

Lakeville and Israel:

The Six-Day War and its Aftermath

By MARSHALL SKLARE

THE RESPONSE of American Jewry to the Crisis in Israel in April-May of 1967, to the Six-Day War which followed, to the Israeli victory, and to the State of Israel from that time to the present, is as yet imperfectly understood. While a veritable flood of books has appeared about the War—the events which preceded it, the strategy on which it was based, and even the attitudes of Israeli soldiers engaged in the struggle—no comparable literature has emerged on events in the American Jewish community and on the attitudes of American Jews. In fact, we do not as yet have even a simple chronicle of the response to the War in a single American community.

The story of American Jewry and the Six-Day War will, of course, be a subject of scholarly inquiry in the years ahead, especially on the part of historians who will seek to reconstruct the past by the use of documentary sources. But the events are too momentous, and

their significance for the understanding of Jewish identity too crucial, to await the ultimate verdict of historians. Much can be learned by studying what is readily available, especially by probing the feelings and actions of both average citizens as well as community leaders. In fact, data about such feelings and actions, if gathered close enough to the period in which the events took place, may provide the type of understanding which is difficult to come by from more conventional historical sources.

In the early months of 1968 we returned to Lakeville—where field work had been conducted a decade earlier on the problem of Jewish identity—to learn something about the response to the Israel Crisis, to the War, and to its aftermath. Lakeville, located in the Middle West, is a suburb of Lake City, one of the leading industrial and commercial centers of the nation. Lakeville's history as a suburb goes back to the turn of the century, when it attracted members of the Gentile upper class who proceeded to build very commodious, even luxur-

• Thanks are due to The American Jewish Committee for their financial support of this project.

ious, summer homes and estates in the community. As transportation improved, Lakeville became their year-round place of residence. Shortly before World War I the industrialist who was the most widely respected member of the Jewish community of Lake City, both by his fellow Jews and by Gentiles, bought an estate in the area. His choice signified both to the Jewish upper class as well as to the Jewish middle class that Lakeville and the adjoining communities were to be the preferred locations for Jewish suburbanites.

Lakeville grew slowly in Jewish population during the 1920's, most of the new residents being upper-class and upper-middle-class German Jews. During this period the first Jewish religious institution was established: the Isaac Mayer Wise Temple. The Great Depression saw few Jewish newcomers, but soon after World War II a heavy migration of Jews from Lake City took place. Lakeville attracted the more prosperous and the more highly educated of the new Jewish suburbanites of the 1940's, '50's, and '60's. But although on the whole wealthier, better educated, more urbane, less traditionally Jewish, and less ethnocentric than the average new Jewish suburbanite of Lake City, the majority of Jewish newcomers were different from the Jewish old-timers in the community. For one thing, they were from East European stock, rather than from the more acculturated German-Jewish one.

The influx of new Jewish residents had profound implications for Lakeville's Jewish institutional structure. Many new Jewish groups were established, including branches of most of the major national Jewish organizations. Even the Isaac Mayer Wise Temple was transformed. The Classical Reform Jews who had established the institution were displaced and they proceeded to establish the David Einhorn Temple. Einhorn grew out of a reli-

gious school established in the community by the American Council for Judaism. Two other Reform congregations were founded in the post-World-War-II era. The Max Lilienthal Temple serves the younger and newer suburbanites of East European lineage whose income is on the modest side by Lakeville standards. The Samuel Hirsch Temple is noted for its image as the "thinking-man's" temple; it ranks higher than any of the other congregations in the proportion of its membership which are college graduates, and it includes families of both East European and German-Jewish stock. Conservative Judaism is represented in Lakeville by the Solomon Schechter Synagogue, a large and vigorous institution. Efforts to establish an Orthodox synagogue in Lakeville have been unavailing.*

THERE HAVE BEEN no startling changes in Jewish institutional life in Lakeville since the community was originally studied a decade ago. In the attitudinal area change has been slow as well: there is nothing to suggest that prior to May-June, 1967 feelings of Jewish identity were in strong movement, either in a positive or negative direction. People do feel that there has been a gradual increase in the frequency of intermarriage. But they also feel that there is greater interest in Jewish education both for adults as well as for the young.

The Crisis, and the Six-Day War which followed, altered the picture of orderly communal evolution and attitudinal change. All observers in Lakeville attest to the fact that no event during the past decade has had an impact upon feelings of Jewish identity

* For details about the community and the findings of the original study see Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier: A Study of Group Survival in the Open Society*, New York, Basic Books, 1967.

comparable to that of the War. Yet there is no agreement about what the impact was, why it occurred, the extent of its duration, and its eventual result.

A definitive assessment of these challenging questions must await the mounting of a full-scale sociological assault. The present effort is in the nature of a reconnaissance: a series of relatively unstructured interviews with seventeen Lakeville residents, eleven of whom were among the 432 persons interviewed in the original sample.

A reconnaissance effort, by definition, is only a beginning, although if successful it may contribute measurably to present understanding as well as to the strategy of future research. But first there is the problem of evaluation. Should Lakeville's response be considered on the high or the low side when we think in terms of the nation at large? In evaluating Lakeville's response we must bear in mind that the community does not have the reputation of being a hotbed of pro-Zionist sentiment. For example, in contrast to some less-statusful suburbs and inner-city Jewish neighborhoods where the most popular Jewish women's group is Hadassah, in Lakeville, Women's ORT occupies this position. Furthermore, there has been a very small but recognizable segment of the community identified with the American Council for Judaism. As we have noted, some years ago this group was strong enough to establish a religious school in the community, and as an outgrowth of this school the David Einhorn Temple was established. While the connection between Einhorn and the ACJ is quite different today from what it once was (the Temple now belongs to the Union of American Hebrew Congregations), the fact that such an institution was established means that there was a group of residents whose family background included a non-Zionist or anti-Zionist tradition. Lakeville has its

Zionists of course (including some who are leaders of Zionist organizations), as well as an extremely large group who are pro-Israel. Yet while there are Lakeville residents who have made large financial contributions to Israeli causes, Lakeville is not the type of community where one would look for a maximum response to the Six-Day War (unless of course one is prepared to argue that the maximum response occurred in precisely the wealthier, more acculturated Jewish communities). Thus if we find that a given impact occurred in Lakeville, it would be fair to infer that this impact was at least as strong in the country at large.

Concern and Interest

OUR RESPONDENTS remember being very anxious during the days in April-May 1967 when the crisis was developing. Their anxiety was greatly heightened by the doubts which they had concerning the ability of Israel to withstand the might of the Arab armies. Such doubts can best be illustrated by the two respondents who found themselves under cross-pressures to shift from a feeling of anxiety to a feeling of confidence. In both cases the impetus was provided by Israelis. In the first instance the Israeli was a houseguest of one of our respondents who had come to the United States on a fund-raising mission for a specialized Israeli institution. In the other case the cross-pressure was provided by a neighbor, a *yored* [an emigrant from Israel] who had recently settled in Lakeville after reputedly having made a "killing" on the stock market.

Both of our respondents were more troubled than reassured by what these Israelis told them, namely, that there was nothing to worry about and that Israel would be able to take care of its enemies without much trouble. Our first respondent—the one with the

house-guest—reported that in spite of his great esteem for his visitor he became hostile to him on the basis that he was so lacking in feeling as not to experience the anxiety the respondent himself felt. The respondent with the *yored* for a neighbor had other problems. While the *yored* lived in luxurious style, he had rebuffed our respondent when the latter had approached him for a donation to a Jewish charitable cause. Our respondent felt that his neighbor was an insincere person who was putting up a brave front since he refused to acknowledge how difficult was the situation of beleaguered Israel and how much his help was needed.

If the two respondents who were under cross-pressures did not have their fears relieved, our respondents as a whole were left undisturbed with their anxieties. If the optimism of the two Israelis was typical of the mood in Israel at the time—as we think it was—then our respondents' fears may in part be traced to their very distance from Israel and Israelis; were they more involved they would have been less worried. But even more must be at stake. The man on the fund-raising mission who told his host to stop aggravating himself was resented. Thus a psychological reaction probably occurred, namely that if the Israelis are bearing the brunt of the struggle, the least that we comfortably-situated American Jews can do is worry. Those who would deprive us of this function will make us feel like bad Jews whereas we wish to consider ourselves to be good Jews. However, in spite of their anxieties our respondents were able to carry on with their normal routines. Only one reported psychosomatic symptoms.

The feeling of our respondents was unambiguously pro-Israel. There was no doubt in their minds as to which side was right. Support for Israel seems to have increased as the Crisis deep-

ened, undoubtedly because it evoked unconscious feelings.

WE SHALL HAVE occasion to return to the problem of unconscious feelings; at this point we only wish to highlight the strength of pro-Israel sentiment. The depth of support for Israel during the Crisis and War can perhaps be gauged from the reactions of a respondent whom we shall call Robert Himmel. Himmel is a board member of the Einhorn Temple and a long-time member of the American Council for Judaism. He traces his lineage to pioneer German Reform stock. Himmel now considers himself "pro-Israel and anti-Zionist." His justification for supporting Israel during the Crisis and War was that: "It is the only democracy out there [in the Middle East]. It is important for the United States from a strategic point-of-view." When Rabbi Elmer Berger came out with a statement critical of Israel during the period of the Crisis and War, Himmel reacted strongly. He wrote Berger a long and blistering letter (he instantly put his hands on the correspondence). Himmel did not object to the content of Berger's statement: "What Berger said was right but it was bad timing. I hate negativism. If he couldn't say anything good about Israel why couldn't he have kept his big yap shut?"

Our respondents felt so highly involved that their appetite for news during the Crisis and the War was well-nigh insatiable. While they do not ordinarily listen to news broadcasts on transistor radios, such devices were pressed into service. One woman took her radio with her when she kept an appointment at her hairdresser. There was some radio-listening in business offices, a most unusual procedure for our respondents. One woman reported an almost insatiable hunger for news comparable to what she had experienced

when President Kennedy was assassinated.

Many of our respondents watched the debates at the United Nations far into the night. As they saw it, the hero of the drama which unfolded there was Abba Eban. All were entranced by Eban. His presentation was felt to be both logical and stirring, his case airtight, his mind colossal, his oratory magnificent. One respondent feels that Eban far surpassed Churchill at his best. All felt Eban to be the perfect Israeli and the perfect representative of Israel. Their overwhelming enthusiasm for Eban would suggest that they saw him as their representative as well, and they were gratified that he provided them with a model they could so readily identify with. None of our respondents seem to be aware that their feeling that Eban is the perfect Israeli is not shared by all Israelis.

If Eban was judged to be a Jewish superman, the representatives of the Arab states were regarded with contempt. Their presentations were seen as fraudulent, their motives as sinister, their corruption complete. The speeches of the Arab representatives—and those of their Communist allies—only confirmed our respondents in their pro-Israel opinions.

American Loyalties vs. Support for Israel

OUR RESPONDENTS were not only united behind Israel but the Crisis and War was a case where they did not experience any strain between their national loyalties and their support for a foreign country. Or better, they strove not to perceive any such strain. The fact that Gentiles did not press for such a strain was very helpful to them.

The desire not to perceive any strain is exemplified by a respondent who was thrilled at the Jewish response to the

Crisis and who was firm in his support of Israel. He then added "I'm a firm believer that what affects other countries affect us as well," as much as to say that any right-thinking American would have supported the Israeli cause out of the national interest.

In the present instance the possibility of a strain was provided not by anti-Semites, not by the general public, and not even by the American government, but, surprisingly, by the government of Israel when it made the decision to attack the U.S.S. Liberty. But even this incident did not, in most cases, affect the feeling of our respondents that good Americanism and good Jewishness were one and indivisible. Some interpreted the incident, in which thirty-four U.S. sailors died, as the type of accident which is inevitable in a fast-moving war. They suggested that if it had been known that the Liberty was an American ship there would not have been an attack. Others, however, viewed the attack as deliberate—as a move by the Israelis to preserve their sovereignty and security. These respondents felt that the Liberty had no right being where it was (some interpreted the Pueblo incident along much the same lines). Many of these respondents supported the Israelis in their action, while others showed understanding even if they did not support it. But whether the action was viewed as deliberate or accidental, there are those who remember being concerned at the time about the Gentile response. There is, for example, the man who recalls being "... concerned that bigoted people might fasten on the incident and try to make the most out of it."

The strongest criticism of Israeli actions in respect to the Liberty came from a respondent who considered himself a firm supporter of Israel rather than from a present or former member of the ACJ. This respondent felt that

the action was deliberate. He recalls his sentiment at the time: the incident was a "catastrophe." The Israelis had no right to proceed as they did because it meant hurting their staunchest supporter, the U.S. Government: "... the Israelis should remember you don't bite the hand that feeds you. ..." But in actuality this respondent was much more concerned with the welfare of American Jews than with the relationship between the two governments: "... you don't complicate the position of American Jews who want to support Israel." In spite of his feelings against Israel for its action against the Liberty, there is no reason to suspect that this respondent shifted to a lower level of support. His strong reaction can be accounted for by the fact that, having considered himself pro-Israel for many years, he began to perceive a strain between his loyalties as an American and as a Jew.

Assuring an Israeli Victory

THE STORY is told of an ultra-Orthodox Jew who, in the midst of the siege of Jerusalem during the War of Independence, went around the city proclaiming: "Jews, do not rely on miracles! Recite Psalms!" While prayers and Psalm-saying are traditional Jewish responses to impending catastrophe, there is little reason to suspect that they were much in evidence in Lakeville during the Crisis and War. We did not probe our respondents on this score but none volunteered information which would suggest any increase in personal devotions. (It is entirely possible, however, that prayers and Psalms were recited during the Crisis and War in various congregations during the course of their regularly scheduled services.)

If personal devotions were something which the Lakeville Jew was incapable of, he was able to perform a traditional act of another sort: the giving of mon-

ey. In fact the giving of money is not only viewed as an act of solidarity with Israel but as having helped to assure an Israeli victory.

Strange as it may seem, our respondents even today connect their own actions with the Israeli victory. If the winning of any war ever depends upon superior financial means, the Six-Day War was not such a war: by the time the first public (if not private) fund-raising meetings could be convened, victory was a foregone conclusion. But sober businessmen long experienced in problems of procurement, of manufacturing and of transportation, acted as if the money they contributed one day could somehow miraculously be turned into the sinews of war the very next day. Because they wanted to believe in such a miracle, the emphasis was not upon pledges—the usual form of Jewish fund-raising—but on a different approach: the giving of cash. And when the imminence of the Israeli victory forced another justification for the fund-raising, and especially for the giving of cash, the following approach was articulated: "Since the costs of the War have been so great, Israeli resources have been completely depleted. Unless we help, Israel will become bankrupt and the victory will be in vain." American Jewish money, then, would keep Israel from losing the peace.

The agency charged with the responsibility of organizing the drive for contributions to Israel from Lakeville Jews is the United Jewish Welfare Federation and Council of Lake City (JWF). This organization sponsored a drive for the Israel Emergency Fund. However, since grass-roots sentiment was so strong, drives were started on local initiative. Thus some of the religious institutions in Lakeville proceeded to organize campaigns; such campaigns, of course, were soon coordinated into the plans of the JWF.

Nevertheless, the synagogue drives were more spontaneous than the JWF campaign and at the outset they were relatively free from professional control. Although the largest gifts were given through JWF channels, it was the synagogue drives where grass-roots sentiment was apparent in its most pure and unsophisticated form. Thus, these drives hold a special interest for us.

FOUR OF THE FIVE synagogues in the Lakeville area sponsored such drives. A detailed report on one of them—the drive sponsored by the Samuel Hirsch Temple—is presented below. This meeting eventuated from an extraordinary session of the Temple board which had been convened on the evening of June 5th in response to the news that war had just broken out that morning in Israel. The information below is from an interview with the congregation's spiritual leader, Rabbi Samuel Aaron:

At the meeting Monday night the immediate thought was to raise money. It was clear that the money would be for the Emergency Fund but there was some complication with the [Israel] Bonds people, who wanted in. However, it was the feeling that they should not be in and some compromise was arranged in that Bonds were not sold from the rostrum but the chairman announced that officials of the Bond campaign were in the audience, that they had blanks, and that if anybody wanted to purchase Bonds he should see these men and women in the audience.

The Monday night planning meeting was attended by Joe Cohen, who is on the staff of the JWF. Cohen came to the meeting late, tired from the many meetings that he had already attended. There was a decided lack of rapport between him and Rabbi Aaron and it was necessary for peace to be made between the two men. Apparently some people at the meeting lined up on the side of Cohen but more seemed to line up on

the side of Rabbi Aaron. Cohen wanted to hold the Wednesday meeting in usual Jewish fund-raising style, to call cards, to announce donations in order of magnitude and to do all the things that go on at these affairs. Aaron felt that this was completely inappropriate and that Cohen did not understand the nature of the crisis and the mood of the people. Cohen wanted a big-name speaker. Rabbi Aaron burlesqued his approach as follows: "We'll even get you a guest speaker who died in the War." The people at the Monday night meeting who wanted to do it the Cohen way were those people who were old JWF people and not really active Temple people. It was finally decided there would be no calling of cards, that people could get up in any order in which they wished to, that they would not need to announce any amounts, and that they could say anything they wanted and not only announce a gift. It was also decided that no refreshments would be served. No guest speaker was to be invited.

Some 500 families belong to the congregation. It was decided to send a telegram to each. When these were ordered there was immediately a problem at the local Western Union office: there was not sufficient manpower to deliver the telegrams. The youth [of the Temple] helped out, although some were in school and Aaron is not quite sure how all the telegrams got delivered. There was some annoyance at the telegram approach. Some people resented being disturbed by deliveries made in the middle of the night. There were some people who were against the idea of the telegram itself, and perhaps some who objected to the expense connected with it.

About 500 showed up on Wednesday night. In trying to estimate what percentage of the families of the congregation were represented, Aaron arrived at the figure of 55 percent. The people who had arranged the meeting had hoped for more. However, this was the

largest meeting that had ever been held in the building. It attracted more people than on any other occasion in the history of the congregation except for the High Holidays.

The president of the congregation opened the meeting. Part of his job, he felt, was to justify the convoking of this extraordinary gathering. Aaron said "he is not a *farbrenter* Zionist" and therefore he had to put the meeting in context for the audience but even more for himself. The spirit at the meeting and the spirit during the week at the congregation was fantastic. More than on any other occasion the congregation was unified.

There was some problem at the Wednesday night meeting because the feeling of threat had been dissipated and by that time the Israeli victory was quite clear. Aaron took the approach at the meeting that even if the War would be won the disruption of the economy would be tremendous and that economic troubles might make Israel go down in the end. Money was therefore needed not so much to win the War but to keep the country alive.

Aaron is not sure how much money was actually raised at the meeting but it was an extremely large amount. The JWF was contacting people simultaneously and there was some confusion. They were also skimming off the cream by talking to the really big donors, so that from this point of view the meeting could be viewed as an anti-climax. It was not an anti-climax for any of the women, however, for they had not been contacted by the JWF.

The entire meeting was cash-oriented. A great many checks were handed in; people not only wanted to pledge money but they actually wanted to give cash at the meeting. Several people got up and said that they had arranged for a bank loan so that they could give the cash. Another man got up to say that Baron Rothschild in Paris has sold his race horses to raise cash. Aaron found

this example of "privation" hardly inspiring.

The entire meeting on Wednesday night lasted only one hour and ten minutes. People stood around afterward. They were reluctant to go home. Everyone told Aaron, who was the principal speaker, that his presentation was wonderful. He felt it was not, that it wasn't as good as it should have been.

THERE ARE intimations in this interview that giving is seen as a religious act. Hence the criticism of those who would secularize or in some other way corrupt it. It is difficult to say whether other respondents feel the same way as Rabbi Aaron. What we do find in quite a number of interviews is the mention of heroic acts of giving—of individuals who could not afford to give what they did. Not all such acts are known personally to our respondents—some are the result of second or third-hand information. But some of those which are known at first-hand may strike the observer as less than heroic. For example, one of our respondents who is in the banking business was amazed to find that individuals came in to his bank to arrange loans so that they might make their Emergency Fund donations in cash. However, while the loaning of money in order to give charity deviates widely from the philanthropic norms of our culture, it actually says little about what proportion of his wealth the individual is giving away.

We avoided probing the respondent too deeply about the size of his own donation to the Emergency Fund, lest rapport be interfered with. But in only a single case is there even a possibility that a family might have temporarily had to deny themselves something to which they were accustomed. There is also a case among our respondents of a family which thought it might be necessary to cancel their summer vaca-

tion because of their Emergency Fund contribution. However, they finally decided to go through with their plans.

All of our respondents who gave to the Emergency Fund had enough ready cash to cover their gifts. None say that they had to resort to bank loans or to the selling of securities in order to meet their obligations. Respondents did not claim that they personally gave in a heroic manner: few if any who participated in the Emergency Fund campaign claim that their giving was of such a magnitude as to make a noticeable dent in their personal assets.

Focussing exclusively on the question of the magnitude of the gift, however, creates the danger that we lose sight of the significance of gift-giving. This is particularly so in the case of first-time givers. One of the most interesting types of first-time givers is the kind whose previous non-giving is based on a lack of contact with Jewish life, rather than on ideological considerations or psychological makeup. An example of such a non-giver who became a first-time giver is Mrs. Mildred Fried. Of all of our respondents Mrs. Fried is closer to being assimilated than any of the others interviewed. Thus she lacks any of the points of contact which Mr. Himmel, the anti-Zionist, has with Jewish life. Mrs. Fried follows no religious practices in her home, does not belong to a synagogue or a Jewish organization, and has not given her children a Jewish education. A salaried professional woman, she has been criticized by Jewish and Gentile colleagues for working on Yom Kippur, but she feels that she would be perpetrating a fraud if she remained at home. In contrast to most of our other respondents, Mrs. Fried has a number of close friends who are Gentile. In spite of all this Mrs. Fried leads an underground Jewish life. While she has never disapproved of the idea of intermar-

riage, she was secretly pleased when her daughter married a Jewish boy. While she has never given her Gentile friends any reason to suspect she is ethnocentric, she feels that "... there is a certain 'ego' in being Jewish. Gentiles can't keep up with Jews."

Mrs. Fried was as emotionally involved as any of our respondents with the Crisis and the War. She was glued to the TV set, watching the UN debates far into the night and relishing each word of Abba Eban. She has saved the newspapers of June 6-11: "This is history, and this I wanted to keep." She made a contribution to the Emergency Fund. This is the first time she can remember doing anything for Israel. Giving a contribution was more complicated in her case than in others. Not appearing on any membership list of a synagogue or Jewish organization, she received no telegram summoning her to a meeting and she had to go out of her way to find out where contributions should be sent.

MRS. FRIED's desire to donate to the Emergency Fund was not an uncomplicated act of generosity but was intimately connected with the meaning which the struggle had for her. According to our record:

The five days after the first day of the struggle Mrs. F. described as "pure ecstasy." Israel was performing miracles. She was deeply touched by what was happening. She felt that no more does the Jew march to the ovens. Now he has something to fight for.

Later in the interview Mrs. Fried told us about a letter she had received from her son who was at graduate school:

"Bill wrote to me how proud he was to be a Jew at this time. He had told me before that he could not understand why the Jews walked to the gas chambers." Mrs. F. says that her boy believes in fighting back. He could not under-

stand his grandfather and previous generations who lived by "backing away." Her implication was that while she had tried to explain this to Bill, she could not really understand it herself. Now no more explanations are needed.

The interview concludes on the following note:

Mrs. F. emphasized that the Six-Day War was an enormous event in human history. "We have never fought back before. We always picked up our bundles and ran. Now we can fight back."

Mrs. Fried's donation, then, is intimately connected with her desire to assist those who, according to her understanding, were putting an end to Jewish behavior with which she could not identify—behavior which she had always been ashamed of.

Among the leaders of the David Einhorn Temple we find a different situation, for there we encounter cases where people have been approached year after year to contribute to Israel but have refused to do so, presumably because of ideological considerations. One of the leaders whom we interviewed persisted in non-giving, and refused to make a contribution to the Emergency Fund. But we also interviewed other leaders of the Temple who made a first-time contribution to Israel. Unlike Mrs. Fried, both non-givers as well as first-time givers seek to justify their respective actions. According to non-givers, money given to the Emergency Fund would continue the tradition of the United Jewish Appeal which draws no distinction between philanthropic and political purposes; it uses its funds for the illegitimate purpose of stimulating *aliyah* to Israel, including the *aliyah* of American Jews. Thus, according to one board member of the Einhorn Temple, the JWF utilized the Six-Day War to raise funds far beyond anything they had previously conceived of, the JWF was "hysterical" and played

upon the emotions of Jews, and the JWF never specified how the funds being given to the Emergency Fund were going to be used.

While this particular non-giver was well-defended, he left us with the impression that he was not happy with his lack of giving. Two of his fellow board members—contributors to the Philanthropic Fund of the ACJ—had, on the other hand, donated to the Emergency Fund. These men were obviously happy that they made a decision for Israel. Their decision, however, was more a break with principles than a sacrifice of substance. While both are substantial businessmen, one stated that his contribution was \$50 and the other did not reveal his gift. We infer it was also a pittance. Yet such token giving had deep significance for these men, for they were doing their bit to assure an Israeli victory. One man repeated his old resentments against the JWF: "They send the money to Israel and it comes back here for propaganda purposes." But he felt that money contributed to the Emergency Fund was different: "It is being used for economic needs in Israel."

THE EINHORN TEMPLE held no fund-raising meetings for the benefit of the Emergency Fund. Yet the question of how the group should respond to the Crisis agitated the leadership of the Temple. Some wished to do nothing while others went so far as to suggest that a fund-raising meeting be held. A compromise was arranged: a letter was sent out under the signature of the president and the rabbi, stating that if a member wished to make a donation he should contact the temple office where he would be supplied with a list of Israeli causes. One member resigned from the Temple as a result of the letter.

One board member of the Einhorn Temple remains staunch in his criti-

cism of the philanthropic response of the Jewish community. He feels that people were exploited and as a consequence far too much money was made available to the Emergency Fund. On the whole, however, our respondents were thrilled at what was done. They have knowledge of some of the sums given by the big-givers and they highly approve of such generosity. Those who gave do know people who did not give and they also cite cases of friends, relatives, neighbors, or business associates who did not give enough. But in the main our respondents feel that the level of generosity was extraordinary. The most critical is Abraham Weinberg, a strong supporter of Israel and of all the laymen whom we interviewed the most devout, the most highly involved in Jewish life, and the most concerned with giving his children an intensive Jewish education. On his own initiative Weinberg organized a parlor meeting for the benefit of the Emergency Fund. About \$5,000 was raised among his neighbors at this meeting but he told us: "They felt it was tremendous but I feel that the response was lukewarm. People were surprised and worried by their generosity."

One special aspect of this particular parlor meeting requires mention at this point. When the meeting was being organized there was a question concerning a Gentile who resided on the block. Since this man was particularly friendly with his Jewish neighbors he constituted a problem: if he was not invited he might feel insulted, but on the other hand, if invited he might feel compelled to give and thus be forced into participating in an act of Jewish solidarity. It was decided that he should be invited but that he be instructed that he was to come as a guest and thus was not to make a contribution. The man came but refused to act as instructed. He made a contribution of \$100. He also gave an additional gift

of \$25 on behalf of his son.* He said he admired the Israelis and supported what he called their fight against the Arabs and against Communism.

Though money represented the dominant mode of response, there were other reactions as well. Little if anything was done by our respondents in terms of political activity, but one declared: "If it would have been necessary I would have contacted my Congressman." Others echoed the same sentiment. A further question was whether children should be encouraged to go to Israel to help. Our respondents were generally passive in this regard. There were one or two who had a problem, however, for their children took the initiative and said that they wanted to go during the Crisis. The tendency of these parents was to temporize. Thus Mr. Weinberg's oldest son wanted to go but he prevailed upon the boy to finish the term at college. In one family, however, there was an offer of support when a child indicated a desire to go to Israel. This is the Fried family—the most alienated among our respondents. But their youngster did not get to Israel: in spite of the approval of his parents, he was prevented from pursuing his objective of rendering personal assistance to Israel because of circumstances irrelevant to our present study.

The Mass Media and Attitudes in the General Society

THE PROBLEM presented by the Gentile on the block leads us to a consideration of the relationship between minority and majority. We have already discussed this problem in terms of the possible conflict between divergent loyalties, especially as these were highlighted by the Israeli attack on the

* A number of our respondents did the same thing—wanting their children to participate, they made donations in their name.

U.S.S. Liberty. Here we shall be concerned about what the respondent perceived to be the attitude of Gentiles with whom he associated, of the mass media, and of society at large.

Most of our respondents report that they were happy, even delighted with the coverage given to the conflict in the mass media. Even media they expected to be hostile gave a fair presentation. The only critical reaction they can remember was to be found in letters-to-the-editor columns where occasional anti-Israel sentiments could be encountered. While anti-Israel material was absent, the mass media contained considerable anti-Arab and anti-Russian comment. As one respondent put it: "It was clear that the Gentiles were with us against the Arabs."

If our respondents perceived the mass media as friendly, their contacts with Gentiles—on whatever level these occurred—reinforced the impression that the general community supported their position. *Most respondents reported an unambiguously positive reaction.* However, the wife of one respondent—a woman who works in an office where most of the employees are Gentile—reports that on the first day or two of the War the reaction was not too positive: "Then it abruptly changed for the better when the Israeli victory became apparent." Respondents were very pleasantly surprised to see the reaction of Gentiles. The respondent who appears to be the most surprised of all (he says he was "rather startled") is the board member of the Einhorn Temple whose negative comments about the Emergency Fund were quoted earlier.

Our respondents have different theories about why the Gentiles were sympathetic. One feels it was a case of Israeli cowboys against Arab Indians. Others introduce the theme that the anti-Soviet views of the public made them unusually receptive to a pro-Israel point of view. Yet another re-

spondent says that while he feels Gentiles were basically pro-Israel, he suspects that Jews heard as much pro-Israel sentiment from Gentiles as they did because "... it was said for the benefit of the listener."

ONE RESPONDENT is thoroughly distrustful of the Gentile response. This is Rabbi Aaron, who ordinarily spends little time in interfaith work but who was drawn into such activities during the Crisis and War as well as during the months which followed:

On June 7th Reverend James, the minister of a Presbyterian Church in the area (and one of the brightest and most pro-Jewish of the ministers in the area), had the idea of circulating a petition to support Israel. This petition was never published, however, because not enough signatures of other ministers could be gathered. If only some of the ministers signed, it was felt that the publishing of the petition would do more harm than good. At the time of the blockade the rabbis in the area sought to promote a petition supporting the Israeli position, to be signed by ministers in the area. Aaron had been given about 15 names to call. He called all 15 and about eight or nine said yes. Other rabbis did not achieve such a high percent of assent. Since there was no clear consensus, this petition was dropped. Ministers who would not sign the petition generally responded by saying that the matter was a political one in which they could not interfere as ministers of the Gospel.

In addition to Reverend James, the other person who came to the fore during the blockade and crisis was the Unitarian minister in Lakeville. He sent a letter to his membership asking them to contribute to the Emergency Fund. It is Aaron's impression that this letter was signed by the president of the Unitarian Church as well as by the minister. This is the Church in which there are many Jewish-Gentile intermarriages and many

people of Jewish lineage. The mood in the Church, as Aaron put it, was to show that "We Jewish Unitarians are doing our part."

The latest aspect of the Christian response is a gathering which had been held in the winter sponsored by the rabbis for the purpose of convincing Christian ministers that they had a long-range obligation to support Israel. It was first thought that the meeting should be held at the new sanctuary of the Isaac Mayer Wise Temple, but there was some question as to whether this was a good idea. The problem was whether the sanctuary was too showy and demonstrated too much wealth, and would therefore reinforce Gentile stereotypes.

Aaron is not quite sure how the meeting was financed, as this group has no treasury. He estimates the cost of the meeting was about \$1,000. He wonders whether a Zionist group picked up the tab. The main speaker was the nationally-known Rabbi Jacob Benjamin of New York, who spoke on the theological commitment of Jews to the State of Israel. He was followed in the afternoon session by a local man, Rabbi David Rose, who spoke about the Christian reaction to the Crisis and the War. Rose put the cards very much on the table, stressing that there was much less support from Christian leaders than the Jewish community expected. He stressed the great disappointment and shock the Jews experienced when they found what the Christian reaction was. Most of the ministers sat on their hands. The specific purpose of the meeting was to light a fire under these ministers. It was quite obvious that none was lit.

The meeting was predominantly a Protestant meeting, for only three or four Catholic priests were present. Aaron summarized his reaction by saying that: "We Jews are dealing with a deep-seated and potentially very dangerous anti-Semitism in this ministerial group."

Except for Rabbi Aaron, then, our

respondents perceive that Gentiles supported their own position toward the War. *Furthermore, our respondents feel the victory of the Israelis improved the status of American Jewry.* Perhaps the single deviant in this regard is the non-giver of the Einhorn Temple, quoted earlier. The most doctrinaire of the anti-Zionists whom we interviewed, this man stated: "Gentiles do not think that we American Jews are connected with Israel in any way." But other Einhorn board members took a very different view. One reported that: "... the stature of the Jew rose." A Gentile associate with whom this man has done business for many years told him over the long-distance phone with obvious approval: "You Hebes really taught those guys a lesson." Another board member, who had resigned from the ACJ because "they fight Zionism unintelligently," found that Gentile business associates considered the Israeli victory to be his victory. He became more respected in their eyes because of the Israelis' feat of arms. This was the general view: that the American Jew had achieved new respect in the eyes of the Gentile because of the Israeli victory.

The Problem of Long-Range Impact

PERHAPS THE MOST frequently-asked question about the Crisis and the War is its long-range impact on the attitudes of American Jews. Does it represent a decisive turning point in feelings about Jewish identity in the restricted area of attitudes toward Israel and/or in the more general area of attitudes toward self? Does it portend a renaissance in American Jewish life or will its impact--whatever it is estimated to be--gradually be dissipated by the inevitable march of other events which turn out to have greater meaning and relevance in the life of the individual?

These are difficult questions to answer on several counts—they require us not only to prognosticate but also to provide a definitive answer to the problem of what exactly it was that happened to American Jewry during the Crisis and War. In approaching this issue we shall first discuss the desire of our respondents to experience the victory at first-hand and to strengthen their ties to the country by visiting Israel in the aftermath of the Six-Day War.

1. Visiting Israel

In the original study we did not ask a question about visiting Israel: a decade ago travel to Israel was still an exceptional experience. Asking now about visiting, our assumption was that most of our respondents (particularly those who were over 40 and who were in the upper-middle or the upper class) would have visited Israel at least once during the intervening decade. But we were surprised at how few had done so. *We were particularly surprised that as late as February of 1968 not a single one of our respondents had visited Israel since the War.* Furthermore, with a single exception—a family we shall call the Melvin Whites—none had at the time any definite plans to visit Israel.

The lack of any compelling desire to go to Israel during the summer of 1967 or in subsequent months is highlighted by the case of Philip Green. Mr. Green, who is in his early sixties, is a wealthy owner of a wholesale electric supply house. He lives in a very comfortable ranch house situated on one of Lakeville's best streets. As is apparent from the following extract from his interview, Green experienced as strong a pro-Israeli reaction during the Crisis and War as any of our respondents. In respect to the Six-Day War, Green said:

"I was never so vehement about anything in my life. I was practically ready

to go over to fight." Green doesn't know why he reacted in the way he did but he knows that he had never felt anything like this before. He went to a fund-raising affair at the Isaac Mayer Wise Temple, where he is a long-time member. He gave more than he had ever given before. At the fund-raising affair he made a contribution in the name of each of his children. He wanted them to participate in some way.

Green—the only one of our respondents who spontaneously mentioned the phantasy of fighting for Israel—has never been to Israel and has no plans for going. When asked about travel plans he seized upon the President's recommendations against non-essential foreign travel:

In respect to travel Green feels he is an American as well as a Jew and therefore the welfare of this country has to be considered. Thus, if travel to Israel has to be deferred because of the balance of payments, so be it.

Green's apathy about travel suggests that there was in his case, and by extension in others, a strong unconscious element in the reaction to the Crisis and the War. Like others, he could not explain why he reacted in the way he did.

THE MELVIN WHITES are the exception—they are the only family which has made definite plans to visit Israel. This youngish family lives in a luxurious home on a heavily wooded site; it was once the estate of a member of the "400." Mr. and Mrs. White travel abroad regularly, sometimes with their three sons. Indeed they are the most fashionable people we interviewed in Lakeville: they travel more, play more, spend more, and seem to have better connections than any of our other respondents. Their style-of-life conveys a strong "JFK" image. To quote from the interview:

The White family was in Israel two years ago for the first time, spending eleven "very full" days in the country. Mr. White, who has developed an important manufacturing business, was shown various projects in Israel. The family was apparently given the VIP treatment. However, to the best of Mrs. W's information her husband did not subsequently make any investment in Israel.

The Whites were taken to S'de Boker to meet Ben-Gurion. He asked the boys when they were coming to live in Israel. The second thing he asked them was whether they spoke Hebrew. Receiving a negative response to both questions, he "bawled us out." Ben-Gurion told the Whites that the next time they would meet he wanted the boys to speak to him in Hebrew.

They met "wonderful, wonderful people" in Israel. The study of their home has many framed color photos of their guide, people they had met at kibbutzim, officials of the Histadrut, factory managers, and prominent personalities: Eshkol, Ben Gurion, Teddy Kollek, Golda Meir. Mrs. W. emphasized again and again the wonderful, wonderful people they met and how very lucky the family was to have these connections. The boys were very impressed with Israel.

From Israel they visited Greece and Italy. They enjoyed these countries but there are very few pictures in the study about their visit there. The exception is a photo of Mr. and Mrs. W. with Pope Paul. Mr. W. is a generous contributor to a Catholic university located in Lake City.

Mr. and Mrs. White are going to Europe in March for a vacation. After sightseeing and winter sports they have made arrangements to spend several days in Israel. Thus, they will be the first of our respondents to see the country after the awesome events of June, 1967. But even they will not have planned a special trip to Israel—they will jet to Lydda after their European

expedition is concluded. But the Whites do want to see what has happened since their first visit, and especially the changes which have occurred since the Six-Day War. Mrs. White looks forward to renewing her acquaintance with the people she met before. She experienced a quality with Israelis which she finds lacking in her friends and neighbors in Lakeville: "... they have been making great sacrifices for their country and it is a wonderful place because there is a strong feeling of nationalism and of giving oneself to a cause."

2. Shifts in the Level of Pro-Israel Support

In our original study a six-point scale was used to measure the level of pro-Israel support. Interviewees were asked to respond positively or negatively to the following types of support:

Raise money for Israel

Seek to influence U.S. foreign policy in favor of Israel

Belong to Zionist organizations

Give Israeli financial needs priority over local Jewish causes

Encourage their children to immigrate to Israel

Participate personally in the building of Israel through becoming a citizen of Israel

Some 93 per cent approved of raising money, 63 per cent of influencing foreign policy, 31 per cent to belonging to Zionist organizations, 14 per cent to giving Israeli needs priority, and 1 per cent to both of the items on *aliyah*.

This scale was administered to ten of the eleven respondents who were part of the original sample, with the following results:

Same Response	5
One Step Increase	2
Two-Step Increase	1
One-Step Decrease	2

Half of our former respondents, then, would extend the same level of support today as a decade ago. These five individuals include two who only go so far as raising money, two who approve raising money and also influencing U.S. foreign policy, and one who approves of belonging to a Zionist organization and giving Israeli needs priority as well. The two individuals who increased by one-step were both money-approvers who moved up to the influence-foreign-policy level. The single individual who increased by two-steps moved from a zero score to approving money and influence. The two individuals who experienced a two-step decline formerly approved of money, influence, and belonging to Zionist organizations; they no longer approve of Zionist organizations.

VERY SURPRISINGLY, then, the Crisis and War do not appear to have made any real impact on levels of pro-Israel support. Our respondents are not ready to go farther today than they were a decade ago. There are those who have moved up a step but their example has been balanced by those who have moved down.* Finally, the single case of a two-step increase does not represent a conversion from a medium level of support to a high level. Rather, this individual started out at the zero-level and is now at a level which is very close to the average for the community. His life history reveals the story behind this shift. George Mandel was born and raised in a small Iowa town where Jewish influences were minimal. His origins are still manifest in his quiet speech and his reticent manner. Since his marriage to a Jewish girl and his settlement in Lakeville, Mandel has gradually accultur-

ated. This has meant that he has become more "Jewish," including the adoption of normative attitudes toward Israel.

3. Shifts in Feeling about Jewishness

If we cannot discern any real increase in the types of support which Lakeville Jews feel compelled to render to Israel, it is possible that there have been subtle shifts in feeling about Jewishness—shifts which have long-range implications of a positive kind for Jewish survival. What these shifts might be we cannot say. But our interview with Rabbi Aaron contains some relevant hints:

Asked about the High Holidays, Aaron said that they were better attended this year than previously. The services were also the best services. He does not know whether this is directly because of Israel but in his opinion it helped. In general, the Israeli crisis served to bring the congregation closer together. There was an impending crisis in the congregation over Vietnam, but the Israel victory averted any such confrontation. His first sermon for the High Holidays was on Israel. He imagines that every rabbi in the country did the same. The people who were with Aaron on Vietnam (he is a dove) he describes as the better Jews in the congregation. Peculiarly enough, people who followed him on Vietnam were more Zionist-minded than the hawks in the congregation. He thinks that because Vietnam, Jewish identity, Israel, and Hebrew had been presented by him as a package, those who wished to emulate him bought both his Jewish attitudes as well as his general social attitudes. He feels there has been and continues to be a conflict with some over supporting Israel and being against Vietnam. The conflict is sometimes a very subtle one, and in some people there is a conflict but they are not aware of it. He personally is worried about Moshe Dayan and his image, and there

* It might be claimed that the meaning of the item "belong to Zionist organizations" is not the same today as it was a decade ago.

are some people in the congregation who are also worried about Dayan. Aaron is more comfortable with the "Buber image" than with the Dayan image and he said that for himself and those who follow him in the congregation: "Eshkol is for us a better image than Dayan."

Asked about what residue the Crisis and War have left or what it has meant in addition to the High Holidays, he said that the congregation is in favor of extending its program of sending youngsters to Israel for the summer. This would involve increasing the amount of money they make available—the program now costs the congregation about \$3,000 a year. It will escalate and he feels there is no question but that the congregation will continue to pay for it. The congregation is very proud of its subsidy program in sending some of its young people to Israel each summer. It represents a kind of commitment to Israel. The Reform appeal for Israel, on the other hand, is not attractive; the congregation is not excited about raising money to establish a Reform presence in Israel.

The Israeli Bond dinner that the congregation sponsored raised more money this year than before and almost everything in the congregation this year has gone somewhat better than before. There is more attendance at Hebrew classes this year.

The impact of the Israeli crisis may be involved perhaps in the new high school department which the congregation has embarked on. Aaron feels the congregation will spend more per pupil in the high school department than any Reform congregation in the country, and that while the groundwork was prepared for this in past years, the issue had to be voted on during the time of the Crisis. He expected much more opposition to the new program than developed. He wonders whether the program received such firm support because of the mood induced by the Crisis.

Aaron finds that Jewish life at the Temple isn't *all* that different this year,

however. He expected the change to be sharper than it actually has been.

The Meaning of the Crisis and the War

WE ARE NOW prepared to confront the question of what exactly happened to American Jewry during the Israeli Crisis and War. We know that our respondents were shaken by the threat posed by the Crisis, were unambiguously pro-Israel, were tremendously stirred by the victory, felt that they did their duty to bring such victory about through their financial contributions, have not shifted in their level of pro-Israel support, and have not evinced any extraordinary eagerness to visit Israel. We also know that central participants in Lakeville Jewish life, such as Rabbi Aaron, expected "... the change to be sharper than it actually has been." And it has occurred to one of our respondents who occupies a much more marginal position in Jewish life, George Mandel, that he no longer feels about Israel the way he did. He recalls how he felt last June:

"If anything had happened to Israel it would have been a catastrophe. People wouldn't have had any place to go. Israel was a symbol of what modern Jews can do." While Mandel did not take any political action, if the war had taken another turn he would have contacted his Congressman and asked for U.S. support. He remembers having a feeling of great pride in what the Israelis had done.

The following excerpt from his interview records his contrasting feelings at the present time:

Mandel does not have as much feeling about Israel at the present time as he thought he would based on his feeling in June. If he was going on a foreign trip, Israel would not be the first place he would visit. He has seen slides taken by one of the people who works at his

office. This person brought back an extensive collection and showed them to a group for a whole evening. "When I saw the people and the countryside I didn't relate to it as much as I thought I would. I don't know why but the people looked very foreign to me." He has no urgent feeling about visiting Israel. He does not know anyone who has changed decidedly in his feelings and his actions about Israel as a result of the Crisis. Since the situation has cooled off he doesn't see much difference. People feel about the same way as they did before.

How then may we explain the sharp difference between present emotions and those of the immediate past, as well as the absence of a revolutionary change in Jewish life?

It seems to us that the response of May-June was not a response to Israel in the conventional sense but rather a response to the events of Jewish history from the 1930's onward. The response in Lakeville must be understood in light of the fact that American Jews, by fortunate circumstance, have been exempt from this cataclysmic history. The Crisis brought to the forefront of consciousness the possibility of a repetition of that history—the possibility of another holocaust. Like the first holocaust—in which American Jewry was exempt not by virtue of any special nobility of its own but rather by pure happenstance—another holocaust would have meant that again the American Jew would miraculously escape harm. If we have the problem of justifying our escape from the first holocaust, the least that we can do is make the gesture of helping to prevent a second one; at the very minimum such a gesture will indicate that some good purpose was served in our being spared. (And the possibility of a second holocaust presents us with an opportunity to cleanse the record of the 1930's and 40's—perhaps we are not en-

tirely sure that we did all we could to avert that holocaust and to succor its victims.) Thus, our support of Israel is intimately connected with our desire to preserve a feeling of our worth as human beings.

Furthermore, we support Israel to protect our sense of meaning. Israel created meaning, for it meant that out of the destruction of the holocaust something new, clean, and good was born. Thus, Israel protected our sense of meaning in a world which assaulted any sense of meaning which the Jew might have. Israel's destruction, then, would involve the destruction of meaning. Hitler, whom we thought to be dead and conquered, would be alive again; the final victory would be his. By upsetting our sense of meaning, a new holocaust would have plunged American Jewry into total *anomie*. From this perspective, Israel *had* to be supported as never before. Her destruction would have meant our end as an American Jewry, for we could not survive such a complete loss of meaning.

THESE PERSPECTIVES, tenuous as they are, help us to understand why Mr. Green, who fantasied going to Israel as a soldier, has not taken the first plane and gone there as a tourist; why Mr. Mandel, with his lack of any contact with a meaningful Jewish culture, cannot recapture the enthusiasm of the immediate past; why Mrs. Fried is still as marginal a Jew as before; and why Rabbi Aaron is surprised that Jewish life in Lakeville, although characterized by an aura of good feeling, has seemingly resumed its accustomed tempo.

Those who are disappointed, who feel that an *immediate* and *revolutionary* change in Jewish feeling and behavior should have occurred in Lakeville and throughout the land, might consider that only if events in Israel

during May-June 1967 had taken an unfavorable turn might we have expected such a rapid change of values. But such a change would necessarily have been in a negative, rather than a positive, direction; instead of optimism such a change would have induced the blackest kind of pessimism about the future of being Jewish. Thus for those who are disappointed there is a kind of ironic consolation in the fact that no immediate revolution in Jewish life took place in Lakeville during the aftermath of the Six-Day War. Finally, for students of ethnicity in general and of Jewish life in particular, the re-

sponse in Lakeville demonstrates that feelings of Jewish identity—albeit on the unconscious level—are more abiding than we had any reason to suspect previously.

MARSHALL SKLARE specializes in the study of racial, ethnic and religious groups. He is professor of sociology at Yeshiva University. During the current academic year he is also a visiting lecturer at the Princeton Theological Seminary.

In addition to Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier: A Study of Group Survival in the Open Society, he is the editor of The Jews: Social Patterns on an American Group, and the author of Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement.

Reprinted from

midstream

A MONTHLY JEWISH REVIEW

October, 1968

for additional copies, write to
THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Institute of Human Relations
165 East 56 Street, New York, N.Y. 10022