


AJC American Jewish
Continuity Co-85

Not Quite at Home

**How an American Jewish Community
Lives With Itself and Its Neighbors**

By Marshall Sklare,
Joseph Greenblum
and Benjamin B. Ringer



LAKEVILLE

INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS PRESS

PAMPHLET SERIES

NUMBER 11



Not Quite at Home

**How an American Jewish Community
Lives With Itself and Its Neighbors**

**By Marshall Sklare,
Joseph Greenblum
and Benjamin B. Ringer**

INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS PRESS

The American Jewish Committee

165 East 56 Street, New York, N.Y. 10022

Edited and produced
by the PUBLICATIONS SERVICE
of the AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
SONYA F. KAUFER, *Director*

Copyright © 1969 THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 77-81092

Institute of Human Relations Press

A. M. Sonnabend Memorial

The Institute of Human Relations Press publishes books and pamphlets of original scholarship and research which cast light on intergroup attitudes, problems of prejudice and discrimination, and the status of human rights here and abroad.

This is one of a series of publications dedicated to the memory of A. M. Sonnabend, twelfth president of the American Jewish Committee.

Authors' Note

This pamphlet is based on material reported in greater detail in *The Lakeville Studies*, published in 1967 by Basic Books, Inc., in two volumes: *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier: A Study of Group Survival in the Open Society*, by Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, and *The Edge of Friendliness: A Study of Jewish-Gentile Relations*, by Benjamin B. Ringer.

Data on reactions to the Israel-Arab War of 1967 (on pages 31-34) are from an informal investigation conducted for the American Jewish Committee by Dr. Sklare, a number of months after the event.

The authors are indebted to Joel Lieber and to two staff members of the American Jewish Committee, Rose Feitelson and George Salomon, for their invaluable help in translating the material into its present nontechnical form.

"Lakeville" is not the real name of the community described in this pamphlet. The names of other localities and of synagogues and organizations have also been disguised.

Contents

FOREWORD	ix
Introduction	1
Profile of the Jewish Community	7
Religion and the Lakeville Jew	11
The Synagogue	23
Other Expressions of Jewishness	30
The Next Jewish Generation	38
Who Is a Good Jew?	45
The Climate of Gentile-Jewish Relations	49
The Jewish Influx and Its Reception	53
The Will to Integrate	61
Coexistence at Work and in Organizations	66
Neighborhoods and Social Relations	72
The Limits of Friendliness	76
SUMMARY	80

About the Authors

The authors of this report were formerly Director, Study Director and Senior Study Director of the American Jewish Committee's Scientific Research Division. As such they conducted the research documented in their two-volume work, *The Lakeville Studies*.

MARSHALL SKLARE, Ph.D., is Professor of Sociology at Yeshiva University, and has also taught at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He is the author of *Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement* (1955), and editor of *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group* (1958).

JOSEPH GREENBLUM is a member of the Yeshiva University faculty. His writings include "The Attitude of Jews in Small Towns to Their Communities," in *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group*, and "Vertical Mobility and Prejudice," in *Class, Status and Power*, edited by Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (1953).

BENJAMIN B. RINGER, Ph.D., is Professor and Chairman of the Department of Sociology at Hunter College of the City University of New York. Earlier, he was associated with the Bureau of Applied Research at Columbia University. He is coauthor (with Charles Y. Glock and Earl R. Babbie) of *To Comfort and to Challenge* (1967), a study of Episcopalian laymen and clergy.

Foreword

•

THE ISSUE of Jewish identity — to which the American Jewish Committee has devoted a sizable portion of its thought, resources and energies over the past several decades — is one peculiar and unique to our own time. In the closed and pervasively anti-Semitic European societies where most Jews lived in earlier days, it was rare indeed for anyone born into the Jewish fold to question his “group belongingness.” One was a Jew not only because one’s parents were Jewish, and not only because one was raised in the Jewish faith and nurtured in the Jewish tradition, but also because the hostile Christian world made it abundantly clear to any Jew who contemplated shedding his Judaism that he could expect little welcome and less acceptance.

In 20th-century America, however, individual merit and drive have counted more heavily than the lingering prejudices carried over from the Old World. In this relatively benign and welcoming atmosphere, one national and religious group after another has managed to overcome the disabilities of immigrant and minority status. Jews have been particularly successful in transforming themselves — in the brief span of two or three generations — from poor and powerless newcomers into recognized partners and often leaders in the country’s intellectual, political and economic life.

On the surface, at least, there is little difference between the life styles of American Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors. To a degree unparalleled in modern Jewish history, the American Jew, now of the third and fourth generation, can, if he so chooses, live his life and raise his children without his Jewishness being central to his planning and thinking. In such a setting, as all

religious and ethnic minorities have discovered, true belongingness becomes a matter not merely of birth and tradition, but also of conscious and deliberate choice.

What is the future of Jewish continuity in such circumstances? How will the rituals, traditions and values that have survived millennia of exclusion and persecution stand up under benign acceptance, and how will they be altered? To what degree does being Jewish continue to connote differences in attitudes, values and life style, and to what degree does it seem to be blending into a general "American" ethos? How do Jews see their relationships with the larger community, and how deep is the acceptance accorded them by their Christian neighbors?

These are some of the questions that concerned the American Jewish Committee almost a decade ago, when it launched the wide-ranging investigations reported in the two-volume *Lakeville Studies*, published by Basic Books in 1967. The findings, widely discussed and commented upon since their publication, offer insights important for all students of group life in America, but especially for Jewish professionals and laymen interested in and concerned about Jewish continuity.

This condensation of the *Lakeville Studies* has been prepared to facilitate the widest possible dissemination and discussion of these important findings, as well as to serve as a resource for teachers, secular and religious leaders, and particularly parents, who are dedicated to, and working for, a meaningful Jewish identity in American society.

BERTRAM H. GOLD
Executive Vice-President
The American Jewish Committee

INTRODUCTION

IN 1900, the rabbi of Slutsk, Russia, told an audience in New York City that any Jew who came to live in the United States was a sinner. In his view, Judaism had no chance of survival on American soil. When Jews left their homes in Europe, the rabbi said, they also left behind their *Yiddishkeit*, their entire Jewish way of life.

Similar misgivings were expressed more cautiously by a Jewish scholar, Solomon Schechter, who had initially had high hopes for Judaism in America. "The problem," he wrote in 1912, "is whether we are able to keep the immigrant within Judaism after he has become Americanized." Schechter feared "the abyss," the "great 'melting pot,' which will devour Judaism ruthlessly as soon as the social prejudice on the part of our neighbors will sufficiently relax." But the majority of Jewish thinkers did not share these qualms. Rather than looking upon America as the future graveyard of Judaism, many saw it as the site of a future Jewish renaissance.

Today, two generations later, the direction of Jewish life in America is a matter of neither mystery nor prophecy. The Jew is no longer an immigrant at the bottom of the social and economic ladder, facing an ambiguous future, but a suburban citizen who looks, lives and works just about the way his Christian neighbor does. The question is, in fact, whether the prophecies have already come true.

How far have the permissiveness and openness of American society eroded the American Jew's group identity? Just what is the nature of Jewish identity in present-day America? Do Jews seek above all to integrate themselves into the prevailing culture? Or do they have any desire for the culture of their grandparents and for traditional Jewish values? If a new kind of "Americanized Jewish-

ness" is being practiced in the nation's suburbs, what are its customs and its prospects for the future? And, since the Jew is still a newcomer to suburbia, how is he viewed by the gentile majority?

Studying One Community

To find the answers to these questions, a team of researchers placed the town of Lakeville (not its real name) under the microscope. The community they chose is a suburb of an industrial and commercial metropolis in the Middle West, to be known in this report as "Lake City." At the time of the study, Lakeville's 25,000 inhabitants included a Jewish community of about 8,000 persons. The Jewish group was characterized by a high percentage of persons with college and postgraduate degrees, upward social mobility, and a striking level of "culture consumption." It consisted mainly of families with school-age children, which meant that parents faced the immediate, concrete problems of transferring values — Jewish or otherwise — to a new generation.

Lakeville's origins as a suburb lie in the late 19th century, when it was developed as a secluded summer community for wealthy families from Lake City. Lakefront mansions and country clubs accompanied the growth of a socially prominent population. In the 1920's, suburbanization took hold; many families began to live in the community the year round. The population was then about 12,000.

While Lakeville was still a summer colony, a small number of affluent German Jews built mansions and estates along the lake. Their first step toward organized Jewish life was not to buy land for a cemetery or a synagogue, as they probably would have done in a year-round community; it was to set up a social institution consciously patterned after the gentiles' style of life. Finding themselves excluded from the posh gentile clubs, the Jewish elders established their own — the Wildacres Country Club.

The Lakeville Jews of those days accommodated themselves to the local customs, one of which was that Jews led a separate social life and did not disturb the prevailing gentile tone of the community. Accepting their marginal position, they kept their distance even

while beginning promptly to contribute to the town's cultural, educational and philanthropic life. In the 1920's, they established their first religious institution: the Isaac Mayer Wise Temple, a Reform congregation. But aside from the temple and the country club, they did not develop a strong Jewish community program, because they did not want to make themselves unnecessarily conspicuous. To the community at large, they must have seemed like "good Jews."

The character of the community changed dramatically after the Second World War, when Lakeville experienced a massive influx of settlers from Lake City. Between the late forties and the end of the fifties, the number of inhabitants rose by more than one-half, with most of the increase concentrated in a single five-year period. The population figure which community planners, back in the forties, had projected for 1970 was actually surpassed before 1960. The town's residents found themselves assaulted by unaccustomed traffic snarls, proliferating gas stations, unfamiliar architectural styles and a flood of administrative problems. In the words of one old-time inhabitant, the growth "tore hell out of the town."

Most of the old-timers interviewed in the study — those who had lived in Lakeville for 11 years or more, and thus were survivors of this period of chaos — expressed misgivings about the new Lakeville. They looked back nostalgically to the town's former "country style," or claimed that the current local authorities were "insensitive to beauty." Some deplored high taxes or other costs of progress.

All the same, a majority even of the long-time residents favored the changes that had come with the population wave: a city-manager system of government, improved schools, overall modernization. As one life-time Lakevillean summed it up: "The growth is good in the sense . . . that Lakeville has controlled it. We have an enlightened management in government from civic-minded people, a minimum of bad politics, the service of conscientious people who have the interest of their fellow citizens at heart. . . . That is all to the good and we appreciate it."

Some 60 or 70 per cent of the newcomers were Jews, and what had been a small minority quickly grew to the point where one out

of every three households in town was Jewish. The new settlers were the most prosperous and most highly educated among the Jews who were then leaving Lake City for the suburbs. Lakeville's highly reputed school system acted as a magnet for families concerned over the deteriorating city schools. In contrast, those Lake City Jews who were less educated and more attached to their accustomed ways of living tended to avoid Lakeville and to choose newer suburbs.

The majority of the Jewish newcomers to Lakeville differed from the town's Jewish old-timers. They were of East European extraction, rather than of the more acculturated German-Jewish stock. And they were much less inclined to take an inconspicuous back seat in the community. They established new temples, took a hand in running community affairs, publicly maintained certain customs they brought from the city's Jewish neighborhoods, and organized chapters of national Jewish organizations. Within a short time, they became much more visible than the older Jewish residents. As a result, strong differences arose between the two groups.

At the same time, a significant number of the upper-class gentile residents left Lakeville. To what extent this departure was provoked by the influx of Jews, and to what extent by growth and change in the general community, can no longer be determined. In any case, the shrinking of the gentile elite, combined with the influx of wealthy, influential Jews, dramatically altered the town's character. There were gentile newcomers, but they tended to be younger and less well-to-do. The ranks of the socially prominent were not refilled.

Impressions of Modern Lakeville

As of the time of the study, Lakeville gentiles showed great diversity in occupation and income. Although they included a considerable number of middle-class business and professional men who commuted to Lake City, there was also a substantial proportion of working-class families: employees of the electric and telephone companies, railroad employees, craftsmen who maintain the community's homes and gardens. In contrast, Lakeville Jews were almost solidly middle-class or upper middle-class. The differences between

the two groups were outwardly reflected in their housing: Gentiles occupied a range of dwellings, from modest frame houses in the center of town to early American or early modern homes in the estate sections, whereas recently arrived Jewish families almost always lived in newly constructed houses of modern ranch design.

The downtown business district had changed markedly in the two decades just past. Streets with old-fashioned lamps and quaint 19th-century shops were being put in the shade by neon-lit plazas and sleek, style-conscious contemporary stores. New shopping facilities had opened: a kosher butcher shop, a Jewish delicatessen and several Chinese restaurants.

Lakeville's government structure had been overhauled in the 1950's. Under the new system, policies were set by an elected Mayor and a City Council of six members, and were executed by a professionally trained city manager responsible for the municipality's day-to-day operations. This form of government was deemed necessary to cope with the many problems created by rapid growth.

The school system, which attracted so many Jewish families to the community, had long been a source of local pride. It achieved its high ratings by years of painstaking effort and liberal expenditure of public funds. During the postwar boom, when other community services deteriorated and education systems in suburbs all over the nation fell behind the rising birth rate, the Lakeville schools not only maintained but actually raised their standards—a feat that testifies to the public investment in education. At the time of the study, four out of five Lakeville high school graduates went to college. The schools reflected the ethnic, religious and class composition of their neighborhoods; but since there were virtually no Negroes in Lakeville, and few in immediately adjacent areas, the problem of racial integration had not come up.

The town's religious life was dominated by the Protestant community, which constituted one-half of the population. Protestants were chiefly of English, German or Scandinavian descent; they maintained seven churches, of which the Presbyterian and the Episcopalian were the largest and most prestigious. Catholics, chiefly of

Irish or Italian descent and making up about one-fifth of the population, supported one church plus a school. Jews, who had been the last of the three major faiths to organize, were served by one Conservative and four Reform congregations.

Relations between religious groups were considered cordial. There had been periodic interdenominational services and interfaith meetings and activities. Jewish and non-Jewish residents met at work or through membership in various community organizations, and, in the process, got to know each other more or less well.

Modern Lakeville boasted five private golf clubs, a yacht club and such public facilities as bathing beaches, a marina, tennis courts, golf courses and playgrounds. Perhaps the community's outstanding institution was a performing arts center, which provided first-rate musical and theatrical programs during the summer season. In the winter, a community concert series was held at the high school. Adult education courses in such varied subjects as foreign languages, woodworking and municipal government were also conducted there. The 140,000-volume library sponsored an active music department, a Great Books discussion group and several other cultural programs. Elsewhere there were an art league, a film club and a literary society.

Most Lakeville residents belonged to a variety of social, humanitarian and philanthropic groups. In terms of status, the Lakeville Community Hospital was the leading philanthropy. In addition, an array of health and welfare groups raised funds for the treatment and research of various diseases. Service clubs such as Kiwanis and Rotary were active, as were various neighborhood improvement associations and the League of Women Voters.

In short, Lakeville was a pleasant place to live in, with all the ingredients of a model community: public spirit, a balanced population, good intergroup relations, excellent schools, fine recreational and cultural activities. How, one wonders, did Jewishness fare in a community that typified so much of the American aspiration? And how, beneath the tranquil surface, did Jew and gentile really feel about each other?

PROFILE OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

FROM INTERVIEWS with 432 adults, chosen as a representative cross section, it was possible to draw a fairly clear picture of Lakeville Jewry. It proved to be, for the most part, a community of people in early middle age. With children excluded from the statistics, the median age of males was 43, that of females just under 38; of the males, 72 per cent were between 30 and 49. The town did not have large numbers of very young families, which typically require modest, inexpensive housing; nor were there many old people. Only about 9 per cent of the adults surveyed were between 20 and 29 years old, and only 2 per cent were 60 or older.

For single persons the place seemed to hold few attractions. Of the adults surveyed, 96 per cent were married; the rest were widowed or divorced. All but 2 per cent had children, but families generally were not large: 56 per cent of the couples had two children, whereas only 6 per cent had four. In nearly three-quarters of the families, the mean age of the children was less than 15 years; in half, it was 10 years or less.

Almost all of Lakeville's Jews worked in professional and technical capacities, as managers, officials and proprietors, or as sales workers. Practically none were clerks, skilled workers, service workers or laborers. The manager-official-proprietor category, which accounted for 52 per cent of main earners, included senior officials of large enterprises, junior members of small firms, owners of retail chains and proprietors of independent shops. Of the professional and technical group, which constituted 34 per cent of main earners, the majority were involved in law, medicine or dentistry. No fewer than 61 per cent of Jewish main earners were either self-employed or part-owners of a business.

Education, Income and Descent

By any yardstick, the educational level of Lakeville's Jews was high. A full 89 per cent of the men had had a year or more of higher education; 34 per cent had attended graduate or professional school. Some 82 per cent of the women had had at least some college education, and 24 per cent of them had gone on to graduate school.

Incomes were sizable. During the late 1950's, the median family income was \$18,112. Some 40 per cent then reported that they had incomes of \$20,000 or more; 9 per cent said they made \$50,000 or more. On the other hand, only 12 per cent reported incomes of less than \$10,000 per year. Most of the families could look forward to bigger incomes in years to come, judging by the fact that the older residents were considerably more prosperous than the younger. Of the under-40 group, only 8 per cent attained an income of \$30,000 or more; of the fortyish group, 33 per cent did. Men of 50 or over did even better.

How long had it been since the fathers or great-grandfathers of Lakeville's Jews came over from the "other side"? Second-generation Americans were the largest group among the residents, with 39 per cent; next came the third generation, with 31 per cent. The fourth generation totaled 19 per cent, and the first (immigrant) generation accounted for only 8 per cent. Most members of the first generation had come to this country as children or early in adolescence, had been educated here, and thus bore no resemblance to the stereotype old-world Jew. Also included in the first generation group were well-educated, sophisticated persons who had come to America in the 1930's as refugees from Hitler.

In Lakeville (as in the United States as a whole), the majority of Jews were of East European extraction, and most of the rest were of German background. The overall proportions were roughly three-fifths East European and one-fifth German, with most of the rest being mixtures of these two. However, the ratios varied from generation to generation. Since many German-descended Jews had come to America long before the East Euro-

peans did, persons of German ancestry were fully ten times as numerous in the fourth generation as were East Europeans. Among the second generation, on the other hand, more than half were East European in origin, and only 15 per cent were German.

Differences in background were reflected in economic differences. The German Jews had a higher median income; some 46 per cent of them earned \$30,000 or more, whereas only 20 per cent of the East Europeans did.

Although Lakeville was old for a suburb, most of the Jews there were relative newcomers. Their median length of residence was only 4.5 years. About half had been living in Lakeville between 3 and 8 years, and only 11 per cent for 17 years or more.

Compared to American Jewry as a Whole

Lakeville Jewry was not representative of American Jewry in the sense that living conditions there resembled those in most other Jewish communities. In fact, the settings in which American Jews live are so varied that no one of them can be considered typical in a statistical sense.

Just how did Lakeville differ from the places where many or most other Jews made their homes? First, it was a town of expensive houses and therefore beyond the reach of average middle-class Jewish people. Second, it was essentially a "bedroom suburb," a place for living but not for making a living. And third, Jews in Lakeville differed from those elsewhere in such respects as age, education and occupations.

Nationwide surveys — conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan and the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago about the time the Lakeville Studies were in process — found that 14 per cent of Jews in the country were between 20 and 29 years old, 53 per cent were between 30 and 49, and 14 per cent over 60; in Lakeville the corresponding proportions were 9, 74 and 2 per cent. According to the same surveys, 31 per cent of Jews in the nation were foreign-born, as against 8 per cent in Lakeville. About 33 per cent

of American Jews had had at least some college education; in Lakeville, 86 per cent had. Roughly two-thirds of America's Jews earned less than \$7,500 annually; only 4 per cent of Lakeville's Jews did. And finally, in the nation as a whole, 18 per cent of Jewish earners were professional or technical workers while 21 per cent were craftsmen, skilled workers or non-farm laborers — as against Lakeville's 34 per cent in the former group of occupations and 1 per cent in the latter.

With two-thirds of its members self-employed or owning businesses, Lakeville Jewry strikingly contradicted the national trend under which more and more workers — professionals, technicians, managers, officials — work for enterprises they do not own. However it could be doubted whether the new generation growing up in Lakeville would be able to, or even care to, achieve such high levels of self-employment.

If Lakeville differed so much from other Jewish communities in the United States, why was it significant? The answer is that it showed in magnified form certain trends characteristic of American Jewry as a whole. Thus, Lakeville Jews of any given age group were far ahead of the American Jewish average in education, occupation and income; but the trend among Jews throughout the nation is toward more schooling, more rewarding work and higher earnings — which means that the gap between Jews in Lakeville and Jews elsewhere probably will narrow during the decades ahead. At the same time, the nationwide proportion of foreign-born Jews will inevitably diminish to something like the proportion found in Lakeville.

In short, as far as anyone can tell, what was observed in Lakeville affords a preview of the Jewish future in America. Jews throughout the country will increasingly look and act the way Lakeville Jews do. And since the particular social, economic, age and nativity patterns of groups are often accompanied by certain typical attitudes, a look at how Lakeville Jews practiced their Jewishness may offer a glimpse at the future of Jewish identity in America.

RELIGION AND THE LAKEVILLE JEW

“How MUCH observance is necessary to be a good Jew? . . . I feel Judaism is changing. Some people only think of religion in terms of ritual. I don't.”

A young Lakeville mother, the wife of a successful businessman, was talking about her difficulty in deciding what claim ritualism had on her life. She was more observant than the majority of her coreligionists, yet troubled because her religion was so different from that of her parents and grandparents. Her remarks reflected a far-reaching change in Jewish religious observances.

Traditionally, Jews have been a group by virtue of having embraced the Torah. They lived and showed their Jewishness through adherence to a complicated code of ritual, sacramental laws. These laws made radical demands on the individual, requiring him to follow an all-encompassing way of life. The dietary laws are a striking example: They invest the act of eating with sacred significance and provide the believer, several times each day, with an opportunity to show his obedience to God's will.

But a highly ritualistic religion, which controls the very rhythm of the individual's life, creates forbidding problems for people who have chosen to live under radically changed conditions. During the last 150 years or so, many Jews came to accept the once-heretical belief that the ancestral way of life with its all-pervading array of *mitzvot* — of ceremonial, legal and ritual observances — was inappropriate to the new times. Some of the old observances could be maintained, but flexibility was demanded. Thus, modern Jews have had to discover for themselves which *mitzvot* from their vast sacramental heritage they could still comfortably practice.

Religion in the Home

How many of Judaism's rituals were observed by Lakeville's Jews?

To get a clear picture, the 432 participants in the study were asked, "Which of the following observances are practiced more or less regularly in your home?" And, as a basis of comparison, they also were asked which of the rituals used to be practiced in their childhood homes. The observances listed were:

- Bacon or ham never served.
- Kosher meat regularly bought.
- Kasher the meat.
- Special dinner on Friday night.
- Lighting of candles on Friday night.
- Kiddush on Friday night.
- No smoking allowed in the house on Sabbath.
- Seder on Passover.
- Bread not eaten in home on Passover.
- Either or both parents fast on Yom Kippur.
- Candles lit on Hanukkah.

Of the eleven practices, the mean number observed by the respondents was 2.8. Some 19 per cent observed none, while only 10 per cent observed seven or more. The largest number, 37 per cent, kept up only one or two rituals. The figures speak for themselves: Traditional ritual in most homes was at a very low level (see Table on following page).

The parental homes of Lakeville's Jews had been considerably more observant. The mean number of rituals followed there had been 5.2, and 41 per cent of the older generation had regularly practiced seven or more.

In view of these contrasting findings, one might wonder whether the present generation of American Jews will not be the last to maintain any semblance of religion in its homes. On the basis of the Lakeville evidence, however, the picture is not totally bleak: The percentage that abstained from all ritualistic observance was no greater than it had been in the preceding generation. Possibly, then, the change will not go from total observance all the way to total abstention; rather, observance may be stabilizing once more, albeit at an exceedingly modest level.

HOME RITUALS OBSERVED BY RESPONDENTS
AND BY THEIR PARENTS

<i>Number of rituals</i>	<i>Currently observed by respondents</i>	<i>Formerly observed in respondents' parental homes</i>
All 11	1%	14%
9 or 10	2	18
7 or 8	7	9
5 or 6	14	10
3 or 4	20	12
1 or 2	37	16
None	19	21
MEAN	2.8	5.2

Which rituals had survived in Lakeville, and which had lost favor? The most popular *mitzvot* were the lighting of candles on Hanukkah and the Passover Seder — practiced, respectively, in 68 per cent and 60 per cent of the homes. In contrast, Sabbath candles were lit in only 32 per cent of the homes. Just 1 per cent of the Jewish population refrained from smoking on Saturday. Dietary observance was equally minimal: 9 per cent abstained from eating bacon or ham in the home, and 5 per cent bought kosher meat.

The parents of Lakeville's Jews had been strikingly different in their observances. Thus, 46 per cent of the older generation had bought kosher meat. Nearly two-thirds of the parents would fast on Yom Kippur (whereas only one-third of Lakeville's Jews did). About half of the older generation used to light Sabbath candles and to hold special Friday night dinners; 19 per cent refrained from smoking on the Sabbath. Only slightly more of the parents — 67 as against 60 per cent — had held Seders; but more than half the parents had abstained from bread during Passover, whereas only one Lakeville Jew in five did. Perhaps the oddest finding was that the lighting of Hanukkah candles had actually increased in modern Lakeville: 68 per cent of the respondents practiced this ritual; only 60 per cent of their parents had done so.

In short, the general decline affected different rituals in greatly varying degrees. Specifically, Hanukkah and the Passover Seder proved to have considerable staying power, whereas Sabbath rituals had lost a good deal of ground, and dietary laws no longer commanded much interest.

Why are some rituals more attractive than others? What causes some to remain, others to decline? Judging by what was found in Lakeville, the answer seems to lie in the pull between two forces — between the impact of the modern, Christian, secular environment and the desire to express at least a minimum of Jewishness. A particular ritual seems most likely to be kept if it meets the following specifications:

1. *The ritual is capable of being redefined in modern terms.* Traditionally, the Hanukkah and Passover stories were focused on the miracle of divine action: the miracle of the vessel of oil which lasted for eight days, and the intervention by which God made possible the exodus from Egypt. Today, the miraculous elements have become muted in favor of a theme more appealing to modern people. The two holidays are no longer considered symbolic of God's benevolence, but of man's heroic struggle for freedom. Dietary laws and Sabbath observances do not lend themselves to such easy reinterpretation.

2. *The ritual does not demand social isolation or the following of a singular way of life.* Were the Lakeville Jew to observe all eleven rituals on the list, he would find himself separated from the general community. But the very fact that he has moved to a predominantly gentile suburb shows that he does not want to be too "different." Accordingly, those rituals which do not demand a distinctively different way of life become the more appealing to him.

3. *The ritual accords with the religious customs of the larger community and provides a "Jewish alternative."* The customs of Hanukkah—the exchange of gifts, the happy mood, the display of the *menorah*—seem to offer a ready parallel, a Jewish counterpart, to Christmas. Hanukkah, celebrated as a sort of Jewish Christmas, works against alienating the Jew from the general culture.

4. *The ritual is child-centered.* Of the observances in the Jewish calendar, the Passover Seder and Hanukkah have traditionally been most beloved by children. The giving of presents and playing of *dreydel* games on Hanukkah, the four questions asked by the youngest child at the Passover Seder — these customs appeal to parents, because they are eagerly received by children, and thus are comfortable ways of transmitting Jewish identity. Also, the mood on these days is festive, and this tone is in keeping with the spirit of optimism and fun in which the prevailing culture seeks to raise children. By eliminating the tedious, the serious, the profound and the difficult, and by concentrating on the light and joyous, parents hope to provide their child with “positive” associations concerning Jewishness, so that he will have no cause to reject their heritage.

5. *Observances are not performed too frequently.* As American culture becomes more and more secular, with religion figuring in fewer and fewer areas of the individual's life, people become less inclined to follow a daily routine of religious ritual. Sabbath and dietary observances make frequent or constant demands on the individual, and therefore tend to fall into disfavor. On the other hand, the once-a-year festivals of Passover and Hanukkah are unusual occasions, a relief from the daily routine; and this undoubtedly helps to maintain their observance. In a society as secular as ours, a yearly ritual is likely to persist more than a seasonal one, a seasonal more than a weekly, a weekly more than a daily.

Going to Services

If Lakeville homes had little distinctively Jewish character, could it be that the focus of Jewishness had shifted to the synagogue?

It might seem so, for the majority of Lakeville's Jews belonged to synagogues. But there was a difference between belonging and attending. Some 68 per cent of synagogue memberships in Lakeville were in the four Reform temples, which demanded relatively little traditional religious observance. The one Conservative synagogue in town, the only one that held daily services, often had trouble gathering the prescribed *minyan* (quorum) of 10 worshippers.

The majority of Lakeville's Jews — 74 per cent — attended their synagogues rather irregularly. Some showed up only on High Holy Days, not necessarily every year; others attended the High Holy Day services regularly and came to Sabbath services a few times during the year; still others—the more regular among the irregulars—came for the High Holy Days and occasional Festivals, and for Sabbath services a few times each year or every month. Only 13 per cent were what might be called regular worshipers by Lakeville standards, attending on High Holy Days each year, on some Festivals, and on Sabbath twice a month or more. On the other hand, 72 per cent never, or virtually never, attended on Festivals, and 13 per cent never went to the synagogue at all.

Synagogue attendance did not necessarily parallel other aspects of the individual's Jewishness, particularly in his home observance. Some 59 per cent of those who did not perform any rituals at home did attend religious services on some occasions, usually on the High Holy Days. More generally speaking, synagogue attendance exceeded home observance; people whose home observance was minimal attended synagogue more than minimally. This sometimes led to situations which a tradition-minded Jew would find paradoxical. For example, a woman might regularly join the congregation for Sabbath worship, which is an optional observance for her sex, and at the same time might fail to light Sabbath candles in her home, which is a mandatory ritual for women.

Holy Days and Festivals retained their traditional relative significance in the synagogue; there had been no shifts like that in the home which escalated a minor Festival, Hanukkah, to major importance. The emphasis remained on the High Holy Days, with nearly three out of four persons attending services on those days every year or almost every year. That Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashanah had retained their significance as the most sacred convocations of the Jewish year was unquestionably one reason; but there also was the fact that they met the specification of being infrequent occasions.

As might have been expected, Lakeville people participated in public worship less frequently than their parents had done. Specif-

ically, 37 per cent of the parents had attended services regularly, in comparison to the 13 per cent of respondents who did. However, the decline from one generation to the next varied with the nature of the services. Thus, on High Holy Days, the proportion of persons regularly attending services was 20 percentage points lower among the respondents than it had been among their parents, but on Festival days it was 34 percentage points lower.

The fact that synagogue attendance, however modest, appeared to exert a somewhat stronger attraction than home ritual may indicate a positive trend. Lakeville's rabbis and the more committed of its laymen were aware of the fact that some of those who observed little or no ritual at home did attend religious services, and they tended to think that the Jewishness which had been lost from the home could be somewhat revitalized through the influence of the synagogue. The synagogue, they felt, was the one place where the new suburban Jew could learn how to be a Jew.

Influences on Religious Practices

Among all the influences that affected people's religious practice, none proved to be as important as the religious tone that used to prevail in their parents' home. The more observant the parental home, the more observant was the present one. Those who had been exposed as children to a particular practice were fairly likely to keep it up — whether it was the Passover Seder, Sabbath rituals or High Holy Day observance. Those who had not inherited the rituals practiced them to a much lesser extent. For example, yearly synagogue attendance on Yom Kippur was the rule among 67 per cent of persons who knew this pattern from their parental homes, but among only 31 per cent of persons who did not; synagogue attendance at least once a month was found among 43 per cent of those whose parents had attended this often, but among only 15 per cent of others. There was no mistaking that observance was handed down more frequently than it was acquired.

Just as the degree of ritualism in a person's life depended on his inheritance of rituals, so did adult religiousness reflect pleasant

childhood memories of activities associated with religion. These memories were not always literally religious in nature; they often included a variety of recollections, from visiting relatives or the smell of special foods to new clothes or simply a warm feeling of security and family love.

A young Lakeville lawyer (the son of an immigrant who owned a corner grocery) had discarded most of the dietary laws but practiced many other rituals. He recalled: "It was pleasant when we came home from school on Friday and celebrated Shabbes; we lit the caudles and had real meals. We ate at all hours during the week."

An observant middle-aged clothing store owner reminisced about "Friday afternoon and the smell of Shabbes in the house—the fresh baked *challah*, the *gefilte fish*."

A moderately observant Lakeville mother of two children remembered: "The excitement of the holidays! We always had lots of people for the Seder and on Sukkos. I used to enjoy the singing and the gaiety." Another informant remembered getting a new suit of clothes for Passover.

The Seder was recalled most frequently and, it seems, with the greatest warmth and sentiment — an embrace of ceremonial and familial memories. A manufacturer reminisced: "The rituals of Passover were most pleasant. All my relatives would be there, including fourteen children....My oldest uncle would say kiddish."

While parents exerted one kind of influence on religious practice, children exerted quite another. With the responsibility of raising a child, individuals were compelled to move from relatively abstract religious issues to the concrete question which observances they would practice and thereby transmit to their children. Observances taken for granted in childhood, but later set aside as irrelevant, often came up for reconsideration during the early years of parenthood. Generally speaking, parents tended to follow different ritualistic practices at different points in their life cycles: While the children were little, home observance and synagogue attendance were at relatively low levels; as they reached school age, observance rose, attaining a peak when they were of Bar Mitzvah or Con-

firmation age; and finally, when the children were grown up, the parents' observance declined.

This dropping and readopting of observances at different times of life is a comparatively new phenomenon in the Jewish community. Some observers have suggested that whereas formerly Jews performed rituals because they were pleasing in the sight of God, they now perform them merely as child-rearing devices, under pressure from religious-school teachers or other "professional Jews."

Actually, the increase in ritualism during the child-rearing years may not stem from such merely expedient reasons. It may be an expression of the parental role, a result of inner as much as outer pressures. And in impressing on a child the importance of tradition and ritual, the parent is making a religious commitment toward what sociologists call "cultural transmission" — that is, the furthering of Jewish survival.

In Lakeville, young parents spent a great deal of time discussing and reformulating questions of observance, as it pertained to their children. Parents of children under six seemed most preoccupied with the problem. Their sons and daughters were approaching the age of understanding, and decisions about future religious commitments had to be made. Since they had not decided how far they would go, how formal and committed they wished the child's religious pattern to be, they tended to be tentative and uncertain.

One young Lakeville father, a businessman, had been discussing questions of a kosher home and holiday observance with his friends. He had found no definite answers, he reported: "We all perhaps would like to be more observant, but we have excuses, so we talk about it." A woman, though a "doubter," was concerned about "the importance of making tradition more meaningful — re-evaluating the importance of tradition in religious services."

In the minds of a few, the question of religion in child-rearing centered on fending off Christian influence. One young Lakeville couple was at odds with each other over whether to have a Christmas tree: The wife had introduced Hanukkah into the home, but the husband wanted the tree, so the children would not feel "deprived."

As well as by their time of life, Lakeville Jews were influenced in their religious practices by the generation of which they were members. From the first to the second American generation, observance usually fell off sharply, from the second to the third and fourth less so — even though the members of the third generation had, on the average, been raised in far less observant homes than had those of the second. For example, among second-generation East Europeans brought up in highly observant homes, nearly 60 per cent fell substantially below their parents' standards of home observance; among third-generation East Europeans from such homes, only 45 per cent did. Similar patterns were found in families of German descent and of lower levels of piety.

The Shift Away From Ritual

The woman who said, "I feel Judaism is changing . . . Some people only think of religion in terms of ritual . . . I don't," was unwittingly summing up the whole religious climate in Lakeville. The influences that weaken Jewish ritual seemed to be more marked in the community than those that strengthen it; observance of time-hallowed traditions was at a rather low ebb; and yet people showed a great deal of concern about religion. They were aware that their faith had many aspects besides its traditional sacramentalism, or emphasis on ritual acts; they were chiefly attracted by these other aspects, values and meanings.

Today, the chief alternative to sacramentalism is moralism — the belief that the religious man is distinguished from the irreligious simply by his ethical behavior. In contrast to the follower of sacramentalism, who sees religious observance as the basis of ethical conduct, the moralist thinks ritualism may actually conflict with morality, because it can be hypocritically used to mask unethical behavior. At best, he considers ritualism irrelevant. For him, the true purpose of religion is to teach man how to deal justly with his fellow man.

Belief in God's existence is another dimension of religious feeling on which sacramentalists and others may disagree. To the former,

belief in the power and goodness of a Divine Being is only one of the things required of a religious man. To the latter, faith in God and a sense of his nearness are the only essentials; ritualism is merely optional, or even superfluous.

Some index of these attitudes was found when Lakeville Jews were asked: "Irrespective of whether you follow religious practices or attend synagogue, do you consider yourself a religious person?" Some 15 per cent considered themselves "very religious," another 15 per cent "not at all religious," and the majority, 70 per cent, felt they were "somewhat" or "moderately" religious. The "very religious" most frequently conceived of religion in terms of moralism; they were generally satisfied with their own moral behavior, and did not feel themselves wanting in other religious dimensions. On the other hand, those who considered themselves "moderately religious" tended to see religion in terms of rituals.

The moralistic note was sounded by a man, brought up in a traditionally religious home, who felt that rituals mattered little. "They disappear," he said, "but not the innate very personal belief in God. . . . I wouldn't hurt anyone, can't turn anyone down, and no one will walk out of my house hungry. . . . My belief in religion is not in the hereafter, but rather in the hell and heaven here on earth and now. I don't believe in putting money into a church or *shul* as a premium on an insurance policy for the hereafter. I don't even have to go to *shul*." Another respondent considers himself "very religious" because of his conduct, his honesty, his charity.

A woman, also of moralistic bent, said her concept of being a good Jew was "being a good person. I wouldn't do anything to hurt anyone. Just being religious [i.e., observant] doesn't make one a good person. Showing a non-Jew what a good person a Jew can be without ceremonials is what I believe. I have a belief in the Ten Commandments . . . and I live it." To her, as to some other unobservant Jews, belief in God has become irrelevant in connection with being "very religious." In their view, God has been altogether supplanted by ethics, and the ethical performance is the real measure of religious value.

In contrast, the sacramental view was succinctly stated by a young architect: "I'm an observant Jew, and that's the only way I know how to be a religious Jew. A person can be moral without being observant. But he cannot be religious without being observant."

There were, of course, those who were altogether alienated from Judaism. They might or might not think of themselves as religious in some other sense. One respondent who considered himself "not at all religious" — a man apparently not given to hedging or justifying himself — expressed what appeared to be a vague kind of pantheism: "My religion? It's love of nature. I mind my own business. I'm a damn good citizen."

THE SYNAGOGUE

IN LAKEVILLE, as in countless other American suburbs, the synagogue is the leading Jewish institution. Locally based and supported, it functions as a repository of sacred values, a bastion of Jewishness in a non-Jewish world. Yet it does so in a way quite different from the traditional one.

The old-style European synagogue was first and foremost a center of corporate worship and adult study. Its role as a "house of assembly" — a center of communal life and sociability — was distinctly secondary. As for religious education of the young, it did not take place on synagogue premises but was essentially the responsibility of the home and the community.

In suburban America today, on the other hand, the synagogue depends to a remarkable degree on human fellowship, which flows as much from social and recreational programs as from joint study and worship. Whereas the old-time synagogue was essentially a custodian of Jewish religion, the present-day synagogue is also, to a large extent, a guardian of Jewish life. At the same time, religious education for the young has become one of its chief functions.

A Choice of Congregations

Some two-thirds of Lakeville's Jews belonged to a religious congregation. Of the families with children aged 18 or older, over 90 per cent were former or current members. Nearly every Jew in town had been, or was likely to become, a synagogue member at some point in his life.

Though Lakeville had one Conservative and four Reform synagogues, it lacked an Orthodox house of worship. Only once had an

effort been made to establish an Orthodox congregation in the town, and that attempt had found no significant response.

The oldest and largest of the congregations, drawing 38 per cent of the affiliated respondents, was the Isaac Mayer Wise Temple. Founded after the First World War by Lakeville's early German-Jewish residents, this congregation had originally adhered to the school of thought known as Classical Reform — a movement that stressed reason and the elements of universal morality in Judaism, did not recognize the concept of Jewish peoplehood, rejected the idea of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, and preserved only those rituals and traditions that fitted exactly with its rationalistic preferences. In those days, services at the Wise Temple were conducted on Sunday, rather than on Friday evening or Saturday.

Since then, however, the congregation had shifted to the less extreme viewpoint known as Neo-Reform, which is more hospitable to tradition and ritual, and endorses the idea of a Jewish homeland. Services were conducted on Friday and Saturday. Those on Saturday were strongly child-oriented. Festival services also revolved mainly around the young; at one Passover, children conducted much of the Torah service, and the rabbi's sermon consisted of a story for the grammar-school age level.

The Conservative congregation, called the Solomon Schechter Synagogue, was established in the early 1950's. At the time of the study, it accounted for 27 per cent of the synagogue-affiliated Jews in town. The daily services at Schechter tended to retain the traditional adult character of Jewish worship.

Of the three smaller Reform congregations, only the David Einhorn Temple, which comprised 14 per cent of affiliated Jews, defined itself as "Classically Reform." In the opinion of some residents, the congregation violated Jewish tradition so flagrantly that it could scarcely be called a bona fide synagogue. Festivals were celebrated, not on their actual dates, but on the nearest Sunday. There was virtually no Sabbath observance; Temple services were held on Sunday mornings. At these services, hymns were sung in English, and the music was primarily that of Haydn, Mozart,

Beethoven, and certain American composers more often encountered in Protestant hymnals. Prayer and ritual were played down, while a large part of the time was devoted to the rabbi's sermon.

The religious school at Einhorn sought to indoctrinate students with a particular viewpoint, rather than equip them with a body of common Jewish knowledge. No attempt was made to teach Hebrew, or even the most basic Hebrew prayers. Zionism was discouraged. The curriculum and the textbooks were largely borrowed from the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism and the Unitarian-Universalist Church. The school programs, as well as the services, concentrated on the message of the Prophets; the "inner, moral strength" of Prophetic Judaism — rather than "land, nation or ritual" — was the main theme.

Of the remaining two Reform temples — each of them including 8 per cent of the town's affiliated Jews — one appealed to those of liberal political persuasion and high intellectual aspiration. The Samuel Hirsch Temple was considered a "thinking man's congregation," where at the Friday night services members delivered "creative prayers" and read excerpts from the most varied books by or about Jews. In reading the weekly portion from the Torah Scroll, the rabbi interspersed the Hebrew, line for line, with English translations, on the theory that the worshiper should not be exposed to material he did not understand.

The other remaining congregation, the Max Lilienthal Temple, was the newest in town, consisting almost entirely of young families who had come to Lakeville only recently. The members, most of whom were engaged in family businesses, thought of themselves as occupying the bottom of the economic ladder in the community. The Union Prayer Book — the official prayer book of Reform Judaism — was used, but a visitor might have found the service rather traditional for a Reform institution.

The Lilienthal congregation and Schechter, the Conservative temple, shared the highest attendance figures. The Lilienthal members also were the most home-observant of the Reform Jews, though they were no match for the Conservative synagogue members.

Three of the congregations, in varying degrees, supported a variety of extra-religious activities: youth programs, men's clubs, sisterhoods, bowling leagues, social dancing classes, discussion series and annual dinners. Two — the Hirsch and the Einhorn Temple — limited themselves to strictly religious concerns.

The synagogue situation in Lakeville, then, was one of considerable diversity. With five congregations in a community of 8,000 Jews, a prospective member stood a good chance of discovering a synagogue suited to his taste. But while this diversity of outlook offered the individual an increased possibility of joining the community's religious life, it often made it unnecessary for him to undergo a transformation of values when he joined. The chances were that a prospective member would find a congregation of people with ideas and beliefs like his own, and thus would not have to confront unaccustomed religious demands.

Membership Patterns

Today, the transmission of Jewish values to the children has become a major spur for joining a synagogue. Whether in modest or affluent circumstances, whether alienated from religion or moderately observant, the majority of Lakeville Jews acknowledged that they affiliated with a synagogue so as to expose their children to a Jewish education. Few joined until that need arose. Thus, a father of two girls aged 2 and 4 reported: "I haven't been pushed into joining yet by my children; they're not old enough." A mother whose oldest child was 5 intended to "join next year when Johnny will go to Sunday School." The affiliation rate tripled when children reached early school age, and attained a plateau when the oldest was 12 or 13.

Which synagogue to join was a prime issue, more frequently argued among the parents of young children than were matters of ritual observance. "Joining a temple and which one — the pros and cons. That's the biggest question," remarked the young wife of a wealthy broker. The problem typically was discussed with great frankness by young parents, including some who voiced

misgivings, as did a mother of two pre-school children: "I think it's so hypocritical when people who aren't interested themselves send their children to Sunday School."

A few parents of young children complained about the high cost of affiliation because they did not expect to receive full value from it until their children were ready to use the congregation's educational facilities. The mother of a 1½-year-old explained: "It costs \$100 a year. For two services it's not worth it." On the other hand, when the need to join was felt, economic considerations were overlooked. The synagogue joiners included just about as many families with incomes below \$15,000 as with incomes above \$30,000.

Once the family had joined, the child constituted the major link to the religious institution, particularly among the more alienated. One minimally observant mother, typical of many, acknowledged that "we would not be members of a temple if not for the children." But the more observant, too, were influenced. "My interest has become stronger because of my children," one woman said.

When the children were grown up, the majority of Lakeville families — contrary to what might have been expected — did not go back to their former patterns. Some families gave up their membership at this point, but there was no mass exodus. Some, no doubt, stayed on simply from habit or inertia. But for others, synagogue affiliation seemed to have taken on an altered, more personal meaning: The years of membership had built up a more clearly Jewish self-image. A sense of belonging to the Jewish community and an awareness of the synagogue as the central institution in Jewish life appeared to have developed.

Involvement in Synagogue Affairs

To Lakeville's Jews, belonging rather than attending seemed to be what mattered about religious affiliation. The number of members who came to services each week was much smaller than among local Christians: 6 per cent, as against 22 per cent among Protestants and 73 per cent among Catholics. However, Jews were only

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION, ATTENDANCE AND INVOLVEMENT:
JEWES AND OTHERS

	<i>Jews</i>	<i>Protestants</i>	<i>Catholics</i>
Belonging to a synagogue (church)	66%	66%	94%
Attending services each week	6	22	73
Attending services once a month or more	26	58	91
Belonging to synagogue-(church-) affiliated group	36	24	45
Spending time weekly in synagogue (church) activities	33	42	37

slightly less active in synagogue activities than were Christians in church activities (see Table). Some were intrinsically interested in particular tasks, such as assignments on building, legal or ways-and-means committees; some regarded these or other synagogue activities primarily as a good way of meeting and sharing with people. Many Lakeville residents would have agreed with a businessman who had helped the Conservative temple grow from a small band of followers to a firmly established institution, and who reported: "When you give to an institution, you enjoy it. I started with it. I saw it grow. A good portion of our social life stems from the synagogue."

Did Lakeville Jews pursue synagogue activities as a substitute for worship and study — or was it mainly the more devoted worshippers and students who engaged in those other activities as part of their overall involvement? Generally, the active member proved to be the praying member. Thus, among those who were highly active in synagogue affairs, 42 per cent attended services with maximum regularity; of those who were wholly inactive, only 8 per cent did. Similarly, those involved in synagogue affairs attended lectures and study groups far more often than did the inactive.

On the other hand, members who remained uninvolved in synagogue affairs and did not use the synagogue as a house of assembly generally did not use it as a house of prayer or of study either.

And as might be expected, they tended to be more distant from traditional Jewish usages; at home, they were generally less observant. They often were apathetic about, or alienated from, religion in all its aspects. In addition, many were disenchanted because of unsuccessful attempts to make friends with other members. Some complained that congregations were too large and impersonal. One man expressed his alienation by complaining that every temple was a "hodgepodge of internal politics."

The persons most deeply involved in synagogue life also showed the greatest private interest in matters Jewish — in questions of ritual, belief or morality. Even away from the synagogue, they thought about, and discussed, such issues as observing dietary laws at home, the place of the Reform Jew in Judaism or the definition of "a good Jew." Altogether, the findings in Lakeville suggest that involvement in synagogue affairs does not replace worship and study, but on the contrary fosters concern with the deeper religious values.

OTHER EXPRESSIONS OF JEWISHNESS

IF NOT kosher meat, and if not Saturday morning services, then what about the State of Israel? Can interest in Israel be a substitute focus of Jewishness? How about B'nai B'rith, Hadassah and other Jewish organizations? Perhaps devotion to such causes can replace religious feeling, and function in lieu of the traditional *mitzvot* — thereby filling the void created by the modern suburban Jew's alienation from ritualistic and synagogue life.

Israel Pro and Con

To determine how Lakeville Jews felt about Israel, several questions were asked in the course of the study, the first of them being: "If the Arab nations should succeed in carrying out their threat to destroy Israel, would you feel a very deep, some, or no personal sense of loss?" Some 65 per cent said they would feel a "very deep" sense of loss, 25 per cent "some" sense of loss, and 10 per cent no sense of loss at all.

Vague but powerful feelings about their own Jewish identity or their kinship with Jews abroad affected many (see Table on following page). A businessman declared: "I feel a sense of identity with every Jew in the world — something deep and something compulsive in me." A public relations man expressed admiration for the Israelis' achievements: "They . . . have struggled hard. They have done wonderful things. They're wonderful people; I'd hate to have anything happen to them." A point often brought out was that an Arab victory would mean the destruction of a haven for refugees. The wife of a prominent physician observed: "I've felt Israel is the answer for European Jews after World War II." To which a sales-

man's wife added: "Israel is . . . for the underprivileged and deprived who can't live as citizens in countries they had lived in." ("But," she said, "it's not necessary for the Jews of this country.")

A smaller percentage attributed their feelings about a possible Israeli debacle primarily to humanitarian concern—the same concern they would feel if any other small country were destroyed. However, most of the members of this group felt they would be somewhat more concerned and sympathetic in Israel's case because they were Jews. Only a minority, many of whom held the anti-Zionist political philosophy of the Einhorn Temple (and the American Council for Judaism), rejected any special tie with Israel.

As it happened, the destruction that was merely hypothesized in these interviews was to become an immediate possibility with the Six-Day War between Israel and her Arab neighbors, in the spring of 1967. A few months after Israel's quick victory averted this disaster, a limited supplementary inquiry explored how the feelings of Lakeville Jewry toward Israel had been affected.

During the crisis, Lakeville's Jewish community had raised unprecedented amounts of money through improvised drives as well

**REASONS GIVEN FOR FEELING A SENSE OF LOSS
IF ISRAEL WERE DESTROYED***

Feelings of Jewish identity†	70%
"All Jews are brothers"	31%
"Israel is the Jewish homeland"	13
"Israel is a personal haven"	1
"Israel is a haven for Jews"	28
"Proud of Israel's achievements"	30
Feelings of Jewish identity, combined with humanitarianism	19
Humanitarianism alone	11

*One respondent in every 10 said he would feel no sense of loss. These responses are excluded from the percentage calculations.

†Specific reasons add up to more than 70 per cent because some respondents gave more than one reason.

as through the regional Jewish welfare fund. Even some members of the Einhorn Temple had contributed. The persons interviewed said they had felt intensely anxious during the crucial days (evidently more so than some Israelis who happened to be visiting in Lakeville at the time), and had been thrilled by Israel's triumph.

However, the anxiety had not been so great as to keep people from their normal daily routines. Nor, in spite of some talk about "heroic" giving, were the contributions so large as to imply real belt-tightening for the citizens of this affluent community. (One observer claimed that "people were surprised and worried" by their own generosity.) There seems to have been no increase in religious devotions, and little if any political activity such as sending telegrams to Congressmen. Where young people wanted to go to Israel to help, parents often temporized.

By the time the supplementary inquiry was undertaken, emotions appeared to have shaken down pretty much to where they had been before the Six-Day War. Some respondents could no longer recall why they had reacted so intensely. Interest in visiting Israel had not increased, nor had support for Israel as measured by what sort of action — from fund-raising to settling in Israel — individuals were ready to take. At least one of the local rabbis said all Jewish activities were going somewhat better than before the war, but added that he had "expected the change to be sharper than it has been."

Why was there so little visible effect beyond the days of the crisis? In retrospect, it seems that what Lakeville Jews had unconsciously been most concerned with was the possibility of another holocaust. They evidently felt that their sense of self-worth depended on their helping to prevent such a disaster; and they feared that if Israel, which had created something new, clean and good out of the ashes of the Hitler holocaust, were to go down, it would altogether destroy the meaning of Jewish existence. This, rather than simply Israel as such, was what moved them during the crisis; and so, when the crisis passed, Israel moved back to its usual place among their concerns.

In the original survey, another aspect of Israel in relation to American Jewry had been explored through this series of questions: "Do you think the existence of the State of Israel has had any effect on the status and security of American Jews? . . . A beneficial or harmful effect? . . . Why?" Two-thirds of the respondents thought there was an effect, while one-third felt there was none. Of the former, a majority (66 per cent) felt the effect was beneficial; 19 per cent thought it was harmful, and 14 per cent felt it was both.

Those who saw a harmful effect frequently worried that Israel's existence might cause non-Jews to accuse Jews of "double loyalty." One businessman asserted, with more conviction than grammar: "Most gentiles feel the State of Israel is where all Jews believe in above any other place." The wife of a well-to-do businessman said: "Zionists bombard Presidents with their demands and give the impression of speaking for all of Jewry. Jews resent it. Non-Jews certainly resent it because Israel is a country separate and apart, and we shouldn't think of it first." A teacher saw a possible spur to anti-Semitism: "Some people who might have tended that way anyway would now say, 'You have a country; now go there.'"

Among the majority who considered Israel a boon rather than a threat, the favorite arguments were that Israel was helping to strengthen the self-awareness and the religious and ethnic ties of Jews in this country or, especially, to improve gentiles' attitudes toward Jews. Israel, it was said, had created a new image of the Jew as fighter and frontiersman; gentiles admired what the Israelis did; Israel showed the non-Jewish community that Jews could "stand up and fight — that the Jew is a *man*, not just a merchant."

An engineer who believed that Israel's image counteracted anti-Semitic stereotyping summed it up with the observation: "The American Jew has acquired more status because Jewish people showed themselves to be pioneers, soldiers, farmers — things that people didn't know they could do. Israel shows they have *guts*. And now gentiles take a different look at their Jewish neighbors."

Reactions during the Six-Day War had generally agreed with these attitudes, the supplementary inquiry showed. Lakeville Jews

were delighted with the favorable coverage of Israel on television and in the press. Except for one rabbi, who found the local Christian clergy lukewarm or worse toward Israel, they were pleased, and sometimes surprised, to find that "the gentiles were with us against the Arabs." Most respondents had felt no strain between their status as Americans and their support for Israel — not surprisingly, since U.S. policy was backing Israel. And even some of the members of the Einhorn Temple thought that American Jews had gained new respect in gentiles' eyes because of Israel's feat of arms. One of them reported that a gentile business acquaintance had called long-distance just to tell him, with obvious approval: "You Hebs really taught those guys a lesson!"

What is the connection, if any, between people's attitudes toward Israel and their religious status? In the original survey, the more observant and more active in the synagogue supported Israel more vigorously than did the nonobservant and inactive. It follows that pro-Israel sentiment is sustained by some sort of religious attachment. A commitment to Israel usually is a concomitant of, not a substitute for, piety or synagogue life.

As for descent and specific religious attachment, persons of East European descent were more often pro-Israel than those of German descent; Conservative Jews were significantly more often pro-Israel than were Reform Jews; and pro-Israel sentiment tended to run higher among Reform Jews of Orthodox or Conservative parentage than among those who had inherited their Reform outlook.

Jewish Organizations

A visitor picking up the weekly *Lakeville Bulletin* would probably be impressed with the amount of Jewish news it contains. In addition to the listings of services at five different synagogues in the religious column, a raft of news stories scattered throughout the paper reports on meetings of Jewish organizations. These stories might well leave the reader confused. In some cases the names of different organizations sound almost alike. In other cases, the names give no hint as to the agencies' objectives. The groups seem

at once competitive and similar, public-spirited and self-serving — and altogether overwhelming in number and variety.

Traditionally, Jewish institutions performed specific functions: They buried the dead, ministered to the sick and sheltered the stranger. Their traditional focus was to perform *mitzvot*, not to bolster Jewish identity by providing outlets for Jewish togetherness. Today, however, the importance of Jewish organizations derives as much from the explicit or implicit contributions they make to Jewish survival as from their specific aims and accomplishments. With family and neighborhood ties far weaker than they once were, membership in Jewish organizations has become important as a way of belonging to the Jewish community.

It was the exceptional Lakeville resident who did not have some Jewish institutional affiliation. Some 71 per cent belonged to organizations other than synagogue-sponsored groups. When synagogue-related associations were included, the figure jumped to a full 78 per cent.

Which Jewish organizations appealed to Lakeville Jews? The range was wide, with health and welfare, social and recreational, cultural, community, educational, Zionist and religious groups.

Great differences were noted in the involvement of men and women. Eight of every ten women belonged to one or more Jewish organizations not connected with a synagogue and about half belonged to several. On the other hand, only six in ten men were affiliated with some such group, and only one-third with more than one. Among women, health and welfare groups were most popular, the favorite being ORT, i.e., the Organization for Rehabilitation through Training (to which 40 per cent of women belonged), Hadassah (with 26 per cent), and the National Council of Jewish Women (with 18 per cent). In contrast, when Lakeville men affiliated with a Jewish organization, fewer than one in five selected a health or welfare group, while as many as nine in ten joined a social or recreational one. By far the most popular association among them was B'nai B'rith; some 37 per cent of all Lakeville men belonged to a B'nai B'rith lodge.

The prominence of women in Lakeville's social-service organizations contrasted with their role in the Jewish past. Formerly, providing for communal needs was a purely male responsibility, men being considered the more serious sex. Why, then, this change in sex roles? The usual answer is that suburban women, with few children and no jobs, have time for communal duties, whereas their hard-working husbands do not. However, the men do find ample time for recreation and amusement. The real reason seems to be a change in values: Men no longer feel the traditional Jewish obligation to spend their spare hours discharging religious and communal responsibilities, and women, no longer confined to their traditional domestic sphere, are looking for meaningful activity beyond the home.

Social and economic class had a good deal to do with who joined what in Lakeville. All but 14 per cent of people with incomes over \$30,000 were members of some Jewish organization not connected with a synagogue; in contrast, fewer than half of those making less than \$15,000 belonged to any such group. Wealthy men held multiple memberships more frequently than did those with modest incomes. Also, the wealthiest people tended to deviate from the usual pattern of men's and women's activities: Affluent men might join a health-welfare group as well as a social one, and affluent women might join recreational as well as welfare groups.

A Secular Alternative

To observant Jews, involvement in Jewish organizations, particularly if it is connected with performing *mitzvot* and *maasim tovim* (good works), is a legitimate, necessary religious activity. To the less observant, on the other hand, it offers a secular alternative to religion — a means of expressing Jewish identity without the rigors of religious sanction. Thanks to the large number of Jewish organizations, Jews who have only the weakest of ties with religious Judaism can yet maintain some sort of association with the Jewish community. Indeed, certain Jewish groups have a special attraction for people alienated from religion.

That Jewish organizations meet certain needs of the alienated as well as the observant is indicated by the affiliation figures for Lakeville, which show no clear-cut differences between the two. Generally, multiple affiliation increased with greater religious commitment; but there were cases where multiple membership ran just as high among nonobservers. About the only generalization the data suggest is that persons without religious commitment have a special affinity for groups like Jewish country clubs — for social or recreational organizations with no particularly Jewish objectives and no aims beyond themselves. But even clubs of this sort are not as lacking in Jewish purpose as they may appear: They allow Jews to pursue upper-class activities without shedding their Jewish identity, and without risk of possible embarrassments in encounters with gentiles.

Whatever their particular purpose, Jewish groups provide their members with an opportunity to establish and develop friendships. One Lakeville woman cited the work Hadassah does as her reason for joining, but at the same time she added, "I have many friends in it." An officer in a Jewish child-care agency found the agency's "social" aspects just as satisfying as what he called its "good purpose." However, this is not to say that people always joined spontaneously; sometimes they were strenuously recruited. Representative of many was a young businessman, who said he went into B'nai B'rith primarily because a business contact wanted him to join his lodge. Again, an ORT member explained: "All the women in the neighborhood belong; you have to because of pressure."

The multiplicity of Jewish mass organizations is a recent and remarkable phenomenon. It can be understood only when we realize how many persons lack contact with the synagogue, yet wish to preserve a link to the Jewish community. The Lakeville findings are a case in point.

THE NEXT JEWISH GENERATION

IN THE TREATISE entitled *Pirke Avot* ("Sayings of the Fathers"), the Mishnah relates the following chain of tradition: "Moses received the Torah on Sinai, and handed it down to Joshua; Joshua to the elders; the elders to the prophets; and the prophets handed it down to the Men of the Great Assembly."

From what we have discovered about the new suburban Jew, it is clear that the chain of Jewish tradition will not be continued by the method of past centuries: by rationalizing changes and absorbing them. But it is also clear — if the example of Lakeville proves anything — that most Jews do want to continue the chain in some form.

In Lakeville, as elsewhere, Jewish values were transmitted through two main channels: formal Jewish education, and the home. The hoped-for end product was the continuation of Jewish tradition. This implied a Jewish marriage. However, many Lakeville parents thought it entirely possible that their children would marry outside the faith.

A Jewish Education

When Lakeville parents were asked, "How concerned are you, or have you been, with providing your children with an understanding or background in Jewish life?" a full 93 per cent said they had been "very," "moderately" or "somewhat" concerned. The overwhelming majority sought to provide this background through formal Jewish education: 95 per cent of families with a child 10 years or older sent their offspring to Sunday or Hebrew school. Virtually as many girls as boys were receiving such instruction.

Of those parents who had been exposed to Jewish learning, 96 per cent enrolled their children; but, surprisingly, a full 91 per cent of parents who had not had any Jewish schooling did likewise. Also, more parents foresaw long periods of Jewish education (from five to ten years) for their children than had had corresponding amounts of such education in their own youth (see Table).

Boys were having a Bar Mitzvah — signifying their attainment of adult religious status at age 13 — in about the same numbers as their fathers. Moreover, while the Bar Mitzvah ceremony was retaining its hold, Confirmation — the group ceremony by which boys and girls of 15 or 16 mark the completion of their basic religious studies and declare their attachment to Judaism — was gaining ground. Many more youngsters were being confirmed than had been the case in their parents' day. This is a remarkable finding when one considers that in most ways the parents had had a much more observant upbringing.

Jewishness in the Home

The determination of nearly all parents to continue the chain of tradition through formal Jewish education contrasted markedly with the feeble example they set at home. When asked, "Do you believe the environment in your home is Jewish enough for your children, or is it too Jewish or not Jewish enough?" a 71 per cent majority professed to find the home "Jewish enough." But this satisfaction was found among the unobservant or minimally ob-

PARENTS' EXPECTATIONS FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S JEWISH EDUCATION, COMPARED WITH THEIR OWN

<u>Years of Jewish education</u>	<u>Received by</u>		<u>Expected of children</u>
	<u>Fathers</u>	<u>Mothers</u>	
1-4	23%	30%	16%
5-6	19	19	25
7-8	35	22	30
9-10	13	16	24
11 or more	10	13	5

servant as well as among the average and the strongly observant; and the actual pattern in many or most cases consisted of nothing more than a minimum of ritual, enrollment of children in Sunday school, and a desire to have them undergo Bar Mitzvah or Confirmation. A great many parents relied mainly or almost entirely on the religious school for the Jewish upbringing of their children.

A significant minority of Lakeville parents were troubled to see Jewish education thus cut loose from its traditional moorings in the family. They felt that their children would lack strong, positive Jewish memories, and they were still sufficiently attached to Judaism to blame themselves for letting this happen. Those parents who found their homes insufficiently Jewish often seemed to be prompted by the feeling that their children's present Jewish experiences contrasted poorly with their own warm Jewish past.

What, then, could one do? How wholeheartedly were these self-critical parents trying to create a more Jewish home for their children? A minimally observant advertising executive who had been raised in an Orthodox home said he was unhappy that his daughters were "not being brought up in the same traditional life — it's not really a Jewish way of life." He believed they would have "a better outlook if we gave them the Jewish life I was exposed to." However, he added simply, "I can't."

"We think we ought to light Friday night candles regularly, but we're lax about some of the things we talk about doing," said another businessman, also minimally observant. And an active ORT leader admitted: "We could have Jewish records or go to services Friday night or put up a *sukkah*. We don't because we're not that interested."

Ambivalence was expressed by a woman who thought about hanging paintings of Jewish subjects in her living room: "I saw a picture of a rabbi and didn't buy it because of its content. I thought I didn't have the right room. . . . I should have bought it."

The children of Lakeville, according to their parents' reports, were even more often satisfied with the Jewish environment in the home than were the parents themselves: To 81 per cent of the

youngsters it seemed "just about right." Those children who found their homes inadequately Jewish were said to focus on the neglect of both ritual observances and accompanying customs. In one family the college-age children reportedly compared their mother's and their grandmother's ways of handling Jewish holidays, and found the mother wanting. A ten-year-old boy chided his parents for not going to services or lighting candles.

But these were exceptional cases. By and large, conflict between the generations over matters of religion did not seem to be much on people's minds — at least not on adults'. Parents were asked: "Do you think there is more agreement or less agreement between your outlook and interest in Jewish affairs and your children's than there was between yours and your father's (mother's) when you were a child?" One-half of the persons asked saw no difference between their own early experience and their children's; of the rest, three-quarters thought there was more family harmony now than a generation ago, and only one-quarter thought there was less.

The reason, many respondents seemed to suggest, was that they were more competent in child-raising than their parents had been. Their self-appraisal ran somewhat like this: "The child is an individual with his own special needs; as parents, we understand these needs; and we are capable of satisfying them." As modern parents, they wished the child to conform willingly; motivation, not coercion, was the guiding light.

"We make things more pleasant religiously for our kids and they feel it's something they want to do," a Lakeville mother of two children asserted. A lawyer's wife said: "I think when we were young nothing was explained to the children. We didn't understand the rituals. . . . Today more understand them." A professional man recalled the religious training he got from his father as one of compulsion, not communication: "There was no relation, no real basis for discussion. I *had* to do it." A businessman said much the same thing: "I made a definite effort to inform my children and share with them. I was 'enjoined' by my father, whereas I 'joined' my children."

In short, these respondents — and many others — viewed the traditionalism of their childhood homes as a source of strain and conflict, and thought their present religious regimen made for greater harmony. Many cited how few demands they made on their children compared to the observances forced upon themselves when they were young.

The Threat of Inter-marriage

Having provided an environment with a degree of Jewish schooling but negligible home observance, Lakeville parents were notably unsure of their children's marital future. They did not by any means consider intermarriage a far-fetched possibility. In answer to the question, "Do you think your child may marry a non-Jew?" 58 per cent said "possibly" or "I don't know." Some 36 per cent said "no," but 5 per cent said "yes."

If many parents could not be sure that their children would marry in the traditional way, their own feelings about mixed marriage often were equally removed from tradition, ranging from vigorous opposition to troubled resignation or troubled acceptance. Parents were asked: "How would you feel if your child were to marry a non-Jew? Would you feel very unhappy, somewhat unhappy, neither happy nor unhappy, somewhat happy or very happy?" Only 29 per cent answered "very unhappy," the response closest to Jewish tradition; 43 per cent said they would feel "somewhat unhappy," and 24 per cent said "neither happy nor unhappy."

Of the minority who would be "very unhappy" about a mixed marriage, only a small handful were concerned with Jewish survival. Few Lakeville residents would say, as did one Conservative Jew, an engineer, that intermarriage "would mean breaking the chain. We are a unique group. To survive is necessary. No one likes to become a fossil, extinct. It's a matter of pride."

Most of the persons questioned explained their opposition to intermarriage quite differently. They commented that there were enough problems in marriage without bringing in others, or stressed the inevitability of discord in what they thought would be

an unstable and therefore unhealthy union. In addition, about three of every ten emphasized the difficulties which the offspring of an interfaith marriage might face. Smaller numbers pointed to the likelihood of ambiguous relationships between the mixed couple and their relatives, friends or the society at large. Through seemingly dispassionate arguments like these many respondents evidently sought to resolve a troublesome personal conflict: between their belief in the right to free marital choice and their desire for Jewish continuity.

Alienation from traditional Jewish values is only one of several forces that foster permissiveness toward intermarriage. Another is America's — in fact, the Western World's — attitudes toward romantic love. The residents of Lakeville shared these attitudes, and this landed them in a dilemma which might be summed up as follows: "Jewish survival is one thing, but love is something else again."

The influence of the romantic love idea was illustrated when respondents were asked whether they would rather have their child marry a loved non-Jew or an unloved Jew. No fewer than 85 per cent opted for the former. The mandate was clear: Love, not religion, was considered the basis for marriage. However, if love was thought to outweigh religion, at least religion was in turn thought to outweigh mundane considerations of wealth and prestige. When asked to choose between a Jewish carpenter and a non-Jewish doctor or lawyer as a husband for their child, 54 per cent of the parents chose the former and only 29 per cent the latter.

As might be expected, few Lakeville parents said they would refuse to recognize a mixed marriage or disown their child because of it. The question read: "If your child were to marry a non-Jew how do you think you would react? What would you do?" Only 1 per cent declared they would reject the child. Fully 93 per cent said they would accept the situation and thus retain family ties.

"Would I throw him out? Absolutely not. He's still your child," was the comment of a nonobservant woman whose own son was recently confirmed. A moderately observant ORT leader said: "I'd

be as sensible as I could be; before the marriage I would put the pros and cons before them. The final decision is not mine to make.”

Others stated they would also try to build a meaningful relationship with the gentile son-in-law or daughter-in-law. Said a professional man: “I’d be mainly concerned about their happiness and compatibility rather than Jewishness. If you’ve done a good job in bringing up children, you must trust to their judgment. If you haven’t, you can do nothing.” Some added that they would try to expose the gentile son-in-law or daughter-in-law to Jewish holidays and culture, so as to incorporate him or her into the Jewish group and possibly convert him.

Of those who would be very unhappy over a mixed marriage, a great many said they would eventually accept this state of affairs, however reluctantly. They spoke of “accepting the situation brokenheartedly” and “making the best of a bad situation.” These feelings were found most often among the second generation and, naturally, among persons strongly committed to Jewish religious practices and institutions.

The majority of Lakeville Jews had been more profoundly influenced by the prevailing culture. Not only did they believe that love was the basis of marriage; they also thought children should be treated as autonomous individuals, free to make their own decisions and mistakes. Besides, parents felt they ought to be consistent in maintaining their accustomed liberal orientation in Jewish-gentile relationships — an attitude which conflicted openly with the traditional Jewish norm of banishing the errant child. As one mother put it: “We’ve tried to teach nonprejudice and tolerance to the children, so we couldn’t react too much.”

WHO IS A GOOD JEW?

•

THE RESEARCHERS who carried out the studies in Lakeville frequently heard such remarks as: "X is not a very good Jew," or, "Y acts the way a good Jew should act." Evidently, Lakeville people had some conceptions of what a Jew ought to be. What were these conceptions?

It was only reasonable to assume that, whatever they were, they might be partly self-serving — that some persons would seek to legitimize their own actions or attitudes by setting them up as a norm of Jewish ethics. But it could also be expected that there would be some reflection of honestly held ideals of Jewishness.

Criteria, Old and New

In order to pin down the prevailing image of the "good Jew," respondents were asked what characteristics they considered essential or desirable in such a person — and which traits they thought did not matter. The "essential" things a man must do to be a good Jew were defined thus (in order of frequency with which named):

- Lead an ethical and moral life.
- Accept his being a Jew and not try to hide it.
- Support all humanitarian causes.
- Promote civic betterment and improvement in the community.
- Gain respect of Christian neighbors.
- Help the underprivileged improve their lot.
- Know the fundamentals of Judaism.
- Work for equality for Negroes.

As these priorities indicate, the conceptions held in Lakeville deviated greatly from handed-down Jewish standards. Virtually

all the traditional religious, nationalistic and cultural values were missing. Indeed, at first glance the Lakeville ideal of Jewishness might seem to consist simply of being a good citizen and leading an upright life: A good Jew is someone who is kind, ethical, helpful, and interested in the welfare of others.

Actually, there was more to it than mere Boy Scout ethics. For one thing, there was the matter of Jewish self-acceptance: A good Jew, it was thought, freely and proudly acknowledges his identity. Moreover, the duty to lead a life of moral excellence probably was more keenly felt, more comprehensively perceived and more carefully observed by those who took their religious background seriously than by those who derived their values solely from the general culture; for, it was thought, whatever else Judaism teaches, it teaches ethical goodness.

In any event, the test of a good Jew, as far as Lakeville was concerned, was not loyalty to the old rituals, but the practice of moral ideals. And this morality was expected to be more than personal; it must express itself not only in the "good works" of traditional Judaism, but in efforts for the world at large, for human rights, for the underprivileged.

In contrast, many virtues directly connected with traditional Judaism and Jewish identity tended to be considered merely "desirable," not "essential." Some of the most widely named "desirable" attributes (again in the order of frequency with which named) were these:

- Be well versed in Jewish history and culture.
- Marry within the Jewish faith.
- Contribute to Jewish philanthropies.
- Belong to Jewish organizations.
- Support Israel.
- Attend weekly services.
- Attend services on High Holy Days.
- Belong to a synagogue or temple. •

Knowing the fundamentals of Judaism was thought merely desirable as often as it was considered essential. As for observance of the dietary laws, it was found to rank extremely low on the scale; after

what had been learned in other phases of the study, it came as no surprise that 85 per cent thought such observance "made no difference" to being a good Jew. Other low-scoring items were: having mostly Jewish friends, promoting the use of Yiddish, and giving preference to Jewish candidates for political office. The last item actually was found objectionable by a majority of respondents.

Whatever else one might discover about these conceptions of the good Jew, this much is certain: The actions and *mitzvot* which the Lakeville Jew considered essential were those between man and man, rather than those between God and man; and the *mitzvot* he prized most were often identical with virtuous acts enjoined by the general American culture. In other words, though the Lakeville Jew borrowed the traits that made up his model of the "good Jew" from traditional Judaism, he borrowed so selectively that the model came out more standard American than Jewish.

The Uncertain Future

Lakeville is in many ways an ideal community, with its fine homes, its excellent school system, its pleasant beaches and country clubs. But it provides no rich Jewish experiences for the majority of the Jewish youngsters growing up there. Most of them get no more than a thin smattering of Jewishness from their homes or from their religious schools.

This problem is something new on the American Jewish scene. Things have turned all the way around since the grandfathers or great-grandfathers of Lakeville's Jewish children came to America. They were poor in terms of money, modern education and knowledge of American life — but rich in Jewish lore and loyalty. Since then, material and educational standards have risen, but the original fund of Jewishness has been dissipated until today there is little left.

Behind this development lies a fundamental paradox of American life. American society respects the special identity of ethnic groups in the sense that it does not purposely interfere with their survival as groups. That is what the immigrant ancestors of Lake-

ville's Jews counted on when they came to these shores. But at the same time American society, through its very openness and permissiveness, threatens the cultural inheritance of ethnic groups; and this is something the immigrants' descendants are only now beginning to discover.

The great riddle in the Lakevilles of today is whether the next Jewish generation can be "good Jews" — and what sort of "good Jews." What will become of their Jewish identity when they grow up and go away to live, as many of them will, in more or less mixed environments? Will they feel sufficiently attached to traditional Jewish values to maintain their Jewishness alongside of their general American identity, and thus stave off the threat of assimilation? Or will their store of Jewish values be so meager as to leave them helpless to prevent further erosion? These are not distant questions. The individuals who will determine the shape of Jewish life in the 21st century have already been born. In fact, they are — as a generation — presently in school.

THE CLIMATE OF GENTILE-JEWISH RELATIONS

LAKEVILLE'S physical attractiveness is matched by what is on the whole a pleasant social atmosphere. Relations between gentiles and Jews are generally decent and often cordial. "Everyone seems friendlier here," said a young Jew, new to the town. A gentile who had been living there for nearly ten years spoke of the "nice, friendly group of people here who mind their own business."

On Balance, a Benign Environment

Although well-to-do, Lakeville is not an enclave of the wealthy, nor a bastion of religious or ethnic discrimination in housing, as wealthy neighborhoods sometimes are. Those people who might have wanted to institute such discrimination voted with their feet instead, leaving for other communities more congenial to their tastes. Neither has Lakeville seen such vulgar symptoms of prejudice as swastika daubings on synagogues — in contrast to some nearby towns.

Three in every four of the gentiles interviewed, and nine in every ten Jews, said community life was not appreciably marred by strains between Jews and gentiles; roughly half of each group said there was no strain at all. True, 17 per cent of the Jews reported "a personal experience with anti-Semitism" in Lakeville, and another 18 per cent had heard of such a thing. But the latter figure suggests that the incidents in question were neither characteristic of daily life in Lakeville nor of a sort to affect the community as a whole. If they had been, all or most Jews presumably would have known of — and been shaken by — their occurrence.

An "unpleasant" experience with a gentile individual was reported by 19 per cent of the Jews, but on the other hand, 21 per

cent reported one with another Jew. Most of this unpleasantness involved the classic quarrels of suburbia — over property rights, fences, upkeep, unreciprocated favors, and over dogs or children.

When asked the reasons for the tranquil intergroup climate, many citizens replied that Lakeville was not a “typical” suburb — that it was not inhabited by the “kind” of people who cause strain. Some pointed out that there was no hard core of gentiles determined to keep Jews out. Others mentioned shared values and interests: (“Two fellows who went to Harvard should have a common denominator,” a young Jewish woman said.) Still other respondents felt that the presence of long-time Jewish residents, with ways that were much like those of long-time gentile dwellers, had laid a favorable groundwork for the acceptance of new Jews.

However, some explanations were more ambivalent. In the opinion of a gentile former schoolteacher, Lakeville Jews were not the “loud, outspoken variety . . . but rather educated, hard-working, neat, clean, and not much different than we are.” In other words, some gentiles found a Jew acceptable only to the extent that he constituted an exception to the prevailing stereotype in their minds and exhibited certain virtues which they considered particularly their own; they did not welcome a real diversity of manners and ways. A Jewish housewife agreed that intergroup relations were friendly, but went on: “People here have more poise on the outside than the average person, they’re better educated and maybe more refined. What goes on inside I don’t know about.”

A good many Jews and gentiles — about one in six — said relations were as peaceful as they were only because the groups kept their distance — because, as the gentile wife of a carpenter stated, “people don’t know one another too well. If they did, much more strain among them might be observed.”

Guessing at the Other Side’s Feelings

While Lakeville residents often suspected that relations between gentiles and Jews might not be quite as tranquil as they appeared on the surface, the two groups proved to be quite uninformed about

each other's feelings. Gentiles were frequently aware of this ignorance; more than two-fifths of them said they did not know how the other side felt toward them. Of the Jews, only one-tenth acknowledged that they did not know.

When the gentiles hazarded a guess, it usually was an optimistic one. Only those who believed intergroup relations in Lakeville to be "very strained" were inclined to assume Jews did not like them. The Jews, on the other hand — even those who did not believe group relations in Lakeville to be particularly strained — voiced an almost universal fear that gentile graciousness might sometimes mask private disapproval or animosity. Most commonly, this anxiety stemmed from the assumption that "they" must feel resentful of the large Jewish influx.

In the course of the survey, the Jews' notions of gentile attitudes toward them were tested. Gentile respondents were asked to voice agreement or disagreement with three statements designed for measuring their actual attitudes toward Jews; Jewish respondents were shown the same statements and were asked what they thought the gentiles' reactions would be. The statements read as follows:

1. Persecution of Jews would be largely eliminated if the Jews would make really sincere efforts to rid themselves of harmful and offensive faults.
2. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that sooner or later they spoil it for other people.
3. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they are so shrewd and tricky that other people don't have a fair chance in competition.

In their replies, the Jewish respondents displayed an ignorance bordering on fantasy. On any one item, fewer than one in four estimated the gentiles' responses realistically (within 10 per cent), and only one in 25 gave reasonably correct estimates for two of the three items. What the estimates mainly seemed to reflect was simply the respondents' own complacency or anxiety.

Strangely, considering the widespread uneasiness, gentile hostility was more often underrated than overrated. Those respondents who thought relations between Jews and gentiles were fairly good or better tended to underestimate it, and this group was by far the

largest. On the other hand, those who thought relations very strained were inclined to overestimate gentile hostility. Realistic assessments were most often found among those who thought relations were fairly strained; but even here only 13 per cent gave reasonably correct estimates for at least two items of the three.

Assumptions about anti-Jewish feelings figured visibly in back-fence conflicts. Jews responded quite differently to a conflict with a gentile and with a Jewish neighbor — particularly where the hostility was of an unspoken kind: where encounters were avoided, fences put up without warning, favors not appreciated or not returned. When the opponent in such a situation was also a Jew, the offended person would usually attribute the trouble to the other's peculiarity of character or to personality differences; when he was a gentile, the offended person would often suspect prejudice. In the former case, the injured party would feel surprised and angry; in the latter he more often seemed depressed and resigned — as if he were to say, "What can you expect from a gentile?"

In the occasional open quarrels, untested suspicions of prejudice figured much less prominently. Whereas prejudice was thought to underlie 50 per cent of rebuffs or unrequited favors, and 64 per cent of cases of avoidance, it was reported in only 27 per cent of overt conflicts with gentiles. For better or worse, the vocabulary of rage showed the Jewish party to the dispute where he was at — as in this incident, reported by a Jewish woman who impressed the interviewers with her level-headedness: "Their child called ours a 'dirty Jew.' Ours called theirs a 'dirty Catholic.' I called the mother up. She said she would have to get her husband to stop talking like that around the house."

THE JEWISH INFLUX AND ITS RECEPTION

THOUGH relations between Lakeville gentiles and Jews are more harmonious than otherwise, it is clear that the physical and social upheaval accompanying the rapid, largely Jewish, population influx after the Second World War put them under great strain. In the course of the study, the explicit reactions of long-term gentile and Jewish residents to the more recent Jewish settlers were explored in detail. Data were also gathered on how the newcomers, in their turn, felt about the reception they had gotten.

Gentiles' Reactions to Jewish Newcomers

When the new population appeared, it impressed most of the long-term residents as being out of step with Lakeville's tradition and style, and the fact that 60 or 70 per cent of it was Jewish appeared to be much on their minds. At the time of the study, years later, many still did not like the new inhabitants at all. No fewer than 54 per cent of the long-term gentile residents viewed the rise in Jewish population unfavorably — three times as many as did so among the more recently arrived gentiles. Those who disliked most what had become of Lakeville were also most likely to be anti-Jewish (see Table on following page). They dwelled on the old clichés about Jewish "aggressiveness," "clannishness," "materialism," and they gave detailed accounts of offenses by Jews against good manner or good taste.

On the other hand, Jews were often given due credit for their contributions to recent community improvements. Gentiles who had a positive image of Jews — mostly the younger people, who often were newcomers themselves — tended to speak of the Jews'

ATTITUDES OF LONG-TIME GENTILE RESIDENTS
TOWARD JEWISH NEWCOMERS AND COMMUNITY CHANGE

<i>Attitude toward Jewish newcomers:</i>	<i>Attitude toward community change</i>		
	<i>"Wholly good"</i>	<i>"Mostly good or half and half"</i>	<i>"Mostly or wholly bad"</i>
Favorable	53%	25%	10%
Half and half	12	20	17
Unfavorable	35	55	73
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

beneficial influence on the town's intellectual level, the stimulation they provided or their commitment to better schools. Others, more vaguely, referred to Jewish neighbors as being "friendly" and "well-behaved." Occasionally, a compliment would come out left-handed: "If you didn't know they were Jewish you would never have guessed it."

Many gentiles distinguished between long-established Jewish residents and Jewish newcomers. In this comparison, the old-timers had the best of it. They were described as being "the better class of Jews": better educated, wealthier, committed to community progress. Frequently, respondents phrased the distinction in terms of social levels: The Jewish old-timers were said to be respectable, genteel and aristocratic, whereas the newcomers had "come up the ladder from a furnished room."

Gentiles were especially impressed by the Jewish old-timers' conformity: their acceptance of gentile standards of taste and culture, their adaptation to local customs, their eagerness to preserve Lakeville conditions. A DAR member voiced what she undoubtedly considered the highest praise: "There is no difference between the old Jewish settlers and the gentiles." The "old Jewish settler" actually appeared to have inherited some of the aura of the gentile elite when a large part of that elite moved away; he was preferred on the school board, and sought after as an ambassador to the Jewish newcomers.

Feelings toward the new Jewish settlers were quite different. Their coming inspired anxiety in many gentiles — as was clear from the fact that the size of the influx was much exaggerated. At the time of the study, about one-third of Lakeville's population was in fact Jewish, but gentile respondents believed, on the average, that Jews were already slightly in the majority, and that they would make up nearly two-thirds of the population in another ten years. About 10 per cent of the gentiles interviewed in the study had actually begun to show symptoms of minority psychology; for example, they felt that they or their children were, or would be, excluded from social or economic life. A well-educated young woman complained: "Most of the Jewish women . . . belong to ORT. I am envious that the Jews get out and meet people right away and I have nothing comparable." Some gentiles (like some Jews) spoke of their concern about inter-dating and intermarriage.

Other fears were revealed as well. "There's a problem with a Jewish majority," an insurance broker said. "Jewish people, by and large, look to their own kind in giving jobs, for instance. It's a true class situation. Jewish people are better than others in looking out for their own. . . ."

A well-educated career woman, active in liberal causes, declared: "Too many Jews are moving in. It's a social problem The flavor of any one group is not good for intellectual and social growth. It leads to inbreeding. It's not truly representative of the American way of life."

Apprehensions like these, whether realistic or not, were reinforced by fears that Jewish influence would change the town's character, especially its political, social and religious customs. Politically, Lakeville was not the Republican fortress it had once been, though it remained a Republican town. Two-fifths of the gentile and three-fifths of the Jewish newcomers were Democrats. But this was not what chiefly troubled gentiles about the political effect of the Jewish influx. They worried more about the possibility that Jews, being supposedly more aggressive, would have too great an impact on local politics.

As in almost any community where they set social standards, wealthy gentiles in Lakeville tended to perceive the affluent Jewish newcomer as a *nouveau riche*, a vulgar climber; but they did not feel particularly threatened by his status seeking. Rich gentiles objected to Jewish "lack of refinement" much more often than did the less well-to-do, but only the latter ever criticized Jewish status striving. The gentile rich seemed relaxed about such claims, and their reaction was often affably condescending rather than hostile. For example, the wife of a publisher, a cultivated woman, dismissed criticism of wealthy Jews as mere envy. "They are very nice little people just like the others," she said. But she quickly added: "I don't like some of the women. They wear too much makeup and talk too loud."

Perhaps the most sensitive issue between Lakeville gentiles and Jews was the question how the public schools should deal with Christmas and with Jewish holidays. This issue had generated considerable bitterness among gentiles, both old-timers and newcomers. A native resident who taught in a Sunday school regretted that children in the public schools were no longer exposed to devotional Christmas celebrations: "If they have a Christmas play having to do with the birth of Jesus, they can't show it or use it. Christmas is now just a tree celebration." Some gentiles, including a lay leader in an Evangelical church, found an ominous meaning in the closing of schools on Jewish holidays: "The Jews want to bombard us with their culture while rejecting ours."

Emotionally charged though the issue of religion in the schools was, neither the older nor the newer Lakeville gentiles formed a united front one way or the other. Among those who considered the matter a problem, about three-fifths of the old-timers wanted to keep Christmas celebrations in the schools as they were, while three-fifths of the newcomers wanted them modified. And some of the latter saw an educational value in celebrating both Christmas and Hanukkah.

Hardly less divisive than the question of religion in the schools was a conflict of attitudes toward child-rearing. Of those gentiles

who thought the Jewish influx had created, or would create, personal or family problems, 65 per cent specified that it affected not themselves but their children. The bill of particulars was the same as might be heard in suburbs all over America: Young people were being brought up too indulgently, it was said, with too little discipline and too much emphasis on material possessions, status and sophistication. But in Lakeville, this erosion of disciplined, austere traditions was not attributed simply to the affluent society; it was considered specifically Jewish. A merchant spoke of obstreperous youngsters in stores; a young Catholic said: "Jewish children . . . are not disciplined, and they're always Mama's angel." Jewish adolescents were thought to be spoiled, overindulged with material things, sexually precocious; they "sass their parents," it was said, "and parents pass this off as a gesture of individualism."

Reactions of Long-Term Jewish Residents

Aside from anxiety about what a merchandising executive called a "natural tendency toward anti-Semitism among gentiles," the attitudes of some long-time Jewish residents toward Jewish newcomers proved to be startlingly similar to those of the gentiles, especially those of the established group. Only 31 per cent of the old-time Jews believed Jewish newcomers had been beneficial to Lakeville, and 40 per cent thought they had been noticeably harmful. Some of the gentiles' complaints were echoed almost verbatim. Thus, a middle-aged Jewish woman active in community affairs complained: "When my children went to school they used to work summers and buy a jalopy. Today children have Cadillacs. It hurts them and makes them materialistic."

Like their gentile counterparts, those long-established Jews who took a 50-50 view of the influx, or who were pleased with its overall effect, often pointed to civic improvements — as well as to the newcomers' well-cared-for homes and their success in achieving harmonious relations, at least on the surface. In addition, they appreciated the improved leadership that had emerged within the

Jewish community itself. Of those who were less pleased, many based their judgment on the effects of population growth as such, on the change from rural to suburban living with all it implied, rather than on the Jewish character of the influx.

Jewish old-timers, like gentile ones, tended to exaggerate the proportion of Jews in the community (though they did not believe that Lakeville was already becoming overwhelmingly Jewish), and the higher their estimate of the Jewish influx, the cooler were their feelings about it. But whereas established gentiles were afraid of becoming a minority, established Jews feared becoming a majority. A young man in the insurance business, who had lived in Lakeville all his life, felt that the influx was "harmful only to the extent that [it] has labeled us, as it will, a Jewish town. . . ."

Such critics tended to use the same terms as their gentile neighbors for defining "undesirable" Jews. Not far back in their minds was an old, familiar anxiety, expressed by a lawyer who had worked for 30 years to improve Jewish-gentile relations: "These kinds of Jews may arouse anti-Semitism and it could blow wide open." Jewish "nonconformists" were frequently condemned; evidently, it was felt that only careful conformity could keep the lid on. Indeed, more than 60 per cent of those long-established Jews who criticized Jewish newcomers believed most gentiles were already taking an unfavorable attitude toward Jews in Lakeville, while only 19 per cent believed the opposite. Many assumed — erroneously — that gentiles did not distinguish between "these kinds of Jews" and "us," and this compounded their anxiety.

The Feelings of New Jewish Residents

The Jewish newcomers' reactions to their cold reception by Lakeville's gentile community were, by and large, somewhat defensive; their feelings toward the older Jewish settlers were bitter. They recognized the tensions in the community, but they held Jews as well as gentiles responsible for them.

The newcomers realized that their arrival *en masse* had caused a degree of hardship. They knew that many Lakeville residents

held an unflattering image of them, and they were often ready — perhaps too ready — to acknowledge that some “types” among them reinforced the stereotype. But they contended that, far from damaging the community, they had been the principal agents of its recent progress and enlightenment.

They saw themselves as young, responsible, energetic, creative citizens, and their pride in that role seemed largely justified. (For example, a full 59 per cent of all the women who had moved to Lakeville in the last five years belonged to the PTA.) They believed the recent dislocations in Lakeville had been exaggerated; also, they thought any such change was due simply to the size of the population influx, and were much less concerned about its Jewish complexion than were the long-term Jewish residents.

As with gentile and Jewish old-timers, the higher a given Jewish newcomer estimated the percentage of Jews in Lakeville, the more likely was he to criticize the overall effect of the Jewish population wave. But whereas old-time Jews felt uncomfortable with estimates over 30 per cent (which is a little lower than the actual Jewish population figure), Jewish newcomers tended to fix the critical limit at 60 per cent.

Many of the newcomers believed that the size of the Jewish influx affected attitudes in Lakeville less than did the behavior of individual “problem Jews.” Two out of every five new Jewish residents thought such individuals posed a serious difficulty. Most of these critics used some variation of the old-timers’ vocabulary to express their anxieties. “Jews as a whole are judged by one Jew in this Christian world,” declared a resident who was educated at a prestigious Eastern women’s college. Objectionable Jews create “resentment and ill will” even among unprejudiced gentiles, it was said, and “give the wrong kind of gentiles ammunition in the form of classic examples of anti-Semitic stereotypes.”

On the other hand, many Jewish newcomers were convinced that snobbishness and discrimination on the part of Lakeville’s settled Jews were even more serious obstacles to acceptance. No fewer than 48 per cent of the newcomers said they knew of cases

of discrimination by Jews, whereas only 28 per cent reported cases of discrimination on the part of gentiles.

The depth of the newcomers' resentment was unmistakable in their criticism of the settled Jews' lack of Jewish identity. The president of a local ORT chapter declared: "Old-timer Jews who don't like us are a problem. They are people with Jewish self-hatred. . . . I feel more comfortable with the Catholic neighbor." The well-educated daughter of a rabbi went even further: "A Jew who tries to escape Jewishness . . . degrades Jewishness and draws us down in the eyes of the Christian. He becomes like anti-Semitic Christians, a threat to us."

In actual fact, all indications suggested that the acceptance, esteem and good will currently enjoyed by the town's old Jewish settlers was due precisely to the Jewish newcomers who so aroused the old-timers' anxieties. Until recently, the long-term Jewish residents had by no means been made as welcome in Lakeville as gentiles believed; with the possible exception of a few families they were merely tolerated. As an old-time Jewish lawyer pointedly recalled, until after the Second World War none of the local Jews had "any kind of decent place in the social community or [was] permitted any." But when the postwar Jewish influx came, stereotypes and antipathies were shifted from the old group to the new; and simultaneously the Jewish elite gained in actual power and prestige as a large part of the gentile elite fled before the Jewish newcomers.

THE WILL TO INTEGRATE

•

IN DIRECT contradiction to the old cliché that Jews are “clannish,” the Jewish residents of Lakeville felt strongly that they ought to be an active, integrated part of the larger society, taking part in civic affairs and cultivating good relations with non-Jews. Yet the commitment to Jewish-gentile integration often came more from the head than from the heart; integration was sought for the insights rather than the satisfactions it might bring.

For example, all but 1 per cent of Jews interviewed said they would like to live in an area with substantial numbers of gentiles. But while some thought they might find a genuinely pluralistic exchange of ideas, values and experiences in a mixed neighborhood, others gave less hopeful reasons. A civil engineer held that children ought to get used to the gentile majority so that they would be able “to face the world as it is”; a mother who in her day had been so badly “pushed around” at a gentile boarding school that she suspected herself of prejudice against gentiles, said: “If my children are going to be called a ‘dirty Jew,’ I would like it to be when they are young and it can be explained.”

Just what proportion of Jews to gentiles a particular person found desirable depended in part on how much he thought his Jewish identity might be endangered. (Those who approved of Christmas trees in Jewish homes tended to favor a neighborhood with a majority of gentiles.) Significantly, no fewer than one-half of the Jewish respondents considered 50-50 the ideal ratio — a ratio that would confer the benefits of integration without the liabilities of minority status. Significantly, too, the neighborhoods in which Jews lived fell far short of their ideals of integration.

Attitudes of Jews: Integration-mindedness vs. Discomfort

Jewish individuals were rated for "integration-mindedness" by means of a scale made up of such items as neighborhood preference, membership in nonsectarian groups, concern with civic involvement, and desire to win the respect of gentiles. Most of the persons interviewed scored near the middle of the scale; the average was just under 5 (see Table). While no one attained a score of 10, every Jew interviewed was integration-minded at least to some small extent.

How did these attitudes stand up in actual personal relations with gentiles? Feelings turned out to be quite mixed. Something like one-half of the Jewish respondents said they felt at ease in gentile company; but just as many acknowledged that they found it uncomfortable — and this group included many who, in principle, were all for close contact with gentiles.

Of the "comfortables," a good many said they simply ignored group differences. Most of them stated that they had had gentiles as friends since their youth, and most recalled that their parents also used to have gentile friends. Of those whose friendships had been mostly with gentiles, 48 per cent scored as highly integration-minded, whereas only 31 per cent of others did.

A small (14 per cent) but significant segment of the "comfortables" attributed their ease in mingling with gentiles to their own social poise and adaptability. These were people who did not feel nervous in social situations generally, whose moods were

INTEGRATION-MINDEDNESS OF JEWS

<i>Integration-mindedness score</i>	<i>Percentage of Jewish respondents</i>	<i>Integration-mindedness score</i>	<i>Percentage of Jewish respondents</i>
10 (highest)	0%	4	19%
9	1	3	14
8	5	2	7
7	12	1	3
6	19	0 (lowest)	0
5	20		100%

not easily upset by what others said or did, who did not suffer from inferiority feelings.

As for the "uncomfortables," they did associate with gentiles in situations where everyone's behavior was more or less marked out in advance (for example, on business, at meetings of non-sectarian organizations or at formal social affairs), but they hesitated to go on from encounters like these to more personal, friendly relations, such as home entertaining, or going out together. Many said they were too aware of sharp differences in background or life style to relax. Others feared possible hidden hostility. Gentiles, a Russian-born lawyer said, "feel an antipathy toward some Jews," and "you're not sure if that includes you or not." In these ways and in others, the anxious heart would contradict the — often highly integration-minded — head.

Attitudes of Gentiles: Neighborhood Preferences

Lakeville gentiles felt no principled compulsion to integrate with their opposite numbers such as Lakeville Jews did. A gentile does not need to be accepted by Jews in order to feel that he has established himself in the community. For the gentiles, the question was simply one of accepting Jews in substantial numbers, and establishing contacts with them.

The attitudes of gentiles were measured by their preferences in neighborhood composition, and these preferences turned out to be quite different from those of Jews. For example, a full 20 per cent said they would prefer to live in an area with no Jews at all; only 13 per cent said they would prefer an evenly balanced one (see Table on following page).

When the reasons behind the various replies given by gentiles were explored, those persons who would have liked to live in neighborhoods with no Jews at all were found to be mainly concerned with maintaining their traditional customs and way of life. They lived in areas that had become, on the average, 40 per cent Jewish, and often worried about being engulfed; they believed Lakeville as a whole was 60 per cent Jewish. Some were

PERCENTAGE OF JEWS PREFERRED AS NEIGHBORS
BY GENTILES

<i>Percentage of Jewish neighbors</i>	<i>Preferred by</i>
None	20%
1-49%	23
50%	13
51% or more	1
Don't care	43
	100%

quite exercised about the supposed disadvantages of mixed neighborhoods; they claimed that Jews were "arrogant" or "aggressive," that "when Jews come in, then colored people follow," or that Jews "just take over, period." But most sounded more moderate and matter-of-fact—like a 64-year-old automobile mechanic, a native of Lakeville, who declared: "Let Jew and gentile live by themselves and there won't be any conflict, because basically they are different social units. . . . They get along all right separately."

Gentiles willing to live in neighborhoods with a minority of Jews amounted to 23 per cent of the total. They, too, were concerned about maintaining the dominance of their way of life, but they felt they could control the environment as long as the proportion of Jews stayed below 10, or 20, or 40 per cent. The members of this group did not, as a rule, welcome Jews for the distinctive style or other influences which they might bring to the neighborhood; on the contrary, they were willing to accept a Jewish neighbor only insofar as he resembled them in behavior and way of life. For example, a department store buyer who generally considered Jews socially inferior said: "If the Jewish families were as equally acceptable as the gentiles, that is, if they were not loud, boisterous, and antagonistic, then I'd say they'd be perfectly okay in the neighborhood." A widow* in her sixties explained in cultural terms why she favored a limit on Jews: "The United States was originally a Protestant country of English descent. . . . Why change it to some Oriental culture?"

The 43 per cent who said they did not care how many Jews lived in their neighborhoods were mostly indifferent to, or unaware of, distinctive qualities in the Jewish group. They usually claimed to judge Jews as individuals, "at face value," or they asked, "Why is a Jew so different from a gentile?" The small handful who acknowledged that Jews might be different as a group did so only by way of stressing their own freedom from prejudice. Few saw a positive advantage in a mixed neighborhood.

Of the 13 per cent who preferred a 50-50 ratio, one-half lived in areas where Jews were in a majority, and some of these no doubt were prompted simply by a desire for a more even balance. Still, the members of this group were generally aware of the attributes of Jews as a group; and while they did not necessarily like all of these qualities, they felt such group differences did not justify segregated neighborhoods. Two of every five were genuine pluralists who cherished, rather than feared, variety. "A mixed place is better than what they call 'your own kind,'" declared a corporation executive. The wife of a professor of art went further: "The only thing that displeases me is that Lakeville is a closed white community. I would prefer more variety . . . such as Negroes and Mexicans. . . . If the community is entirely white Protestant, it has a stifling and holier-than-thou atmosphere."

Only three of all the gentile respondents declared themselves willing to live in predominantly Jewish neighborhoods. All three actually were living in such areas. They did not necessarily prefer it that way; yet at least two of them were impressed with some of their Jewish neighbors' ways: their commitment to fine schools, their expenditure of time and money on cultural and recreational activities ("the rest of us should, but don't always"), their intellectual caliber, their perseverance, their helpfulness to neighbors in trouble.

COEXISTENCE AT WORK AND IN ORGANIZATIONS

THE SIZE and structure of the Lakeville community is such that Jews and gentiles rub shoulders almost constantly: in stores and streets, at beaches and concerts, in organization meetings and in the day's work. Many of these encounters, of course, are too fleeting and superficial to have any effect on the feelings of the two groups toward each other; but others — among professional colleagues, for example, or fellow golfers, or members of the same organization, or neighbors — are steady and personal enough to seem a likely basis for friendly relationships. To what extent do such relationships actually materialize?

In Business or Professional Practice

In America today, many kinds of work involve quasi-social activities like luncheons, public dinners or theatergoing. In Lakeville, opportunities for contacts with gentiles on this level were abundantly available to Jewish businessmen and employed professionals, particularly to those who commuted to Lake City, the nearby metropolis, with its far heavier gentile majority. Their experience suggests that shared purposes which do not involve private religious or social attitudes are a likely take-off point toward deeper and more durable friendships.

Of course, social contact in the business world usually is understood to be, as one manufacturer put it, mere "gesture designed to result in personal gain." Still, such encounters may help put Jews and gentiles at ease with each other. Where profits are concerned, difference of religion is irrelevant, but tact is imperative — which means that in a social-plus-business encounter there

is little chance of injured group pride or sensibility. The atmosphere is relaxed enough so that Jew and gentile can wander into areas of shared outside interests or tastes. "We have lunch together," a manufacturer states, "but we don't only discuss business. We talk about athletics, general events; these days it's the space race. In other words, we have a light and airy conversation."

A Lakeville Jew who had made a friend of a gentile business acquaintance said: "The things I do with this gentile are not for business purposes . . . but we'll discuss business as part of what we do together." Many a business lunch in Lake City has led to a more social meeting in Lakeville, with wives included. Indeed, almost three out of ten Jewish women said they had met their closest gentile friends through their husbands' businesses.

Among self-employed professionals like physicians and lawyers, too, interfaith contacts occurred almost as a matter of course. Whether self-employed or salaried, Lakeville's professional people named common interest and similar education as bases for cordial, relaxed and rewarding day-to-day relationships. A gentile surgeon explained why his friendliest contacts with Jews were established in his professional association: "We are all practicing medicine, which gives us a singleness of purpose."

When asked "Where did you meet the person of the other faith with whom you are most friendly?" 57 per cent of Lakeville's Jewish men and 39 per cent of the gentile men said it was at work. And at least eight out of every ten Jewish respondents, whether self-employed or salaried, whether professionals or businessmen, maintained social relations with one or more gentiles they had met through work.

A wealthy, tough-minded industrialist told what drew him to a man whom originally he may have seen as just another tough-minded businessman across the table at a business lunch: "This gentile is very sincere . . . honest and objective about himself and others. He doesn't pretend to be what he isn't. He has convictions about seeing that people get their just rights and he's tolerant of people who disagree with him and he is a warmhearted guy."

Leisure-Time Pursuits

In their leisure activities, the well-to-do and the less affluent of Lakeville's gentiles followed different patterns. The high-income groups went in for competitive sports (especially golf), music and the theater; the people of lower income liked to go hunting or fishing, or to putter around the house and garden.

Lakeville Jews were not so class-bound in their use of leisure. Even the less than affluent men often engaged in competitive sports, music and theater, and the wealthy ones followed these pursuits in even larger numbers than top-income gentiles did. As for Jewish women, they were culture and sports fans no matter what their income bracket.

There were further differences in leisure patterns. Gentiles usually cultivated a few activities intensely. Jews spread themselves thinner; for example, they played more different card games, or took up sports in which they were only mildly interested. They liked to keep up games typically played by Jews in cities, such as handball and ping-pong, gin rummy and canasta; but they also wanted to adopt the games most popular in suburbia or in the American culture generally—such as golf, bowling and bridge.

Although Jews had gone to some length in adopting gentile leisure activities, this had not yet meant social integration. In particular, the country clubs — the leading leisure institutions — remained sharply segregated. Jews who played golf did so with other Jews. True, some 14 Jews had been admitted to social organizations that were otherwise more or less restricted to gentiles; but only two of them said they had found their friendliest contacts with gentiles there.

Voluntary Organizations

Far more contacts between Jews and gentiles occurred in Lakeville's nonsectarian volunteer organizations. There were many of these: youth-serving groups (such as Parent-Teacher Associations), political and community organizations, health and welfare associations, business and professional societies, cultural, frater-

nal, patriotic and purely social groups. All told, nine-tenths of the Jews and three-fourths of the gentiles were found to belong to nonsectarian volunteer organizations. But membership patterns differed: Jews at all income levels belonged to at least one such group, while lower-income gentiles usually did not belong to any.

Moreover, as in their choice of games and sports, gentiles tended to be specialists: they belonged to few organizations at any given time, whereas Jews joined many simultaneously. For example, gentile women would sign up with youth-serving associations while young, and switch to health and welfare organizations when their children were grown up, but Jewish women would join both youth-serving and welfare groups early in life. At every income level, more Jews than gentiles belonged to four or more groups.

How much did volunteer organizations help promote contact and friendship between gentiles and Jews? Of the Jewish women who belonged, more than half said they found the best opportunities for friendly contact with gentiles in groups like these, with their meetings, committee assignments and fund drives. But when it was asked just which types of organizations were most conducive to Jewish-gentile friendship, some surprising results emerged.

It might have been thought that "expressive" groups — the more or less private associations in which people simply expressed their interest in things like cardplaying, gardening or other hobbies — would afford the best chances for fostering cordiality. This proved quite true as far as friendship between gentile and gentile, or between Jew and Jew, was concerned. But for establishing cordial relations between Jew and gentile, "instrumental" organizations — those devoted to communal or public purposes, like the hospital auxiliaries or the League of Women Voters — turned out to be a much more effective setting.

Some respondents thought the reason was simply that the instrumental groups they knew had more members of the opposite faith than the expressive ones. But even when groups of similar membership composition were compared, the instrumental ones proved superior as a basis for gentile-Jewish friendship.

A stronger reason why this should be so was mentioned by about half the respondents: As members of instrumental organizations, working on essential common concerns, people left their private social standards and preexisting friendships at home. In the League of Women Voters, one woman explained, "the major emphasis is on study and government, and this tends to minimize social and religious differences." At the various organizations' meetings, discussions, and excursions to conventions the members could feel, another Jewish woman said, as if they were back at a college bull session. In this climate, new attachments could be readily formed, and often were.

As members of expressive groups, on the other hand, people brought along their status preoccupations or their friendships with people of their own background, and this made group distinctions harder to overcome. Some clubs were blatantly discriminatory. (In the words of one woman: "Up here we don't allow them [Jews] into our organizations. I should say not; they're not generally socially acceptable.") Other expressive groups, without such open bias, subordinated their specific aims to mere sociability and to that extent let status concerns come into play.

The only expressive groupings that generally escaped this danger were the large, formally organized ones that were open to all interested comers. Here the spirit was more like that of the instrumental groups: People focused on their common purpose, not on one another's status, and for precisely that reason found it easy to become cordial. What made the Lakeville Orchestra so friendly, said one amateur musician, was that "making music together is conducive to socializing. It becomes a recreational group." Presumably for the same reason, something like half of the Jewish respondents belonging to the Art League, the Great Books discussion group and the public golf club or its auxiliaries named these groups as the scene of their friendliest contact with non-Jews.

As for the gentiles, 25 per cent of the respondents agreed that the friendliness fostered by nonsectarian organizations stemmed

from "good working relations" or "feelings of acceptance." But both gentiles and Jews seemed to assume that their respective groups played different roles in such relationships. While Jews often felt they had served a kind of probation, or implied they were accepted in spite of being Jewish, or referred to the gentiles' freedom from religious bias, the gentiles seemed to take it as a matter of course that they were doing the accepting, and dwelled on the good qualities that made Jews acceptable to them. "There is such friendliness in the Little League Scouts," went a typical gentile response, "because of the willingness of the Jew to make the organization a success."

NEIGHBORHOODS AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

IN LAKEVILLE, 97 per cent of the Jews and 82 per cent of the gentiles lived in more or less mixed neighborhoods. Even in areas where the population mixture was sharply out of balance, seven out of every ten had established a conversational relationship with at least one member of the other faith.

During the day, in the usual suburban style, there was a lot of "neighboring" among women, especially among the younger ones. Two-thirds of the Jewish women under 30 spent three or more hours a week visiting with gentile neighbors, shopping with them, drinking coffee or minding children. In the evenings, when people went out as couples, Jews — even those living in heavily gentile neighborhoods — were less likely to spend time with gentiles.

The Chances of Social Contact

Jews throughout Lakeville usually kept company with other Jews, no matter how few of them there were in the particular neighborhood; and gentiles followed a similar pattern. In contrast, the chances for mixed social encounters turned out to depend on how many of the "others" were within easy reach. Both Jews and gentiles were most likely to visit, or go out with, members of the other group when the "others" were a majority in the neighborhood. However, within this pattern, predominantly gentile areas proved to be more productive of mixed socializing than predominantly Jewish ones. For example, in neighborhoods that were 90 per cent Jewish on the average, only 20 of every 100 persons (Jews and gentiles combined) visited or went out with people of the other faith; in 90 per cent gentile areas, 45 of every 100 did.

Why should gentile neighborhoods be so much more effective meeting grounds than Jewish ones? One factor was the membership composition of local organizations, particularly PTAs and neighborhood improvement associations — groups which play an important role in bringing people together and inspiring a sense of shared neighborly concern.

In Lakeville, the PTA was the leading local association. And no matter what the complexion of the neighborhood, proportionately far more of the Jewish than of the gentile residents belonged to it: roughly 50 per cent, as against 15 per cent. As a result, the PTAs in predominantly gentile areas were more or less balanced, and evidently helped foster social contact between Jews and gentiles: Twice as many gentile PTA members as nonmembers in these areas met socially with Jews. But in mainly Jewish neighborhoods, the Jews' greater interest in the PTA made it an almost solidly Jewish organization, which plainly could do little to foster Jewish-gentile relations; Jewish PTA members in such areas had hardly any more social contact with gentiles than did nonmembers.

In the neighborhood improvement associations of mainly Jewish areas, gentiles were much better represented, and the groups seemed to help the Jews and the gentiles become friendly with one another. But since altogether far fewer persons belonged to such organizations than to PTAs, this did not begin to redress the balance.

In a similar way, the local pattern of age differences made predominantly gentile neighborhoods a more effective setting for mixed socializing than predominantly Jewish ones. Throughout Lakeville, Jews on the average were considerably younger than gentiles. As a result, the younger set in mainly Jewish areas was overwhelmingly Jewish, and young gentiles to socialize with were scarce there. In mainly gentile areas, Jews and gentiles were more evenly balanced among the younger crowd.

Finally, over and above statistical facts, the psychological orientation of individuals toward the opposite group played a role. Among Jews, these orientations were gauged by the integration-mindedness scale, plus a question about feelings of comfort or

discomfort in gentile company; among gentiles, the yardsticks used were the neighborhood preference scale, plus a number of questions embodying favorable and unfavorable images of Jews.

It was found that just about equal proportions of Jews and of gentiles were psychologically oriented toward social encounters with members of the other group, and that both Jews and gentiles were more likely to be so disposed when they were a minority than when they were a majority in their neighborhoods. But there were large differences in the extent to which the favorable inclination was actually carried out. For example, in predominantly gentile areas, three-fourths of those gentiles who were psychologically ready to mingle with Jews had actually done so; but in predominantly Jewish areas, only one-third of Jews who were disposed to meet gentiles socially had actually met any.

Underlying Attitudes

The key to these patterns lies in the different social roles which gentiles and Jews assume they are supposed to play. Both groups tend to take it as a matter of course that in mixed socializing the Jews seek acceptance and the gentiles do the accepting. Therefore, gentiles will face such encounters without uneasiness, secure in what they consider their dominant role on the social scene; Jews will often approach the encounter with a degree of insecurity, no matter how strongly they feel they have a right to be accepted, or how much they may be psychologically predisposed for contact or friendship with gentiles.

In Lakeville's predominantly gentile areas, both sides found themselves playing these accustomed roles, and a good deal of social contact resulted. The Jews, as a minority, thought they had to gain acceptance from their gentile neighbors if they were to be, in any sense, integrated into the community. Therefore, even Jews who were only moderately integration-minded overcame their qualms and sought the company of gentiles. The gentile majority, for its part, secure in its control of the social scene, gave free rein to whatever readiness for sociability it felt.

In the predominantly Jewish areas, things worked out differently. Here Jews, being in actual control, did not feel they had to seek social integration with gentiles in order to be full members of the community; and even many of the more integration-minded, presumably feeling some of the old uneasiness, did not try. Only a small number cultivated close relationships with gentiles; the rest felt integrated enough if they merely joined nonsectarian community organizations. Meanwhile, the members of the gentile minority (which had, after all, become a minority only recently) assumed that they still set the social tone, and saw no reason for adopting the role of acceptance seeker. As a result, much less social contact materialized in these areas than in the predominantly gentile ones.

THE LIMITS OF FRIENDLINESS

As SHOWN in an earlier chapter, the most fertile grounds for the cultivation of close contacts between gentile and Jewish men in Lakeville were business and professional relationships. For women, the chief meeting grounds were nonsectarian organizations devoted to concrete personal and community needs, and daily informal encounters in the neighborhoods, especially where gentiles were in the majority.

What, then, was the nature of close personal relationships begun in these settings, or in others?

Patterns of Friendship

Just as religious observance and organizational life have changed since the days of the *shtetl* and the first generation's urban ghetto, so have Jewish friendship habits undergone changes. First, friendships have gained in importance as family ties have weakened. (According to the study findings, 58 per cent of the respondents' parents spent more time socializing with relatives than they did with friends, whereas 88 per cent of the respondents themselves spent more time socializing with friends than with relatives.) And second, present-day Jews experience many more friendships with gentiles than their parents ever knew.

Even before they settled in their present location, Lakeville Jews had had a great deal of opportunity for becoming friendly with gentiles in such mixed settings as college and the armed forces. However, these friendships usually lasted only as long as the mixed settings did. Thus, for all their acculturation, 89 per cent of Lakeville Jews had other Jews for all or most of their

really close friends at the time of the study — just about the same percentage as had prevailed among their parents.

Some of the personal relationships that did develop between Jews and gentiles in Lakeville were spontaneous, close and firm. But by and large, such ties were less readily formed than were those between Jew and Jew, or gentile and gentile; and they rarely matched them in warmth or trust.

For one thing, the mixed contacts required more intimacy to get started. Jews often met socially with one another even though they had nothing to say to each other beyond exchanging small talk, and so did gentiles. (This low threshold was one reason why Jews usually managed to establish social contact with other Jews, and gentiles with other gentiles, even where there were few of them around.) In contrast, gentiles and Jews rarely got together socially until they knew each other well enough to feel that they could discuss politics and other controversial matters.

Again, once a relationship was formed, real closeness was less often attained between members of different groups than between members of the same group. Only one-fifth of the respondents said they had discussed financial or other personal problems with friends of the other faith, and only a tiny fraction said they had discussed marital difficulties with them; but one-third or more had talked about personal problems, and one-eighth or more about marital difficulties, with someone of their own faith.

And finally, in cases where intimacy was in fact reached, it came much more slowly. Of the Jews who said they felt as close or closer to a gentile than a Jewish friend, 47 per cent had known the gentile for at least nine years longer than the Jew; of the gentiles who felt similarly about a Jewish friend, 57 per cent gave the corresponding answer.

The Jewish respondents suggested many reasons for the relative rarity of mixed friendships and for their more reserved tone. Some explained their choice of friends as a matter of proximity; they said Jews simply were more available, thanks to synagogues and organizations. Others thought the traditional

injunction against intermarriage caused Jews to segregate themselves. But in many cases, the friendship pattern appeared to stem from individual preference. Jews felt more comfortable with fellow Jews, and therefore placed themselves in situations where Jews rather than gentiles would be available and accessible.

Why this should be so was the subject of a variety of vaguely troubled explanations. Some respondents frankly admitted that the presence of a gentile created a strain for them; one must watch one's tongue and guard against Yiddish expressions or inside Jewish humor. Their feeling of discomfort in gentile company seemed to spring from qualms about what gentiles might think of the particular Jew at the party as a representative of all Jews. Such "ambassadorial uneasiness," as it might be called, and the inhibition and self-consciousness that went along with it, were felt even by Jews who did have gentiles as intimate friends.

Inhibitions like these presumably stemmed from memories of discrimination within the recent past and seemed destined to diminish with the fading of such memories. Certainly the integration-minded younger generation could be expected to feel it less if at all. Children growing up in Lakeville rarely saw prejudice in action and were much less self-conscious about being Jewish than their parents. Therefore, the friendship patterns of the next generation appeared likely to be less closed and less inhibited by fears of possible rebuff.

For the time being, however, many respondents, both Jews and gentiles, evidently felt that mixed friendships differed in some fundamental way from those with members of their own group. The difference was pointedly defined by a gentile respondent — a man who clearly was well disposed toward his Jewish neighbors and on terms of friendship with some of them: "I feel closer to my gentile friend for about thirty-five million reasons. Most are probably self-evident but in general I would say that this gentile is a friend of choice; the Jew, a friend of proximity. True, I see this Jew every day; we go to lunch and such things, but basically it's a friendship of convenience rather than one of choice."

Coexistence—On What Terms?

In the final analysis, most of the mixed friendships had an aura of unreality and uncertainty about them. In this respect, they typified the whole spectrum of gentile-Jewish relationships in the community. What Lakeville gentiles and Jews revealed again and again, at every level of intimacy, was that despite almost daily meetings they did not come anywhere near gauging each other's feelings accurately, and were relying instead on their underlying anxieties or complacencies.

Lakeville has not shut out the Jews. But it accepts them as individuals only if, and to the extent that, they conform to gentile standards. Among gentiles and among many Jews, a vague assumption prevails that with time Jews will become like everyone else, and will then be fully acceptable. The distinctive nature of Jewishness is of no concern to most gentiles — and of little concern to some of the long-established Jewish residents, except as a barrier to complete assimilation.

This is egalitarianism; it is not pluralism, or respect for the diversity that actually exists. True, Lakeville-style Jewishness is feeble in some ways; but it is far from moribund, and many if not most of the community's Jews want to see it strengthened rather than washed out further. There are Jews in Lakeville today, and there may be more tomorrow, who will not try to be as gentile as the gentiles, or more so — who prize their Jewish identity and want to develop a viable Jewish way of living while maintaining neighborly and friendly relations with others. And until their distinctiveness is respected, until their specific character and heritage are recognized, there will always be an undercurrent of malaise between Jews and gentiles in the community.

But, as Ralph Waldo Emerson said long ago, "the years teach much which the days never know."

Summary

IN MANY important characteristics — education, occupation, income and percentage of native-born — the Jews of Lakeville, a suburb of a large Midwestern city, present a probable forecast of American Jewry as a whole in the not-too-distant future. How these second-and-third-generation American Jews view their Jewishness, which aspects of their faith they seem to be most attached to, and how they relate to their non-Jewish neighbors may well offer a reliable index to future developments in Jewish identity on the American scene.

The Jewish community of Lakeville consisted of a small, strongly acculturated, wealthy group of families with a German background, who had been residents of the town for as much as half a century, and a large number of middle to upper-middle class families of East European descent, who had arrived after the Second World War as part of a sudden, massive population influx which brought extensive community modernization in its wake.

The community was free from overt discrimination against Jews, and relatively free from gross bigotry, although incidents with an anti-Semitic aspect were not unknown. Large majorities of both gentiles and Jews thought relations between their groups were good, at least on the surface. This tranquillity was sometimes attributed to cultural similarities of gentiles and Jews, sometimes to the social distance between them. •

Generally speaking, the Jewish community — in which the newcomers had assumed a clear majority by the time of the survey — was more assertively Jewish than in earlier days. Membership in synagogues was widespread, and the community's five

congregations (four Reform, one Conservative) provided a wide variety of viewpoints on Jewish religion and peoplehood, forms of worship, and educational and social activities. To some extent, particular congregations were associated with particular socio-economic or intellectual levels. Most were centers of sociability as well as of worship and study.

Nearly all parents sent their children to Sunday or Hebrew school, whether or not they themselves had received such schooling in their own childhood. The Bar Mitzvah ceremony was holding its own compared with former generations; Confirmation of both boys and girls was much more widely practiced than formerly; and Hanukkah, traditionally a minor festival in the Jewish year, had been elevated to an important and widely celebrated occasion.

The community's numerous Jewish organizations also contributed significantly to the individual's sense of Jewish identity. Involvement in such groups often functioned as a secular alternative to religion.

At the same time, traditional emphasis on ritual acts had become greatly weakened; synagogue attendance was irregular and desultory (though it still exceeded home observance); and religiousness was defined by many solely in terms of morality, or belief in God. However, the decline both in synagogue attendance and in observance of traditional rituals appeared to have been slowed since a generation earlier.

An individual's patterns of synagogue attendance and home observance were affected by the religious upbringing he had received, and by the needs of his children at various times of life. The need for religious training of children was the chief reason why families joined a congregation. Yet, once they were enrolled, the parents usually remained members even after the children were grown up.

Home rituals were most likely to be retained if they were capable of redefinition in modern terms, did not demand social isolation, provided a "Jewish alternative" to the customs of the larger community, appealed to children and were not too frequent.

Most individuals, both adults and children, felt their homes were Jewish enough, but actual Jewishness was often minimal. It was felt by many that families were more harmonious than in former generations, and that lessened insistence on tradition was the reason. The training of children in the fundamentals of their Jewish heritage had largely lost its traditional basis in the family, and religious education of the young had become primarily a synagogue function.

Some degree of sympathy or identification with Israel was felt by all except a small minority. Commitment to Israel was most developed among the more religious. A majority considered Israel's existence beneficial to Jews in the United States, largely because it had created a new, heroic image of the Jews; only a minority feared possible accusations of "double loyalty" against American Jews. The Six-Day War of 1967 set off intense anxiety and a highly successful fund-raising campaign, but did not appear to have altered attitudes toward Israel permanently.

Perhaps most revealing were the qualities which the Lakeville Jewish community considered essential in a good Jew. Specifically Jewish religious and cultural values, while thought to be desirable, were not deemed essential. Overwhelmingly, the emphasis was on humaneness, morality and citizenship — qualities which, though selected from Jewish precepts, added up to a model that was more American than Jewish.

Many parents thought their children might marry gentiles, and most were resigned or only moderately unhappy about this prospect. Love was widely felt to outweigh religion as a criterion for marriage, although religion in turn outweighed considerations of wealth and prestige. Opposition to intermarriage was usually attributed to concern over possible personal difficulties rather than over Jewish survival.

A number of significant contradictions marked the relationships between the Jews of Lakeville and their non-Jewish neighbors. Most Jews had no realistic notion of how gentiles felt about them and vice versa. How Jews estimated gentiles' attitudes often ap-

peared to be determined by their own anxieties. The most realistic assessments came from those who thought gentile-Jewish relations were fairly but not very strained.

Many gentile old-timers were still critical of the population wave that had brought most of the Jewish residents to the community, while others, mostly younger residents, were willing to credit recent community improvements to the Jewish newcomers. The long-established Jewish residents were often preferred to the more recent ones, because of their conformity to gentile standards, customs and traditions. The newcomers were frequently criticized for supposed clannishness, status striving or overly permissive and materialistic ways of child-rearing.

The long-time Jewish residents, for their part, often echoed the criticisms of the Jewish newcomers voiced by gentile old-timers, expressing the fear that "undesirable" or nonconformist Jews might arouse anti-Semitism. The recent Jewish settlers were less concerned about potential anti-Semitism attendant on the Jewish population influx than about individual "problem Jews." They saw themselves as useful, responsible citizens, and resented what they felt was snobbery or self-hatred among Jewish old-timers.

Without exception, Jews felt they should be integrated into the larger society in at least some degree. They considered mixed gentile-Jewish neighborhoods preferable to solidly Jewish ones, if only to provide children with the experience of living in a mixed society; and they thought they ought to cultivate personal relationships with gentiles.

Principles like these were often at odds with emotions. Thus, half of those queried — including many who strongly favored integration in principle — admitted to being uncomfortable in the closer kinds of encounters with gentiles. A feeling of uneasiness, or of having to watch one's step, was reported by many. This feeling, however, seemed destined to wane in the next generation.

Gentiles were far less willing than Jews to live in mixed neighborhoods, particularly in evenly mixed ones. Those who preferred neighborhoods with no Jews, or with limited numbers of Jews,

frequently gave concern with maintaining traditional gentile values and customs as their reason. Jews were usually considered more acceptable if they conformed to gentile norms; their distinctive qualities were far more often ignored or criticized than welcomed.

Both Jews and gentiles were most likely to have mixed social contacts if they lived in areas where the opposite faith predominated, and this was even more true for Jews living in largely gentile areas than for gentiles in Jewish areas. One reason was the greater interest of Jews in community organizations. The fact that Jews were generally overrepresented in groups like the PTA tended to make such groups more or less evenly mixed in mainly gentile areas, but almost solidly Jewish in mainly Jewish ones.

Gentiles were more likely than Jews actually to carry out any impulse for closer social relations with their opposite numbers. Both groups tended to assume that in such situations the role of the Jew was to seek acceptance, and that of the gentile to do the accepting. Hence Jews, more wary of possible rejection, were less likely to press for personal contacts, and often considered themselves sufficiently integrated into the larger community if they merely joined nondenominational organizations.

Semi-social encounters on the job, though superficial in themselves, often led to more personal relationships between gentile and Jewish men. Voluntary organizations were the chief bases for friendly relations between gentile and Jewish women. Usually, groups organized for communal or charitable purposes were most effective in fostering such relationships; groups devoted to hobbies or cultural interests were less effective in this respect.

Jews tended to belong to more nonsectarian groups than did gentiles. Leisure-time pursuits of Jews and gentiles also differed: The former, regardless of economic class, were more often culture-oriented and given to a diversity of sports and games, while the latter tended to cultural interests only among the rich, and concentrated on fewer interests with greater intensity. Country clubs — the leading leisure-time institutions — remained essentially segregated.

Jewish-gentile friendships usually required more intimacy to get started than did those within either religious group. They also took longer to mature and reached real closeness less often. Thus, even though at various times in their lives Lakeville Jews had experienced far more mixed friendships than earlier generations, their really close ties were still overwhelmingly with other Jews.

Both in their feelings about themselves and in their relationships with their gentile neighbors, the Jews of Lakeville illustrate a unique paradox of American society: The very freedom which permits groups to maintain their distinctive cultural traits also permits group identity to be washed out. Lakeville-style Jewishness differs in many ways from that of earlier generations; it is much poorer in tradition and ritual. Still, there is good evidence that the Jews of Lakeville want to, and mean to, remain Jews in some significant sense. Just what being Jewish will mean to the generation of Jewish Americans now coming to maturity — and whether their desire for a distinctive group identity will be understood and accepted by their neighbors without the present demand for conformity — only the future can tell.

INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS PRESS

The American Jewish Committee

165 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022