentieth century; the Holocaust and the birth of the Jewish state. Israel doesn't generate the emotional meaning among them that it does among older age cohorts. The survey of British Jews illustrates this latter point. Ties to Israel among young British Jews vary in a statistically significant manner with age. But among the younger age groups they also correlate with the number of visits one has made to Israel and the number of friends and relatives one has there. This is far less true of older British Jews. I endorse the authors interpretation of this finding. They say:

It would appear then that, after all, the more visceral attachment to Israel upon which the relationship between British Jews and Israel has always been based is very much age-related and in apparent decline. For young people to develop a close attachment to Israel, they need to see the land and meet the people -- but even then, that experience only outpaces the attachment of the older generation who have not been there by a relatively small margin. In that sense, the young have a psychological and emotional deficit that has to be compensated for by the physical connection. An Israeli

experience just stops the cracks from widening; it does not reverse the trend of growing distance between young Jews and Israel.¹¹

A far smaller percentage of American Jews have visited Israel or have friends and relatives living there. As a result, differences by age are even more dramatic in the U.S. than in Britain. In an as yet unpublished study based on a 1997 survey of American Jews undertaken on behalf of the Jewish Community Centers Association Steven M. Cohen asked over 1,000 Jewish respondents a series of questions about their attachment to Israel. He then created an index of attachment based on their responses. Cohen found that whereas only 23 percent of those aged 25 to 34 scored high on the attachment to Israel scale, the percentage increased consistently by age group reaching 46 percent among those aged 55 to 64 and 47 percent among those over 65.

Changing Conceptions of Judaism

What is being described is growing indifference rather than hostility. Israel is simply assuming less and less importance in the lives of American Jews. Changes in the role Judaism plays in the lives of American Jews and new images of Judaism are the major explanatory factors. They are interrelated and reinforce one another but they are analytically distinct. I will discuss each of them separately.

The Declining Role of Judaism

There has been an overall decline in the importance of being Jewish. This doesn't mean that the decline has taken place among all American Jews. On the contrary, some third and fourth generation American Jews feel more intensely Jewish than their second and third generation parents. But most American Jews are less intensely Jewish, or to put it another way, feeling Jewish is a less important component in the lives of most American Jews than in the lives of their parents. Without distinguishing between cause and effect, factors worth mentioning are the virtual disappearance of Jewish neighborhoods, the decline of Jewishness as a factor in business, career, employment and even social opportunities and the increased rate of intermarriage and its growing acceptance within the Jewish community. All these undermine the significance of being Jewish. One's Jewishness is no longer rooted in the patterns of one's life. Being Jewish is no longer a given which, for better or worse, has enormous consequences in the basic structure of one's life. It is only important for those who choose to make it important.

Consider the consequences that such a change has on the very conception of Jewishness. It is no longer, in the Durkheimian sense, a force of such ultimate significance in one's life that one is moved to reify it. On the contrary, it becomes a matter of choice, a leisure time activity. I return to this point in the

next section. Here I only stress that as being Jewish plays a less important role in one's life, the importance of Israel declines as well.

These developments are so obvious on the one hand, and there is so little that can be done about them on the other, that it seems pointless to elaborate upon them. A related though analytically independent factor is somewhat less obvious and therefore, deserves greater elaboration.

Changing Paradigms of Jewishness

In our book, Choosing Survival to be published in 1999 by Oxford University Press, my colleague, Bernard Susser, and I describe dramatic changes taking place in conceptions of what it means to be a Jew. We attribute these changes to a decline of what we call "the ideology of affliction". The sense that Jews were a besieged and beleaguered people played a major role in traditional Judaism. This is not the place to describe how the experience of Jewish persecution, theological conceptions of "chosenness" and images of the relationship between Jews and non-Jews ("a lamb among seventy wolves"), reinforced one another. The distancing of American Jews from Israel is best understood in the context of the new Jewish experience in the United States; the experience of acceptance rather than rejection and of a physical existence that is secure rather than precarious.

The Persistence of the Classical Paradigm

Despite the climate of acceptance and the unprecedented prosperity of American Jews, evidence points to the persistence of the classical paradigm of "affliction" or "adversity" among some segments of American Jews. This is the most credible explanation I find for the belief among 40 percent of American Jews that antisemitism in the United States is currently a "very serious problem" and only five percent who believe it is "not a problem at all".¹² But there are significant differences between those under 40 and those over 60, lowest income and highest income groups, most poorly educated versus best educated, and those who feel very close as opposed to those who feel fairly distant from Israel. In all cases, the former are more likely to believe that antisemitism is a very serious problem. No less significant is the fact that these differences are not found among those who define themselves as Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or Just Jewish. (Conservatives are slightly more likely to believe that antisemitism is a very serious problem than are the members of other denominations.)

My thesis is that among a large segment of American Jews the fear of antisemitism plays a critical role in their sense of Jewishness. "The Shoah (Holocaust), fear for Israel's survival, antisemitism," as one observer of American Jewish life summarizes it, are "the heartfelt issues for American Jews".¹³ These concerns appear to run very deep and to affect even Jews who are

not particularly traditional or institutionally committed. To paraphrase one unaffiliated Jew in his early forties who is anxious lest his children lose their sense of Jewish identity:

I'll take the kids aside to talk. They'll grow up with a sense of Jewishness, a sense of some justifiable fear and pride. I'll tell them about anti-Semitism and the Holocaust and the vulnerability of the Jews. It is part of the survival indoctrination of children to know that they are particularly vulnerable because they are Jews.¹⁴

Support for Israel and preoccupation with the Holocaust have a common root: both focus upon the beleaguered nature of Jewish existence. As Jonathan Woocher notes, American Jewish leaders regularly refer to Israel as: "a spiritual homeland", "the focus for our sense of peoplehood," the exemplification of "the fundamental values of Judaism, and "a light unto the nations". But, at the heart of these various images is a vision of Israel as "endangered". It is, these leaders quickly add, the responsibility of American Jews to assist it to survive. In a word: "When Israel is endangered...all Jews are endangered".¹⁵ According to Steven Cohen, "American Jewish feelings about Israel are dominated by fear far more than by hope, by nightmares more than by dreams."¹⁶

Not only are Holocaust memorials and support for Israel

similar in their emotional derivation; historically, they became major issues for American Jews at the same time. Both rose to the commanding position they now hold in the days and weeks preceding the 1967 Six Day War. Prior to 1967, neither Israel nor the Holocaust were major components in American Jewish identity. It has been regularly observed that analysts of American Jewish life -- notably in the various Commentary symposia of American Jewish intellectuals on the state of Jewish belief and Jewish self-understanding -- had little to say about either subject.¹⁷ In the first edition of his popular book American Judaism, Nathan Glazer noted that "the two greatest events in modern Jewish history, the murder of six million Jews by Hitler and the creation of the Jewish state in Palestine, have had remarkably slight effects on the inner life of American Jewry."¹⁸ It took the 1967 War to change these attitudes although other developments, including the emergence of Black Power and the legitimation of ethnicity in American life also had an impact.

From 1967 until the 1980's the massive support for Israel on the part of American Jews remained constant. It constituted the most important single item on the Jewish communal agenda, rooted in the traditional adversity-centered view of Jewish life. Interestingly, there is a significant correlation between perceptions of Arab hostility and perceptions of American Gentile hostility. "For American Jews, caring about Israel is tied to

worrying about the 'goyim'."¹⁹ It follows that those who view the world as generally antagonistic to Jews and to the Jewish State display high levels of caring about Israel. I also suspect that those wedded to the "adversity" thesis also imagine Israel as a financially needy country. The prosperity that Israelis display abroad, either as tourists or as investors, undermines this assumption.

American Jewish views of the world as antagonistic and Israel as beset with adversity are on the decline -- nowhere more so than among the youth. It should come as no surprise then that interest in Israel is declining as well.

New Paradigms

Developments in the last two decades are characterized by the emergence of personal and privatized Judaism and an accompanying decline of ethnic Judaism. The rhetoric of ethnicity concentrates on themes such as peoplehood, community, and solidarity. Its message centers on slogans such as "We are One" and "Keep the Promise". Its surpassing moments are Super-Sundays, collective mobilizations for Israel, and well-orchestrated political campaigns for or against some specific public policy. It is necessarily militant and impersonal. The language of privatized Jewishness on the other hand, speaks in the hushed, softer terms of individual meaning, journeys of discovery, and the search for fulfillment. It's emphases are inter-personal

rather than collective. Its favored qualities are authenticity and sincerity rather than achievement or efficiency. Typically it is consoling, non-judgmental, intuitive, and non-obligating.

Intermarriage, even marriages in which a non-Jewish spouse converts to Judaism are among the contributing factors though I doubt if they are the primary ones. A number of studies confirm that holding constant for denomination, ritual observance among converts to Judaism and within families in which one of the spouses converted are no less intense than among those who were born Jewish. But ethnic sentiments, including ties to Israel, are less intense among converts or among couples in which one of the spouses is a convert than among those who are born Jewish. This is not at all surprising since the convert and of course the non-converted marriage partner will have internalized Christian conceptions of what it means to be affiliated to a religious group; conceptions, we may add, which all American Jews increasingly internalize.²⁰ The assimilation process is not simply a process whereby an individual distances himself further and further from his own roots. It is also a process in which the group increasingly internalizes conceptions which prevail in the general culture about itself, about others and about God . This form of acculturation is inevitable in an open society and under certain circumstances may be a source of strength. But it is a mistake to believe that it is invariably a source of strength.

As Jack Wertheimer has shown, contributions to the Federations of Jewish Philanthropy -- a major form of public Jewish expression -- are stagnating if not actually declining.²¹ Mobilization for political causes of all kinds is reported to be more and more difficult to justify and sustain. Jewish organizations are increasingly comprised of and supported by an aging membership. Organizational work, once a commonplace Jewish avocation, appears to be eschewed by many; it is for them, excessively impersonal, power-centered, and perfunctory. Perhaps more significant than anything else is the decision of UJA to abandon its classic slogan "We are One" which epitomizes the public-ethnic dimension of Judaism for the personalist privatized slogan "For ourselves, for our children, for Israel".

In place of the declining public face of Jewishness, a burgeoning private sphere offering a new understanding of the Jewish tradition has begun to make itself felt. Affluence and security are implicit in all of its pronouncements. It is the voice of a distinctively Americanized cohort whose initial inspiration can be traced back to the counter-culture of the Sixties. Since then it has lost many of its rebellious qualities but it still presents a picture of creative diversity and moral enthusiasm.

The personalist 'life-style' is indeed a 'style', that is, a form of life given to sharp fluctuations and not a structure that

is stable and continuous. It tends to be constituted out of episodic and exceptional experiences rather than out of a fixed position that encourages disciplined regularity or patterned coherence. Simply put: personalism, that which many American Jews prefer to call "spirituality", detaches individuals from the larger social collectives of which they are a part, releases them from the binding duties these collectives impose, and leads them toward self-directed lives that pursue rare moments of meaning and growth. It is nicely illustrated in the only article devoted exclusively to Judaism in the December, 1997 issue of the New York Times Magazine which focused on religion in America.²² The author Rodger Kamenetz, winner of a National Jewish Book Award for his Stalking Elijah: Adventures with Today's Jewish Mystical Masters writes as follows:

For the past seven years, I've been searching for a Jewish practice that works for me. One thing I've learned: I'm not on my own.

My search began, oddly enough in Dharamsala, India, in 1990 following an encounter with the Dalai Lama. The Buddhist leaders asked the Jewish leaders who were assembled to meet him: What is your inner life? How does Jewish practice benefit people in their everyday lives? In particular, how does practicing Judaism help you deal with "afflictive states of mind"

-- anxiety, anger, trouble? Strikingly, these questions from a Buddhist master are precisely what American Jews are asking themselves today.

I know something was up when I gave a lecture for the United Jewish Appeal in New York. U.J.A. is a bulwark institution of secular (sic) American Judaism, yet here I was fielding questions about Jewish spirituality -- meditation, the renewal movement of Rabbi Zalman Schachter and kabbalah (Jewish mysticism). Finally, a bewildered older gentleman asked, "What does this have to do with supporting the state of Israel?" I smiled and thought, Absolutely nothing.

Similar responses are reported from the 1998 UJA young leadership conference. The headline describing the conference was: "The Spirit Moves Them" and the sub-head, "Continuing a trend, large dose of spirituality mixes with politics at annual UJA young leadership conference".²³ This emphasis on the self and its realization rather than on obligations transcending the individual person, entails a turning away from the kinds of commonplace commitments that lack the special cachet of personal authenticity or inner growth. What are called "traditional family values", for example, suffer accordingly. Once thought to be natural and sacred, these bonds are weakening apace. What seemed natural a generation or two ago -- that parents forego their own

needs for the sake of their children's, that grown children bear the responsibility for the welfare of their aging parents, that husband and wife renounce and compromise for each other's sake -- have become questionable propositions for very many. Accordingly, rates of divorce among Jews, once just about the lowest among all ethnic groups in the United States, are now rapidly approaching the national norm. Considering that Jews are far more understanding of abortion, homosexuality and extra-marital sexuality than other Americans, this tendency seems likely to become even more pronounced in the future.

Much the same can be said in regard to responsibilities toward abstract collectivities such as the Jewish people. From the personalist perspectives, true love, the ultimate personal experience, far outweighs one's ethnic ties. Indeed, to the degree that love needs to overcome obstacles (ethnic or religious) in order to be realized, it is considered the more authentic and marvelous. Understood in terms of personal meaning, Jewishness becomes -- even for Jews -- an acquired taste, a take it or leave it affair. Moreover, experience-based religiosity has no justification for exclusion or boundaries; it necessarily includes all who are partners to the inspirational moment.

Steven Cohen demonstrates this in his paper for the Jewish Community Centers Association referred to above. The paper is aptly titled "The Fall of Ethnic Judaism". His 1997 survey of

American Jews shows that younger age cohorts are, if anything more religiously oriented than older age cohorts (for example younger Jews are more likely to report they believe in God than are older Jews), but they are significantly less concerned with ethnic issues and feel lesser ties to other Jews. Whether these developments may reverse themselves or how those charged with strengthening American Jewish-Israel relations might confront these developments is a tough question.

ENDNOTES

-
1. Portions of this paper were prepared for a meeting of the Koret Institute fellows in September, 1997
 2. A report of such impressions based upon a plethora of anecdotal evidence is Yosef Abramowitz, "Distant Relatives," Moment (December, 1995), pp. 54-57, 81, 84-85, 88. Abraham Ben-Zvi, Partnership Under Stress: The American Jewish Community and Israel (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Jafee Center for Strategic Studies, Memorandum No. 52, August, 1998) is an effort to describe the implications for U.S. Israeli relations of the growing distance between American Jews and Israel.
 3. The survey was conducted in cooperation with the Israeli newspaper Yediot Achronot and the results were published in Israel as a special supplement to the Passover edition. Yediot Achronot (April 16, 1998).
 4. Steven M. Cohen, Ties and Tensions: An Update. The 1989 Survey of American Jewish Attitudes Toward Israel and Israelis (New York: Institute on American Jewish Israeli Relations The American Jewish Committee, 1989), p. 8.
 5. American Jewish Committee, 1997 Annual Survey of American Jewish Opinion (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1997), p. 51.
 6. Waxman's article appears in Allon Gal (ed.), Envisioning Israel: The Changing Ideals and Images of North American Jews (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996), pp.374-396. Steven M. Cohen's article in the same volume, "Did American Jews Really Grow More Distant from Israel, 1983-1993? -- A reconsideration," (pp.352-373), offers a contrary thesis but then concludes that there is an age related decline in attachment to Israel. "Older American Jews are somewhat more attached to Israel than their middle-aged counterparts, who in turn are more attached than younger Jewish adults". (p.368).
 7. Barry Kosmin, Antony Lerman and Jacqueline Goldberg, The Attachment of British Jews to Israel (London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research, jpr/report no. 5, 1997).
 8. Ibid., p. 22.
 9. Ibid.
 10. These statements are cited in Steven Cohen and Charles

Liebman, "Israel and American Jewry in the Twentyfirst Century: The Search for New Relationships," Anat Gonen and Smadar Fogel (eds.), Israel 2020: Master Plan for Israel in the 21st Century (Jerusalem: Jewish Agency for Israel, in Hebrew, 1996), pp. 207-223.

11. Kosmin, Lerman and Goldberg, op. cit., p. 13.

12. American Jewish Committee, 1997 Annual Survey..., pp.22-23, 85.

13. Barry Rubin, Assimilation and Its Discontents (New York, Times Books, 1995) p. 252.

14. Sara Bershtel and Allen Graubard, Saving Remnants: Feeling Jewish in America (New York: The Free Press, 1992), p. 22.

15. Jonathan Woocher, Sacred Survival: The Civil Religion of American Jews (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), p. 77.

16. Steven M. Cohen, "Israel in the Jewish Identity of American Jews: A Study in Dualities and Contrasts," in David Gordis and Yoav Ben-Horin (eds.), Jewish Identity in America (Los Angeles, University of Judaism, 1991), p. 128.

17. Charles Silberman, A Certain People: American Jews and their Lives Today (New York: Summit Books, 1985), p. 185

18. Nathan Glazer, American Judaism (Chicago, Univeristy of Chicago Press, 1957) cited by Silberman, op. cit., p. 204.

19. Cohen, "Israel in the Jewish ...Contrasts," p. 128

20. For more on this topic see Steven M. Cohen, "The Conversion Illusion," Jack Wertheimer (ed.), Jewish Identity and Religious Commitment (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, The North American Study of Conservative Synagogues and Their Members 1995-1996, 1997), pp. 29-35.

21. Jack Wertheimer, "Current Trends in American Jewish Philanthropy," American Jewish Year Book 1997 (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1997), pp. 3-92.

22. Rodger Kamenetz, "Unorthodox Jews Rummage Through the Orthodox Tradition," New York Times Magazine (December 7, 1997), pp. 84-86.

23. The Jewish Week (March 27, 1998), p.51.