Marshall Sklare: An Assessment

Charles S. Liebman

Marshall Sklare shaped the field of American Jewish sociology in its formative years and his work continues to play a central role in the discipline. It seems appropriate to begin an assessment of Sklare by looking at some of the forces which shaped his work. The autobiographical remarks which introduce this volume are most instructive.

Sociological Observations on Sklare's Autobiographical Remarks

There are four aspects of Sklare's autobiography which I think merit special attention: the intellectual role models present at early stages of his intellectual career, his study of history as background to his subsequent studies in Jewish sociology, the fact that after completing his doctorate in 1953 Sklare was employed by the American Jewish Committee for thirteen years, and his continued career in a Jewish milieu.

Sklare lists some of the faculty members at the College of Jewish Studies of Chicago. He mentions Simon Rawidowicz, Shimon Halkin, Nahum Glatzer and Fritz Bamberger. Any department of Jewish studies in the world would take pride in this gallery of stars. Sklare was exposed, at an early stage of his student life, to keen intellectuals who not only swam in the vast ocean of Jewish knowledge but were productive scholars whose formulations of the Jewish historical, philosophical and literary traditions must have set standards for Sklare and instilled a sense of the responsibility he bore as a Judaic scholar.

I deliberately use the term Judaic rather than Jewish. Virtually everything Sklare wrote emerged out of a context of Jewish history and tradition. This was the way in which he viewed North American Jewish life and this is the way in which he described North American Jews. Sklare took it for granted that the study of American Jewish behavior had to be located in the context of Jewish history and tradition. It stood to reason therefore, that the student of American Jewish life had to become familiar with that history and tradition.[1] So Glatzer, Rawidowicz, Halkin and others like them not only provided models of intellectual distinction but starting points in Sklare's own scholarly pursuits. Nevertheless, despite Sklare's identification with the field of Judaic studies and his admiration for its practitioners, he was unsparing in his criticism of their slighting treatment of contemporary Jewish studies.

In addition to his college and university mentors, Sklare singles out two of his American Jewish Committee colleagues -- Milton Himmelfarb and Lucy Dawidowicz. I have vivid memories of those halcyon days when Sklare, Dawidowicz and Himmelfarb shared adjoining offices on the fifth floor of the A.J.C. I still recall the pleasure I derived from my visits there, generally though not always occasioned by something I was writing for the American Jewish Year Book. I remember thinking how unfair it was that the magnificent A.J.C. library was a few steps away from their offices. After all, Sklare knew all there was to know about North American Jews, Dawidowicz all there was to know about East European Jews, and Himmelfarb all there was to know about everything else. Why, I wondered, did they also need a library at their fingertips. The three of them were marvelous talkers and even better listeners. Sklare's intellectual acumen must have been sharpened in their

presence.

My second observation is related to the first. Sklare's undergraduate major was history. His first serious academic interest was modern Jewish history. History requires an attentiveness to text, an ear to what is being said. Answers to questions which the historian poses are culled from a mass of material which require thought and reflection. This is a distinct advantage, perhaps almost requisite training to one who ultimately enters the field of sociology where so much evidence is based on survey research and the temptation to make facile assumptions about the meaning which the questions have for respondents and the legitimacy of treating responses outside the context in which they are offered is always present.

My third observation brings us back to Sklare's employment at the A.J.C. Sklare mentions the difficulties in working as a professional in a Jewish organization, albeit as Study Director and later Director of the Division of Scientific Research. ("The Division of Unscientific Research is not my responsibility", he used to quip.) No doubt there were all kinds of administrative tasks as well as trivial kinds of programs that Sklare was expected to undertake and there were always additional and seemingly unrelated responsibilities that any senior member of a professional organization is expected to share. Nonetheless, over a period of 13 years most of Sklare's time was spent in learning about American Jewish life whether it was in formal research efforts, in traveling and speaking with Jews all over the continent, in perusing the material that crossed his desk as a matter of course, in listening to the variety of Jews who came through the offices of the A.J.C. or in his and his family's own intense participation in Jewish life. There is no university position today, and

there certainly was none thirty years ago, that would have allowed its incumbent the amount of time and access that Sklare had to the raw materials of Jewish life. Sklare was probably the most perceptive and best trained sociologist the American Jewish community has ever had; he was surely the best informed. It is unlikely that anyone will ever know as much as he did about American Jews and his knowledge was critical in those formative years of the discipline.

There is also a minor point about Sklare's A.J.C. association tht deserves mention. I was always surprised at his sensitivity to differences among Jews by class and origin. He was conscious of status differences between Eastern European and German Jews in the United States and to class differences among all kinds of Jews. This was less noticeable in his own publications though he devoted a number of articles to the topic in his first reader, The Jews.[2] It also emerged in his public speeches, his classroom lectures and most frequently in private conversation. It was an important component in his conceptions of North American Jews. He was also extremely sensitive to class consciousness and snobbery among other Jews. His private comments in this regard always surprised me since I tended to be rather insensitive in such matters. The differences between us might have been a matter of generation but I always thought it was attributable to his years of association and the nature of his relationships with the lay leaders of the American Jewish Committee.

The final point in Sklare's autobiography that casts important light upon his work is his continued employment, even after he left A.J.C. within a Jewish milieu. Sklare was employed on a full time basis by Yeshiva University for three years. In 1970 he accepted a full time position in the Department of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies at Brandeis

University. In both these locations, as at A.J.C., Sklare was located among Jewishly committed colleagues who never called upon him to justify his research preferences or his presumptions in favor of Judaism and Jewish survival. One has only to compare the first reader which Sklare prepared The Jews: Social Patterns of An American Group with the next important reader to appear on the same topic, Peter Rose's The Ghetto and Beyond[3] published in 1969. That volume contained an article (written especially for the volume by a colleague of Rose's at Smith College), on the benefits of the demise of Judaism.[4] The articles on political topics in that reader assumed a radical-liberal stance, reflecting the academic consensus of the period. Not only was Sklare freed, relatively speaking, of the need to project his research as "value-free," he was under fewer constraints than those that normally adhere among scholars to satisfy the political and cultural biases within academia. In addition, he was under no pressure to publish in scholarly journals rather than in journals under Jewish sponsorship. Indeed, as his bibliography indicates, almost none of his publications are in journals of a non-Jewish nature and the few that are, were, mostly, I would guess, by invitation.

There are advantages and disadvantages for any scholar who works under such conditions and they are important to note. Sklare never felt obliged to explicate the theoretical assumptions that guided his work. On the contrary, the editors of the Jewish journals in which he published, Commentary more than any other, would have found such an elaboration distracting. He never had to justify the validity of his studies in relationship to the broad field of sociology nor did he have to answer to referees who might have required him to justify his topic in terms of its applicability to non-Jewish groups. Finally,

he didn't have to legitimate his assumptions about the value of group identity and the desirability of Jewish survival nor did he have to assume a non-judgmental posture. The topics Sklare chose to research, the manner in which he presented his material, and the conclusions he drew stemmed from his own scholarly-Jewish agenda. The fact that Sklare was able to distance himself as thoroughly as he did from the material he researched is a tribute to his own professionalism -- he was under no pressure to do so. The institutional settings in which Sklare was located freed him from constraints to which most other students of American Jewish sociology are subject. I should add that many such sociologists do not view these constraints as impediments in their work. They have so internalized the values and the cultural ethos of the social science discipline that they operate more easily in this Jewishly neutral context. I don't know if that makes them better sociologists. There are certainly temptations that someone in Sklare's position faces, temptations to be less than strictly analytical about the data and to impose one's hidden agenda on the material. I think that even Sklare succumbed once. On the other hand, there is no question in my mind that the kind of research which sociologists who are located in Jewishly neutral situations produce is far less valuable to the Jewish community than anything Sklare did. What I find striking is that even when such sociologists are employed by the Jewish community they refuse or are unable to abandon their professional, value neutral and non-judgmental persona. In refusing, ostensibly, to adopt a stance, what they really do is impose the hidden assumptions of their discipline and/or of academic culture on their work and indirectly on the Jewish community which employs them -- the assumptions of personalism, voluntarism, universalism and pluralism.[5]

Sklare's Role in Shaping the Discipline

Sklare influenced the field of American Jewish Sociology in a number of ways; through key conceptions which he introduced, through his methodology, through the readers which he edited and finally through his explicit statements about the nature of the field culminating in the establishment of the Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University.

No individual has introduced as many core conceptions to the study of American Jewish sociology as did Marshall Sklare. I will note a few concepts which appear most frequently in studies by other scholars. Sklare identified the characteristics of rituals which North American Jews were most likely to adopt, what Sklare called "criteria for ritual retention".[6] He defined them as rituals capable of effective redefinition in modern terms, rituals which do not demand social isolation and the following of a unique life style, rituals which accord with the religious culture of the larger community and provide an alternative when one is felt to be needed, rituals which center on the child and finally rituals which are performed annually or infrequently.

Sklare was not the first to study immigrant culture through successive areas of settlement; the notion derives from the Chicago school of urban studies. But Sklare's application of the notion to studies of Jewish immigrants, especially to the development of the Conservative synagogue[7] brought it to the attention of American Jewish historians and sociologists where it has become a major research tool. Conservative Judaism, in my opinion the best book ever written on American Jews, describes the subtle transformation

of Jewish religious life as a consequence of acculturation, a theme that has become standard in the study of North American Jews. The same volume also demonstrates the importance of observing the religious behavior of the masses as well as the ideological predispositions of the elite. The cooperation and tension between mass and elite was critical in the formation of Jewish religious institutions in general and Conservative Judaism in particular. While it was I who introduced the terms folk and elite religion in an American Jewish Year Book article parts of which Sklare subsequently reprinted with his own three page introduction,[8] it was Sklare's study of Conservative Judaism which provided the inspiration for these concepts. Similarly, I introduced the terms "public" and "private" Judaism, to distinguish collective, ethnic orientations of Jews from personal, self-fulfilling more religiously oriented tendencies[9] but the conceptions are inherent in Sklare's article "The Greening of Judaism".[10] Finally, it was Sklare who introduced the instrument which measured "images of the good Jew" by listing a whole series of characteristics or behavior patterns and asking respondents whether each such characteristic or behavior was essential, desirable, made no difference or was inimicable to being a good Jew.[11] That instrument, which was subsequently incorporated in a variety of community surveys, is, in my opinion the best single measure we have for testing, through survey research, what Jewishness means to North American Jews.

Sklare focused his studies on Jewish identity. He did not exclude the study of religious institutions -- they play an important part in both Conservative Judaism and Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier -- but he generally ignored studies of other communal institutions though he was as fully informed about them as he was about every

other aspect of North American Jewish life. His methods of data collection were eclectic. He utilized survey data where it was available and did his own attitude surveys when there were no other materials at hand. But he was primarily an ethnographer. He observed Jews in a variety of settings, he listened to them as they spoke, he read all that they produced but always appreciated the value of a single anecdote as paradigmatic for a general condition. He employed archival material when it was available, and above all else, he empathized with American Jews. His empathy was really a research tool for it enabled him, as it does the best of the ethnographers and cultural anthropologists to imagine himself in the place of a variety of types of Jews and thereby understand how they respond to a variety of situations. I was and remain awe struck by his capacity to empathize with so many types of Jews -- perhaps this is connected to ahavat yisrael mentioned in his autobiography. I never could comprehend his ability, given his own commitments, to move comfortably in Reform circles and with a variety of Reform leaders. I don't think he became quite comfortable with the ultra-Orthodox until family circumstances propelled him into their company. But he surprised even himself at how easily he was able to relate to them. It was a source of satisfaction to him.

I don't mean to suggest that Sklare loved, sympathized with or even empathized with all Jews. He did not. There were many Jews whom he could not abide. The distinguished professor of Jewish studies whom he mentions in his autobiographical remarks was only one of them. But as far as I know the only group of committed Jews with whom Sklare was unable to empathize was the Ramah-havurah type of young Jew to whom he refers in his article "The Greening of Judaism". Oddly enough, they are the sons and

daughters, nieces and nephews of people whom he genuinely liked. I read the article when it first appeared and I recall thinking at that time that it had a grumpy tone to it. Upon rereading it there can be no doubt that Sklare was absolutely correct in pointing to a malaise which was reflected in The Jewish Catalog, a malaise that increasingly characterizes central tendencies within the "committed" segment of American Jewish life. But because I believe Sklare allowed his irritation to overcome his empathy (the only occasion in which I recall his doing so), he missed the opportunity to analyze the ubiquity of the important phenomenon he was describing -- the rise of personalism and personal autonomy and the decline of heteronomous authority -- a phenomenon that has become critical in the transformation of religion among North American Jews.

Despite his distrust for that group of young Jews whom he felt were Jewishly irresponsible, he was not alienated from the young. Sklare looked to students to exert pressure on faculty and administration to introduce courses in contemporary Jewish studies:

> ...if Jewish studies in the American university are to have a vital future it will be because they fulfill a need which the young Jew experiences. Thus the push to the study of Judaica must originate in the desire to explore personal identity. It follows then that the future of Jewish studies in the American university will be abortive if they move too far in the direction of becoming a pure and impersonal science...in order to plumb his identity the young Jew will not only have to be familiar with the Jewish classics and the history of his remote ancestors but he will have to study himself and his immediate forbearers.[12]

There is an autobiographical flavor to these lines and they may constitute the best explanation of Sklare's own devotion to Jewish identity as the controlling concept in the study of North American Jewry.

The readers which Sklare edited represent, independently of his own publications, an important contribution to the field. The first reader represents a major contribution. His autobiographical remarks suggest the importance and sense of responsibility with which he viewed that particular work, The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group which he prepared for The Free Press. Sklare mentions the significance of The Free Press, but younger colleagues may not appreciate the important role which that publisher played among graduate students in the social sciences in the 1950's and 1960's. In the two fields in which I was most involved, sociology and political science, The Free Press was by far and away the most significant publisher. I remember the feeling that in order to keep current with important new developments in the field all one really had to do was read the Free Press list. Sklare's reader, even more than his book Conservative Judaism, was a statement that the sociological study of the Jews was intellectually respectable. The articles in the reader were magnificent. Without slighting their uniform excellence, the ones by Nathan Glazer, Fred Strodtbeck, Herbert Gans, Jerome Carlin and Saul Mendlovitz, Martha Wolfenstein and Charles Snyder became topics of conversation among Jewishly interested graduate students and were frequently cited in the subsequent literature. (Ben Halpern's "American is Different," had, as I recall, already achieved the status of a minor classic.) They demonstrated that study of Jews fit into the range of subjects to which sociology addressed itself and that these studies could be carried on without the least sacrifice of the highest

academic standards. I never realized, until I read Sklare's autobiographical remarks, that the vast majority of articles were not reprinted from academic journals. Sklare's remarks led me to look once again at the origins of the 33 articles. Seventeen were written specifically for the volume. An additional five articles were revisions, some undertaken by Sklare himself, of research reports or in one case of a series of articles previously published in the American Jewish Year Book which Sklare molded into one piece. Contrary to what I had thought, only six of the articles had appeared or had originally been written for publications or as reports that were not specifically Jewish. In other words, Sklare did not find a mass of superior articles on topics of Jewish interest from which he could pick and choose those most suitable for a reader. He had to persuade others to prepare them or produce the articles himself or a bit of both. His next readers, two volumes titled The Jew In American Society and The Jewish Community in America, published by Behrman House in 1974, contained 26 articles, only two of which had appeared in The Free Press edition, and only one of which was an original article written for the reader. These two volumes, published seventeen years after the first edition, reflected the growing maturity of the field, in no small measure a tribute to Sklare's pioneering endeavors.[13]

The final category of contribution which Sklare made to the discipline was in articles on the nature of the field of contemporary Jewish studies and in the establishment of the Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University. In his early articles, Sklare pointed to the need for courses in the field and to the question of where such courses might be best located -- in social science departments or departments of Jewish studies.[14] (He seemed to favor the latter). By 1984 Sklare was able to describe the problems which those

who teach contemporary Jewish studies and those who enroll in such courses must face.[15] Evidence, once again, of the rapid development of the field.

The establishment of the Center for Modern Jewish Studies was made possible by a Revson Foundation grant. The grant was made in anticipation of Sklare's central role in the projected development of the Center. Prior to issuing the substantial grant and as a condition therefore, the Revson Foundation offered Sklare a smaller sum to commission a series of papers surveying the state of the field. The authors were invited to describe different areas of American Jewish studies including the kinds of knowledge available and some research projects that ought to be undertaken in each of these areas. The papers were then discussed before a larger meeting of scholars in October, 1979. Sklare chose ten areas of American Jewish life: demography, identity, religious life, education, families and family policy, the Jewish polity, relations between Jews and non-Jews, Jewish organizations, local Jewish communities and Jewish organizations.[16] There was an additional paper on the genesis and organization of research centers. The only field I felt he had overlooked was the creative arts and literature although some might have argued over the omission of the Jewish occupational structure; as I recall he couldn't find a suitable author for the occupational study. I never understood why Sklare neglected the creative arts, literature in particular, as an appropriate area of contemporary Jewish studies. It is one of the few subjects I had intended discussing with him and never got around to doing so. Sklare himself wrote an essay which urged the Center to sponsor a synthetic or interpretive volume on the sociology of American Jewry.[17] He believed that such a work would be an important stimulant to the growth of the field, would encourage publishers to solicit other

such works, would lead to the introduction of college-level courses in the subject and by suggesting new problems would inevitably lead to new works of synthesis and interpretation. Sklare made no secret of the fact that he intended writing such a volume and it is indeed unfortunate that he never did so.

Sklare's Influence on American Jews

Sklare was a popular figure on the Jewish lecture circuit. His presentations, like his essays, were carefully crafted, yet entertaining. Whether in print or behind a podium, whatever he had to say had a point. He never used the lecture hall or the classroom simply as a forum to display his erudition or his wit or to appeal to popular prejudices. He bitterly resented those of his colleagues who did. In the 1960's I sat through two of his courses on American Jews at Yeshiva University's Wurzweiler School of Social Work in anticipation of my substituting for him the following year. His course lectures, if anything, were even more stimulating and entertaining than his popular lectures. Almost all his class room lectures followed the same structure. He would begin with a brief survey of the institution he was describing, whether it was the family, or the synagogue, or education, or communal leadership, or the rabbi as it developed through Jewish history noting its condition in eastern Europe in particular. He would then describe its evolution in the United States from the immigrant generation until the contemporary period, accompanying his description with a plethora of anecdotes and statistics, where the latter was available. His listeners, class room students or popular audiences never failed to feel stimulated as well as informed. He touched their Jewish nerve and allowed them to integrate their own Jewish

experiences with the Jewish historical experience and the life of the world Jewish community. I can't imagine many figures, in the rabbinate much less in academia who did more than Sklare to stimulate Jewish awareness and sensitivity.

The topic upon which he was asked to speak most frequently and upon which he wrote such important essays in Commentary, a topic with which he increasingly saw as a threat to Jewish life in the United States, was that of intermarriage. Sklare wrote and spoke about intermarriage before it had assumed its present proportions and before it had effected so many Jewish families in the United States that one had to be very careful about how one addressed the topic for fear of offending the majority of one's audience. I would like to think that if not for Sklare the situation would be even worse than it is. I may be fooling myself.

This essay affords me an opportunity to comment upon the charge that Sklare overlooked the resurgence of Orthodoxy in American Jewish life until the revised edition of Conservative Judaism was published by Schocken in 1972. It is true that Sklare belittled Orthodox prospects in North America in the first (1955) edition of the book. It is also true that in his study of Riverton[18] (Riverton was, as I recall, a pseudonym for Trenton, New Jersey), he found Orthodoxy in precipitous decline. One cannot fault a researcher for reporting what he uncovers. Furthermore, I'm not sure that the emergence of Orthodox Judaism as a new force in American Jewish life could have been apparent to anybody short of a prophet or someone intimately involved in the ultra-Orthodox world at the time Sklare gathered the data for Conservative Judaism. But I can certainly correct the impression that Sklare was insensitive to these developments until he prepared the augmented edition of

his book in the early 70's. In 1963 I prepared an article on Orthodox Judaism.[19] I only knew Sklare by reputation but I sent him a draft of the article and asked him for his comments. He invited me to his office and that is how our association began. He had many comments to make about the article and it was clear to me that he was well informed about Orthodoxy. A year later Milton Himmelfarb who was then co-editor along with Morris Fine, invited me to write an essay on Orthodoxy for the American Jewish Year Book. The need for such an essay, Himmelfarb explained to me, stemmed from the fact that whereas observers of American Jewish life had tended, in the past, to dismiss Orthodoxy, its recent resurgence required the Year Book to take a new look at it. Two points deserve mention here. First, it is stretching credulity to believe that Himmelfarb would have decided upon a lead article in the American Jewish Year Book, especially one that concerned religion in American life, without first consulting with Sklare. Indeed, the original idea might well have been Sklare's. Secondly, although Himmelfarb approached me some time in early 1964, I know that someone else had been approached as early as 1962 who had submitted a manuscript on the same topic which Himmelfarb rejected as inadequate. The timing indicates that Sklare was no less if not more sensitive to the resurgence of Orthodoxy than I although this was the area in which I presumably possessed more detailed knowledge.

I have already suggested that Sklare was neither the gentlest or most patient of souls and his impatience increased as he grew older. At least so people tell me and I see it reflected in his responses to two earlier assessments of his work.[20] I spent quite a bit of time with him from the middle to the late 1960's but after that I doubt if our meetings averaged more than one a year. (Albeit, when we did meet we spent

many hours in conversation). He had little regard for Jews in academia who sought to mask their Jewishness or who felt apologetic about being Jewish, he had no patience for sociologists who happened to be Jewish and who evidenced sympathy for every minority group in the world except their own, but he had least patience of all for those Jews who sought to exploit their Jewishness, and what little knowledge they had about Judaism to further their own agendas, whether personal or public. Sklare not only loved the Jewish people, he loved Judaism -- though I'm not sure he would have recognized the distinction. For as Chaim Waxman quotes him as saying:

> there cannot be an authentic Jewish people without the continuity of Jewish tradition, even as there cannot be meaningful continuity of Jewish tradition without the maintenance of the integrity of the Jewish group.[21]

Endnotes

As Sklare noted in his catalogue of problems in the teaching of contemporary
vish studies:

.the teaching of contemporary Jewish studies proceeds without much attention to interrelationships with Jewish studies generally. The tendency in contemporary Jewish studies is to see every problem as new. Thus, the Jewish family is not treated against the backdrop of halachah or even against the backdrop of medieval and modern Jewish history. It is our impression that whether it is th family, Jewish political behavior, or Jewish religious behavior, the framework of teaching tends to be contemporary American society rather than the framewor of historic Jewish society or of Jewish tradition. (Marshall Sklare, "Problems in the Teaching of Contemporary Jewish Studies," American Jewish Historical Quarterly, 63 ((June, 1974)), pp. 365.)

Marshall Sklare, The Jews: Social Patterns of An American Group (Glencoe: The
ee Press, 1957).

Peter Rose (ed.), The Ghetto and Beyond: Essays on Jewish Life in America (New
ck: Random House, 1969).

Kenneth Stern, "Is Religion Necessary," ibid., pp. 190-200. Stern concludes his
icles as follows:

> me say in conclusion that I recognize that along with the prospective demise of
> Jewishness, their will be a concomitant loss of values, or, at least, things I
> hold valuable. Most of these will be aesthetic. On the other hand, perhaps an
> important good will arise out of this loss. Perhaps the demise of Judaism will
> be the first in the demise of all the racial and national separateness that ha
> caused the world so much havoc throughout its history. If this is the price,
> the loss of Jewish community, shall anyone say it is not worth paying? (p.
> 200.)

Sklare introduced these concepts in his Lakeville study: Marshall Sklare with
seph Greenblum, Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier: A Study of Group
vival in the Open Society (New York: Basic Books, 1967, second edition,
iversity of Chicago Press, 1979). Steven Cohen and I try to show how they
dermine traditional Jewish life. See our book, Two Worlds of Judaism: The Israeli
d American Experience (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) and my article
itual and Ceremonial in the Reconstruction of American Judaism," Ezra Mendelson
d.), Studies in Contemporary Jewry VI (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990),
. 272-283.

Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,

cond edition, 1979), pp. 57-59.

Marshall Sklare, Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement (Glencoe: e Free Press, 1955).

"The Religion of American Jews by Charles S. Liebman," in Marshall Sklare (ed.), e Jew in American Society (New York: Behrman House, 1974), pp. 223-52, reprinted Marshall Sklare (ed.), American Jews: A Reader (New York: Behrman House, 1983), . 245-274.

If I'm not mistaken I first introduced these terms in my article "Changing nception of Political Life and Their Implications For American Judaism," Sam man-Wilzig and Bernard Susser (eds.), Comparative Jewish Politics. Ramat-Gan, ael: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1981, pp. 91-100. Republished in revised form der the title "American Jews and the 'Modern Mind'" Midstream, 27 (April, 1981), 12.

. Marshall Sklare, "The Greening of Judaism," Commentary, 58 (December, 1974), pp -57.

. The table appears in Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier, p. 322 and is scribed on pp. 321-32, but was developed earlier. If my memory serves me correctl was first utilized in the early 1960's, if not before, in surveys sponsored by al A.J.C. chapters in four large Jewish communities.

. Marshall Sklare, "The problem of Contemporary Jewish Studies," Midstream, 16 ɔril, 1970), pp. 27-35.

. Another edition of the Behrman House readers, this time in one edition, was ɔlished nine years later, and all but four of the fourteen articles were reprinte ɔm earlier editions.

. "The problem of Contemporary Jewish Studies," op. cit., pp.27-35.

. "Problems in the Teaching of Contemporary Jewish Studies," op. cit., pp. 361-68

. The papers were revised and published under the title Marshall Sklare (ed.), derstanding American Jewry (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1982).

.Ibid., "On the Preparation of a Sociology of American Jewry," pp. 261-71.

. Marshall Sklare and Marc Vosk, The Riverton Study: How Jews Look at Themselves d their Neighbors (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1957).

. Charles S. Liebman, ""A Sociological Analysis of Contemporary Orthodoxy," daism, 13 (Summer, 1964), 285-304.

. See Contemporary Jewry, 4 (Fall-Winter, 1977-78), pp. 2-45; and American Jewish story, 74 (December, 1984), pp. 100-168 which contain the articles of the mposionists and Sklare's responses.

. Chaim Waxman, "Psalms of a Sober Man: The Sociology of Marshall Sklare,"
ıtemporary Jewry, ibid., p. 9. The citation is from the second edition of
ıservative Judaism, p. 282.