The New Ethnicity, Religious Survival, and Jewish Identity: The "Judaisms" of Our Newest Members

David Ellenson

STUDENTS OF JUDAISM have often observed that neither the Jewish religion nor the Jewish people can be studied without analyzing the general social, cultural and political context, for in every age and place Jewish culture and religion both adapt to, and reflect, the larger world of which they are a part. This observation provides the axiom upon which the present essay rests. The position argued here is that the contemporary religious beliefs, practices and identity of the post-World War II generation of American Jews mirror, in many important ways, developments in general American cultural and religious life during the last few decades.

While these developments have been numerous and varied, the transformations in Americans' attitudes toward both ethnicity and religion are of greatest import to the American Jewish community today. These attitudinal changes affect most deeply the way American Jews, as members of an ethnic religious group, have perceived their own "Jewishness." Consequently, I propose to rehearse these general developments within American life and reflect upon how they have reacted upon the Jewish commitment and identity of American Jewish young adults.

I

The view of Judaism propounded in the Book of Ruth, "Your

DAVID ELLENSON is rabbi of Congregation Ahavas Achim, Keene, New Hampshire. The present essay was delivered as an address at a Seminar on Universalism and Particularism held in New York City under the sponsorship of the CCAR on March 14, 1978.

God shall be my God and your people my people," articulates the normative Jewish view that the Jewish people and its religion are one. Indeed, it is fair to say that Judaism is an ethnic religion. According to Jewish religious law, one born of a Jewish mother is automatically accorded the status of Jew. No faith commitment or affirmation need be made in order for the individual to achieve this status. While, with the coming of civic emancipation, there were members of the Jewish community who attempted to distinguish between Jewish religion and Jewish ethnicity, the Holocaust laid these attempts to rest, and sociologists have noted that both Jew and non-Jew regard "being Jewish" as essentially ethnic-religious in nature.[1]

The indivisible nature of Jewish peoplehood and religion marks Judaism as unique. Though other nationalities and particular religions are often linked together—Italian or Irish and Catholic—no other religion depends, as does Judaism, upon a particular ethnic group for its very survival. Put simply, the disappearance of the Italian people would not mean the end of Catholicism. On the other hand, the disappearance of the Jewish people would be a deathblow for Judaism. In speaking of the Jewish religion and its indivisible link with the Jewish people, we are dealing with a situation which is *sui generis*.

Yet, in spite of the uniqueness of the Jewish situation, the forces which have imperiled as well as sustained Judaism in the United States, and to which Judaism has had to adapt, have acted on other ethnic groups also. For the way ethnicity has been treated by the larger host society housing these particular peoples has affected greatly the perception, both of themselves individually and of their groups, that members of these groups have had. General societal attitudes toward ethnicity have had far-reaching consequences for the maintenance of the ethnic group itself. In order, then, to characterize the self-identity of young adult American Jews, it is necessary both to describe the attitude of the United States toward ethnicity and ethnic groups and to trace briefly the effect these attitudes have had upon ethnic self-perception in general, and Jewish self-perception in particular, during the last two centuries.

First, it is essential to note that Western modernity was established upon the basis of individual, not group, rights. The dissolution of the medieval world brought with it the demise of corporatism. Civil rights were granted to individual persons within the context of the modern nation-state, not to corporate, semi-autonomous ethnic bodies residing within the nation. Clermont-Tonnerre, a leader of the French Revolution, articulated this philosophy vis-a-vis the Jew

when he proclaimed, "The Jews should be denied everything as a nation, but granted everything as individuals." Modern Europe, in theory, was willing to bestow full rights on all minority groups, Jews included, as individuals. However, it was unwilling to accept the legitimacy of a corporate ethnic group, a corporate Jewish community.

This created an impossible dilemma for Jews—a secular version of the Christian demand to convert. That is, one could fully participate in the larger life of the West only if one were willing to divest oneself of particular ethnic traits and group loyalties. Adherence to universalism was the price demanded by modernity for admission to full participation in Western society. The emotional message given the Jew, and all minorities, was: "Become like us; divest yourselves of your uniqueness, your particularism."

The desire to take on the cultural characteristics of the dominant host society has been typical of Jews living in Western European nations since the onset of emancipation. In Germany, France and England this was reflected not only through Jewish participation in the cultural, political and economic life of host cultures, but also in the way that the Jews came to view their religion and, in turn, themselves. Anxious to divest themselves of ethnic particularism, the Jews of Western Europe consciously came to regard Judaism exclusively as a religion and did not see themselves as belonging to a unique ethnic group, a "Jewish nation." To have done so would have been to betray the very notions of Western universalism and liberalism which made the emancipation of the Jews possible in the first place. Thus, the German Jews who came to America in the nineteenth century, and who constituted the bulk of American Jewry prior to 1881, brought views of a nonparticularistic, universal, rational religion with them to a country that was prepared to advance them into positions of prestige and status. These Jews, both by background and promise of future reward within the American societal context, were predisposed to eschew a Jewish particularism which, through its emphasis on group distinctiveness, would have retarded their progress in the United States. Their creation was American Reform Judaism of the "classical" mold, a mold which rejected any stress on particularistic loyalties. They purged "oriental" patterns of worship from the synagogue, devised a liturgy almost wholly universalistic in orientation, and rapidly conformed to the cultural patterns and mores of the United States.

With the onset of Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries a new type of Jew

came to these shores. His own experience of Judaism was so far removed from the Western European-American type that, during the first part of this century, he both deliberately avoided and was purposefully excluded from the Reform community. It is a romantic misconception, however, to claim that the East European Jew and his descendants did not have the same aim of acculturation as his West European brethren. Indeed, the most characteristic element of the Jewish response to modernity in all Western nations has been the Jew's affirmation of his desire to participate in the larger life of the host society. The East European Jewish immigrants to America's shores proved no exception to this general rule.

Charles Liebman has explained the East European immigrants' proclivity to acculturate on the basis of their intellectual and cultural characteristics. He has pointed out that these Jews were not the carriers of elite Jewish religious values as articulated by the scholarly rabbinic leaders of East European Jewry. Simple persons drawn to America by its promise of a brighter future, these immigrants and their descendants did not possess a commitment to Jewish religious values which would have decelerated the pace of their acculturation to American life. They quickly abandoned observance of the Sabbath and *kashrut*, and their failure to construct either ritual baths or *yeshivot* indicates their lack of attachment to traditional Jewish learning and the laws of family purity.[2] Their lack of religious fervor, as well as their desire for a better material life in America, created in these people a universalistic orientation toward Judaism that permitted them to forge a Judaism that easily allowed for full involvement in American life.

Yet such acculturation exacted a cost, for it must not be forgotten that one achieves such universalism, such a purging of the values of one's own ethnic group, only at the price of a high degree of psychological ambivalence. As John Cuddihy has observed, the passage from particularism to universalism is an "ordeal" for the members of the group who are making the journey.[3]

This ambivalence on the part of the first and second generation East European Jews, as well as (to a lesser extent) of the German Jews who came to this country, is mirrored in a play, *The Melting Pot,* by Israel Zangwill. Produced on Broadway in 1908, *The Melting Pot,* as its title suggests, explicitly drew the analogy between the United States and the "melting pot" and gave general currency to a type of thinking which dominated both America's perception of itself and ethnic minority groups' views of America for the next fifty to sixty years. The hero, in the climactic speech of the play, shouts: "God is

making the American . . . he will be the fusion of all races, the coming Superman." The rapturous vision of the universal person, bereft of the paralysis of narrowing and selfish particularity, was the apparent message of the play.

The play seems to reflect a highly pejorative attitude toward ethnicity, and "ethnic" seems to imply that there is something wrong with the individual or group so called. "Ethnic," in this context, means that the religion, or skin color, or character, or speech pattern of the group so identified is somehow amiss; these are qualities which members of the ethnic group should purge in order to acculturate and gain a rightful place within the spectrum of American society. The clear implication of the play is that "ethnicity," by its failure to conform to universal standards of brotherhood, is morally wanting.

Yet even in Zangwill's play, one can detect a certain tension, an ambiguity, between the superficial intent of the drama and the disquietude that the author felt as an advocate of the "melting pot" and that ethnic minority groups feel by being cast into it. The hero, David Quixano, is a Jewish violinist whose parents died in a Russian pogrom. He is engaged in writing a great symphony celebrating America when, at a settlement house, he meets and falls in love with Vera, the daughter of a Russian army officer. They determine to marry, but their love is almost ended when David discovers that Vera's father was the murderer of his parents. David's symphony, however, is a great success and its triumph revives his faith in the "melting pot." Determined to cast the blood feuds of the past aside, David rejects his Jewish heritage and affirms his love for Vera. The expansiveness of his universalism triumphs over the narrowness of his particularism.

While universalism here emerges victorious, the tension reflected in the play between universalism and particular ethnic loyalties mirrors the ambiguities American Jews have felt throughout this century over the conflict inherent in trying to live in a non-Jewish world. On the one hand, Jews had an intense desire to acculturate, to take part in the American celebration of the melting pot. This they did not only by eagerly accepting the benefits the American nation had to confer upon them, but also by establishing systems of religious thought and practice—Reform and Conservative Judaism—which applauded the virtues of democracy and the American way of life. Indeed, an offshoot of Conservative Judaism, Reconstructionism, accorded the status of sancta to such American festivals as Thanksgiving, Labor Day, and the Fourth of July, thus indicating the lover's embrace in which American Jews held the United States.

A paradox emerges, however, in this description of the attitude toward Jewish ethnicity possessed by the ancestors of today's 25–40 year old American Jews. For in spite of the fact that acculturation to American life and affirmation of the melting pot so dominated the actions and thoughts of these Jews, they still clung tenaciously to their ethnic group, if not their heritage, and remained, in many ways, a people who dwelt alone. Statistics demonstrate, for example, that the intermarriage rate was quite low among Jews prior to the 1950s. While it is estimated that 28.7% of the marriages involving a Jew that took place in the United States prior to 1840 were intermarriages, Marshall Sklare writes, "The intermarriage rate dropped with the immigration of the German Jews. It declined still further with the arrival of the East Europeans."[4] Moreover, these Jews found most of their primary social relationships within the Jewish subcommunity, and Jews chose, voluntarily, to segregate themselves within Jewish neighborhoods.[5] Social distance between Jew and non-Jew remained the norm throughout the first half of this century. Finally, it should be noted that certain authors, particularly intellectuals, clearly articulated the degree of distance felt by some American Jews from the centers of American social and cultural life. The works of Ludwig Lewissohn provide perhaps the best example of this genre. America's Jews, then, in the first half of this century, were torn between two poles. The first was universalistic and both affirmed the American dream and celebrated the melting pot. The second, however, demonstrated that the American Jew, in spite of his ignorance of traditional Jewish learning and his failure to observe traditional Jewish religious rituals, remained comfortably ensconced within his own Jewish community. A certain sense of unease, though seldom overtly acknowledged, characterized the American Zion and gave rise to a Jewish ethnic particularism among all segments of American Jewry.

The irony of all this is that the young adult American Jew of today is simultaneously more at ease socially in America and less comfortable with the image of a universalistic American melting pot than were his parents or grandparents. He is far more likely than his parents or grandparents to live in a non-Jewish subculture and have non-Jewish friends, and the rate of intermarriage, according to one conservative estimate, has increased 500% in the last twenty years, so that at least 31% of marriages involving Jews in America today are intermarriages.[6] College fraternities and sororities, as well as other social clubs, that once absolutely excluded Jews from membership have now lowered their barriers, permitting Jewish participation to a degree which would have been unthinkable a generation ago.[7] In

academia, too, Jews have been appointed even as college presidents, and departments of American History and English, which denied appointment to Jewish professors only forty years ago, are now frequently populated by Jewish scholars.[8]

Despite this ever increasing degree of participation in the cultural and social life of American society, young adult American Jews evidence a pride in their particular ethnic heritage which their elders did not. In this way they reflect the larger trend in American society, created by the conditions of a technological world, that Michael Novak, author of the influential work *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics,* has popularized by the term "the new ethnicity." The new ethnicity, according to Novak, is characterized by the conscious sense of discomfort an ethnic feels with the prevailing model of American behavior and attitudes which he is supposed to, and which his ancestors did, emulate. That is, the prevailing cultural image of the ideal American—established by the British-American, Ivy League-educated, upper-class segment of this nation as a cultural model—has largely been discredited among young Americans, Jews included, grown to adulthood during the 1960s and 70s. The Vietnam War, urban decay, racial frictions, educational decline, and the gross public dishonesty of so many public officials during these years have made the attitudes, values and emotions of this WASP type unworthy of emulation in the minds of many ethnics. As Novak himself phrases it: "The older image of the truly cultured American is no longer compelling. Many, therefore, are thrown back on their own resources."[9]

The young adult American ethnics thus approach their past and search for roots not so much out of a deep appreciation of their people's culture as out of the sense of malaise they detect on the general cultural scene. The "new ethnics" do not necessarily speak, or even desire to speak, the language of their people, nor, in most cases, will they respond to narrow "ethnic appeals." They do not exalt their nationality in a narrow way, but instead see it as a way, their particular way, to approach universal truths.

Novak's observations about the new ethnicity are reflected in the work of Eugene Borowitz, who writes in *The Masks Jews Wear:*

> Today mankind desperately needs people who are creatively alienated. To be satisfied in our situation is either to have bad values or to understand grossly what man can do. Simply to be opposed to "the system" leads to quixotic protests that work to entrench the established wrong and promote despair and passivity. Creative alienation implies sufficient withdrawal from our society to judge it critically, but also the

> way and flexibility to keep finding and trying ways of correcting it. I think Jewishness offers a unique means of gaining and maintaining such creative alienation. This was not its primary role in the lives of our parents and grandparents.[10]

What Borowitz offers here prescriptively is what Novak claims to see descriptively among today's American ethnics and applies, quite accurately, to the mood of young, contemporary American Jews. Many of them feel the "creative alienation" of which Borowitz speaks, and it is from this point of dissatisfaction that many come to gain a growing appreciation for the wisdom of Judaism and, perhaps more significantly, a feeling of self-confidence and legitimacy about the Jewish past. Thus the young American Jews, particularly those who affiliate with a non-Orthodox synagogue (and I would submit sociologically that there is little to distinguish persons who join a Reform from those who join a Conservative congregation), are not engaged simply in a narrow search for roots but are seeking a Jewish past that will provide an alternative to the one-dimensional American model that has been imposed upon them. They are not primordial, counter-rational, or necessarily romantic. Instead, this type of Jew, like other "new ethnics," is thoroughly American and has entered the Jewish world because he affirms the legitimacy of his cultural past among the many that comprise the variety that is the United States.

What perhaps best indicates how these young adult American Jews approach their Judaism is the phenomenon of Jewish studies on American college campuses. Prior to the 1960s, Jewish studies had a relatively minor place on the American college scene, with the exceptions of Wolfson at Harvard, Baron at Columbia, and a handful of others. Yet by 1975 there were over 300 full-time professors of Judaica in the United States.[11] Thousands of young Jews enrolled in the courses taught by these academics, and thousands of others attended Year-In-Israel programs in Israeli universities for which their American schools granted them credit. The presence of Jewish studies on a considerable number of American college campuses not only indicates the desire for Jewish knowledge and identity on the part of many young Jews but also, more to the point for this paper, signifies the nature of the new ethnicity many third and fourth generation American Jews feel.

It was no accident that Jewish and other ethnic studies were generally omitted from the curriculum of American universities prior to the past two decades or so. Arnold Toynbee delivered the rationale for this when he referred to Judaism as a "fossil." By this Toynbee did not necessarily mean that Judaism as a religion was dead. Rather,

he was saying that Judaism was culturally insignificant and that, after the creation of the Hebrew Bible, the Jews as a people left the central stage of history. Judaism was a fossil, a relic from an ancient Near Eastern civilization that was dead. This view, however unpopular among Jews, was the normative view of Western civilization until our own day. Indeed, it is because past generations of Western Jews tacitly accepted this view that they felt Judaism had no merit in its own right. Consequently, they also believed Judaism could justify its existence only insofar as it could be shown to have contributed to the growth of Western civilization; scores of apologetic works were written "proving" Judaism's decisive "impact" upon this or that element of Western history. By assuming this attitude, Jews implicitly assented to the indictment hurled against them by the West. Our ancestors' failure to assert the legitimacy of the Jewish past in its own right betrayed their own sense of unease and inferiority when confronted with a gentile society they considered superior.

With the burgeoning of Jewish studies on the campus, Jews have begun to assert the primacy their past has for them. Moreover, by demanding their inclusion in the curriculum of the university, they are forcing American society to recognize the legitimacy of a pluralistic cultural model. The fact that Jews now grant their own past legitimacy tells a great deal about the ever growing sense of self-confidence Jews now feel about their own Jewishness. Of course, it also indicates a greater maturity on the part of American society and its ability to tolerate a multi-cultural, pluralistic societal model. The academic study of Judaism within the university is a positive acknowledgment by the gentile world of its right to a recognized role in civilization.

The relationship between the academic study of Judaism and the new ethnicity suggests that the pursuit of Jewish knowledge within a university setting means that *today's Jews seek and affirm their personal identities within the context of the larger world.* No longer ashamed of their past, young adult American Jews claim that their culture is a valid one which the American public must sanction. The new Jewish ethnicity is not parochial; it accepts modernity and, in turn, demands that modernity accept it. It asserts that one does not need to reverberate to the literature of New England to find a valid cultural identity but can discover it through one's own cultural heritage.

The same cultural dynamics that have led to the rise of Jewish studies within the university also explain, at least in part, the unprecedented growth of Jewish day schools in this country during the past

two decades. Every single Jewish community in America that numbers at least 7,500 persons now has a Jewish day school, and over sixty of these are under non-Orthodox auspices.[12] The non-Orthodox schools are largely populated by the children of the young adult American Jews described in this paper. They come from thoroughly acculturated Reform and Conservative Jewish suburban homes; the parents demand that the schools provide their children with both secular and Jewish curricula. These schools do not represent a retreat from the general society but indicate rather that increasing numbers of American Jews assert the legitimacy of their cultural heritage (however shallow their understanding of that heritage is) and see it as a viable option for their children in a multi-faceted cultural world.

I do not claim that all young adult American Jews share the feelings about Jewish ethnicity here articulated. To be sure, many have no special feelings for Judaism at all and want nothing more than to be considered American. However, the self-consciousness described in this paper applies to an ever increasing number of young adult American Jews. They reject the old notion of the melting pot and, instead, strive for a genuine multi-cultural cosmopolitanism. The ease past generations of American Zion purported to feel in the United States betrayed a basic insecurity our ancestors felt, an insecurity which gave rise to a desire to emulate and affirm the cultural model presented them by the British-American strata of American society. Many young adult American Jews no longer have this desire, for the culture this model represented has been largely discredited. The new ethnicity they feel does not stand for the Judaization of America. Rather, it represents a struggle to create a multi-dimensional America, and one who would understand the nature of many of those young Americans who are now coming to populate the synagogues of this country should recognize and herald the new ethnicity's birth.

II

Another development of recent years which has exerted an effect upon the identity of young adult American Jews has been the so-called religious revival in this country. In order to understand this phenomenon, however, it is essential that the term "religion" itself be defined. Only then can the entity "religious revival" be observed or assessed.

For present purposes, it seems helpful to think of religion as a concept which involves three dimensions—the experiential, the ideological, and the ritual. The experiential dimension of religion

implies that people are open to feelings, perceptions, and sensations which involve the possibility of some encounter—however slight, fleeting, or incomplete—with the divine, whether that divine be labelled an ultimate authority, a transcendental reality, or God. The ritual dimension of religion indicates what people do that is of a religious nature. It involves membership in a religious body, attendance at religious services, and observance of religiously prescribed practices. Finally, the ideological dimension of religion includes those ideas which represent what people believe about the nature of ultimate reality and its purpose.[13]

With these dimensions of religion defined, it is now possible to consider precisely what is meant by the term "religious revival" and assess how it affects the religiosity and, subsequently, the Jewish identity of young adult American Jews. Looking first at the ritual dimension, studies indicate that there has been some increase in religious observances among young Jewish adults during the past two decades. There has been an unprecedented revival of interest in Orthodox Jewish observance among many who do not come from Orthodox homes. In addition, larger numbers of Jews in the non-Orthodox community observe some type of *kashrut*, light Shabbat and Chanukah candles, and attend a Passover *seder* than did a generation ago.[14] However, it seems that the explanation for these phenomena more properly falls under the category of the new ethnicity described above, and while these ritual observances cannot be explained totally by resort to the ethnicity argument, it is not this ritual dimension of the religious revival which best accounts for the emergence of a certain type of young adult American Jew who is coming increasingly to participate in the life of the synagogue.

Nor does the ideological dimension of a religious revival properly account for the emergence of this type of Jew. For though there has been a revival of interest in theology on the part of Jewish thinkers during the past several decades, it does not seem that laypeople are particularly concerned about the nuances of theological argument presented in academic journals of religion. Indeed, the uncertainties of our age make many persons, theologians included, wary of formulations which define precisely what is to be believed about the ultimate nature of reality.

Rather, the religious revival affecting the hearts and minds of many young adult Americans, Jews included, is essentially experiential. That is, a significant number of people are open to the possibility that God exists, and they attempt to lead lives in accordance with values that are grounded in an ultimate reality behind which God

stands.[15] The reasons for this phenomenon are many, but it can be attributed primarily to developments rehearsed earlier in this paper. For events of the past decades no longer permit many people to have the unbridled faith in humanity that characterized past generations. Jews particularly, having been exposed not only to the horrors of a Vietnam and a Bangladesh but also to a Holocaust and the attempted destruction of the State of Israel, are unable to regard humanity as an adequate source of, and foundation for, values. Consequently, many are now open to the possibility of a transcendent referant serving as such a source.

The growing strength of fundamentalist groups within Christendom represents one response to this search for experience with God; the response of many young adult American Jews is more cognitive in character. For it is their disillusionment with the human evil they witness in the world and the destructive values of a predominantly competitive, highly materialistic society which leads them to seek a transcendental referant. Having opened themselves to the possibility of its being there, their chances for moments of religious encounter are heightened. These people neither live in nor continually seek a blissful state of revelation, but they remain open to, and occasionally perceive moments of, encounter with the divine presence. Theirs is not a delicate sort of religiosity, and they increasingly come to the synagogue to see whether their needs can be met. Often, of course, their needs are not met, and many young Jewish adults view the synagogue as bereft of spiritual values. Consequently, some are attracted to a Buberian type of Hasidism and search for the genuine religious community described in so much of Buber's work. It is not accidental, then, that so much of the membership of non-affiliated *havurot* is comprised of young Jewish adults who were exposed to the intense personal and religious atmosphere of the Ramah and UAHC camps as teenagers.

Nevertheless, the number of these persons, though influential, is still relatively small. For few people are willing to exert the effort it requires to establish and sustain a small religious grouping. Besides, many choose not to do so, for to abandon the synagogue in favor of the small, intense *havurah* is to isolate oneself from the mainstream of American Judaism. These people who do not form *havurot* still search for religious and spiritual values and experiences. They are not sectarian and are willing to compromise with the demands both of society and of institutions in order to seek such values and experiences within the context of the total Jewish community. The emergence of these synagogue-affiliated young adults illustrates the

legitimacy religious pursuits have gained in our society and the desire that so many feel, particularly as products of the American culture of the 1960s, to avoid the dehumanizing aspects of life in our post-industrial society. The individual's sense of values—his existential unease with his present situation—leads to the growth of religious consciousness on the part of many young adult American Jews.

Religious revival thus has not meant for Jews, as it has for many Christians, a revived interest in a sort of religious fundamentalism. Rather, it has meant that the person who searches religiously is not suspect. It has legitimated the quest for genuine religiosity, not simply ethnicity, within the synagogue. The notion that Jews comprise a holy community has gained a following among some of the young adults, as well as many older persons, who populate the synagogue. Many genuinely believe in the notion of the Jews as a covenantal people and claim that the rationale for Jewish existence is intimately bound up with the idea of God. Furthermore, some of them feel obligated by the demands this covenantal relationship imposes upon them because, experientially, they respond to it. Franz Rozensweig speaks to them, for it is Jewish lives in response to their perception of God's presence that they seek to live. These people are clearly a minority among the thousands who comprise the Jewish community, but they are there, and their appearance is a phenomenon worth noting.

This paper has not attempted to be exhaustive in its efforts to describe the societal trends and currents which have shaped the consciousness of today's young adult American Jews. Nor has it tried to offer a total description of the numerous types of Jewish commitment and identity that are reflected among them. However, by examining the effects of the new ethnicity and religious revival upon these Jews, it has attempted to elucidate some trends that have been extremely influential in shaping the ethnic and religious identity of many contemporary young Jewish adults. Judaism, of course, is not monolithic, and the approaches one can follow to discover and encounter it are as varied as the numbers who seek after it. This paper has indicated some of that diversity in approach and has defined more precisely the type of particularities which characterize the 'Judaisms' of our newest members.

NOTES

[1]Marshall Sklare, "Church and Laity Among Jews," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 332, November 1960, p. 61.

[2]Charles Liebman, *The Ambivalent American Jew* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1973) pp. 42ff.

[3]John Murray Cuddihy, *The Ordeal of Civility* (New York: Basic Books, 1974). Here Cuddihy describes provocatively, if somewhat unevenly, the Jewish journey from "medievalism to modernity."

[4]Marshall Sklare, *America's Jews* (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 184.

[5]See Gerhard Lenski's study of Detroit's Jews in his *The Religious Factor* (New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1963), p. 79.

[6]Elihu Bergman, "The American Jewish Population Erosion," *Midstream*, XXIII, No. 8 (October, 1977), p. 9.

[7]For example, when my father attended the College of William and Mary, from which he graduated in 1942, not one Jew was a member of a gentile fraternity. However, when I finished William and Mary in 1969, every fraternity had several Jewish students.

[8]See Norman Podhoretz, *Making It* (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 48. Here Podhoretz writes, "It is perhaps worth noting that (Lionel) Trilling was the first Jew ever to be given a permanent appointment in the Columbia English department . . . As late as 1937, it was thought that a Jew could teach philosophy or even Greek, but that no one with such shallow roots in Anglo-Saxon culture could be entrusted with the job of introducing the young to its literary heritage."

[9]Michael Novak, "The New Ethnicity," *The Center Magazine*, Vol. VII, No. 4 (July/August, 1974), p. 20.

[10]Eugene Borowitz, *The Masks Jews Wear* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), p. 209.

[11]Robert Alter, "What Jewish Studies Can Do," *Commentary*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (October, 1974), p. 71.

[12]Leon H. Spotts, "Organizing the Jewish Day School," *The Pedagogic Reporter* (Fall, 1977), p. 33.

[13]These dimensions of the term 'religion' are taken from Charles E. Glock, "The Religious Revival in America," in Norman Birnbaum and Gertrude Lenzer, eds., *Sociology and Religion* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.; Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp. 398–399.

[14]See Joseph L. Blau, *Judaism in America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976), pp. 131–136; and Nathan Glazer, *American Judaism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. 106–150.

[15]See Theodore I. Lenn, *Rabbi and Synagogue In Reform Judaism* (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1972), pp. 253–260, and Charles Liebman, *The Ambivalent American Jew*, p. 75.