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ABSTRACT

The Jews for Urban Justice is an organization of radical individuals living in the Washington, D.C. area. One of the most striking characteristics of this group is its inability to avoid conflicts with the established Jewish community of Washington. My thesis investigates this phenomenon from the analytical observations of Will Herberg in *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*. Herberg, writing in the 1950's, indicates that each generation of Jews within North America, changes in its approach to Judaism from preceeding generations. The first generation abandoned Judaism in favor of acceptance by Christian America; the approach of the second generation was secularism, but it "showed the impress of the religion they were abandoning." (Herberg, p. 185). The third generation, more secure in its Judaism and Americanness than either of the preceeding two, endeavoured to return to Judaism as a basic tenent of North American life. The fourth generation, including the Jews for Urban Justice, are even more secure in their Americanness, and strive to return even further to more basic principles of Judaism than other generations. It is at this point that the conflict between JUJ (fourth generation) and the Washington Jewish community (third generation) becomes irreconcilable.
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CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL STATEMENTS AND PROBLEMS

The initial conception of the Jews for Urban Justice (hereinafter referred to as JUJ) came at Passover, (April) 1966. Since that time, the group has formulated an ideology, and instituted several policies, concommitant with their ideology, which serve as the basis for this study. In addition to JUJ's ideology and policies, concern will also be with the reaction of the greater Washington area's Jewish community to that group.

JUJ is a group of Jewish intellectuals located in Washington, D.C. They are, thus far, strictly a regional group -- although there have been some attempts at broadening the involvement in JUJ.

The group labels itself radical, and defines radical as "confrontation politics." The confrontation that concerns them is twofold; firstly, they attempt to confront the Jewish community of Washington on specific issues. The second series of 'opponents' they feel deserving of opposition are certain governments; they are specifically concerned with policies

---

1 'Ideology' as used in this paper is defined as "the aggregate of the ideas, beliefs, and modes of thinking characteristic of a group." (Maurice Parmelee, in Henry P. Fairchild, ed., Dictionary of Sociology and Related Sciences, Totowa, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1967, p. 149).
that have relationship to Jews, e.g., rent policies in
ghettos, treatment of Soviet Jewry, etc.

The group bases its radical foundations in Jewish
scripture and Jewish traditions. They have attempted to
formulate radical ideology based on the Scriptures. From
this ideology they have attempted to alter Jewish positions
regarding certain issues (e.g., grape boycott), and indeed,
in some cases, to establish alternative Jewish institutions
to counter the established institutions (e.g., Freedom school).

In many of JUJ policies and statements, criticism is
levelled at the established Jewish community. The Jewish com-

unity, in turn, has criticised JUJ for its anti-Jewish state-
ments and policies. This paper will investigate the basis on
which JUJ formulates its ideology and the reaction of the
Washington Jewish community to it.

"The sociology of knowledge," according to Karl Mann-
heim, "seeks to analyse the relationship between knowledge
and existence."² Related to this notion, Marx has argued,
"it is not the consciousness of men that determines their
existence, but on the contrary, their social existence which
determines their consciousness."³ In point of fact, as


³Karl Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Poli-
tical Economy, Trans. Stone, 1913, p. 11.
Stark indicates, it is this relationship between societal events and their influence on the thoughts of men (plural) that separate the sociology of knowledge from the theory of knowledge (epistemology). Epistomologists, when studying the relationship of ideas to man, see individuals in isolation; their notion of man is singular, or as Stark so tersely notes, "... (the epistemologists view) Man with a capital M."^5

Although the sociologists' notion of 'knowledge' is the over-riding current throughout this paper, the epistemologist argument does offer, it seems, a valuable addition to the sociology of knowledge. Epistomologists, and some sociologists (see Stark, p. 12), view, with concern, not only the relation of "society" on man's ideas or consciousness, but, also, the effect of man's ideologies on society. If sociologists are indeed concerned with 'ongoing societal processes,' as Stark says, then the interest must be of a relational nature in a totality; an analogy to reinforce this point is found in the work of systems analysts.

System analyst David Easton has developed the following model which he uses to describe the interactions in


^5 Ibid., p. 13.
a political system.  

In Easton's model, the decisions and actions -- the outputs of the system -- become part of the system's environment, and are transformed into demands and supports-systemic inputs, and thereby making the interaction between the outputs and the inputs circular.

Similarly, when dealing with an ideology and an ongoing social process, as it relates to an individual's (defined probably as an individual's group) ideational make-up, the influences become circular and reciprocal. This is presented graphically in Figure 2.

---

Depending, of course, on the influential strength of the individual's ideology vis-a-vis the surrounding environment and, therefore, the ongoing social processes, one can determine -- in an abstract sense -- to what extent the output becomes an input; or, worded differently, to what extent does the ideology influence the ongoing social process?

Applying Easton's model to the Jews for Urban Justice ideology and relating it to the established Jewish community -- the environment in which JUJ operates -- the diagram appears thusly:

![Diagram](image)

Figure 3

Concern in this paper is, in part, the traditional approach of the sociology of knowledge, i.e., the influence of ongoing social processes on the ideology of the Jews for Urban Justice; this, however, is only part of the concern. In addition to studying the influence of societal factors on JUJ, a significant part of this study will deal with the influence of JUJ on the surrounding Jewish community. This
is the case, if for no other reason than, following the implementation of JUJ's ideology and the reaction of the Jewish community towards that group, the societal inputs (in Easton's terms) do, in fact -- but, not necessarily -- change the environment in which JUJ's ideology is formulated. If, in other words, we assume that an ideology is an ongoing process, then concern must be with variables not only creating an ideology, but also with variables causing that ideology to change.

In addition to ideological change, I am concerned with ideological conflict. Significant in this realm, is the fact that the greatest ideological conflicts appear to be between JUJ and the established Jewish community; i.e., the conflict is intra-ethnic group, rather than between different ethnic groups. Will Herberg, in his discussion of intra-ethnic group conflict, offers some interesting theories, that seem to apply to JUJ and the Washington Jewish community.

Herberg analyses intra-ethnic group conflict on the basis of generations, i.e.; the number of generations having been settled in North America. The first generation, Herberg argues, has abandoned its Judaism in favor of acceptance by Christian America. The first generation felt insecure in its Americanness and therefore attempted to put as little emphasis on differences between itself and the American majority,

and therefore completely de-emphasized its religion — even, at times, to the point of assimilation.

The approach of the second generation Jew "... was secularism. Yet it was secularism with a difference (from the first generation Jew), for even in their secularism the young people of the second generation often showed the impress of the religion they were abandoning" (Herberg, p. 185). The third generation Jew, feels secure in its Americanness -- and acceptance -- and therefore, according to Herberg, rejects the assimilationist pattern of the previous generation. The third generation Jew reidentifies himself as Jewish.

Herberg's thesis is that as each generation of Jews approaches maturity, they, collectively, return to Judaic values. JUJ members would be considered to be fourth generation Jews. They (that generation) therefore, according to Herberg, should be closest to Judaism of all Jews in America.

JUJ's conflict with the established Jewish community is generational. JUJ is dissatisfied with the lack of commitment of the third generation (power structure) Jew to Judaism; they criticise the third generations' secularism, intermarriage and assimilation. JUJ, however, does not define its Jewishness primarily on the basis of religion, but instead in political -- or ideological -- terms. Judaism, to JUJ, is an identification with the "third world." The basic principles of social justice are JUJ's "ten commandments."
In a 1954 study, 97 per cent of adolescents asked "what is a Jew?" replied in terms of religion, as against 80 per cent of their parents. The adolescents in this study by Marshall Sklare, were mostly fourth generation American (JUJ age) while the parent group was primarily third generation Americans (power structure age).  

Herberg, writing in what David Reisman described as the 'apathetic, a-political 50's' conceived of the third generation Jew reasserting his Judaism at the unidimensional level of religion. The events of the 1960's in the United States -- i.e., Viet Nam, political assasinations, the struggle for Civil Rights, etc. -- have politicized Americans in their approach to American social institutions and also, religion. JUJ has equated religion and politics developing a political context of religion.

Whereas fourth generation Jews indicated overwhelmingly that religion is the basis of Judaism -- which is concomitant with JUJ notions -- it is the definition of synthesizing religion with politics that has changed in the 15 years since Sklare's study and Herberg's book.

There are then two basic areas in which JUJ and the Jewish community are in conflict. At one level, JUJ -- being

fourth generation Jews -- is desirous of reasserting its Judaism. JUJ members are no longer interested in their co-optation, assimilation and acceptance by the non-Jewish American culture. JUJ feels "... secure in its American-ness, and therefore no longer [sees] any reason for the attitude of rejection characteristic of its predecessors."\(^9\) Herberg points out that third generation Jews "... began (my emphasis) to reassert their Jewish identification and to return to their Jewishness;"\(^10\) JUJ members are beyond the level of beginning to undertake this process.

At the second level of conflict, and this is what Herberg writing in 1955, does not foresee, is the ideological problem. As Jews, JUJ members feel securely Americanized; however, as Americans, JUJ members are dissatisfied with certain policies of the U.S. government, and militantly opposed to Jewish support of those policies -- either tacitly or demonstrably (e.g., racial discrimination). JUJ therefore opposes the assimilative policies of the third generation Jews, and the alternative the group offers is religio-political. This is the primary basis for conflict between the established Jewish community and JUJ.

Posing the problems to be investigated in question form is useful, in that it delineates precisely the areas


\(^10\) *Loc. cit.*
of inquiry. I will be concerned with answering the following questions:

1. How does intra-ethnic group conflict develop?
2. What is the relationship between Jewish radicalism and intra-ethnic group conflict?

In sum, therefore, this paper will deal with the sociology of knowledge (ideology, radicalism, and JUJ's quest for legitimation) as it relates to ethnic group behavior (intra-ethnic group conflict, and generational conflict).

A few words are in order regarding my approach to the problem of studying JUJ and its ideology. Many studies in sociology are founded in certain hypotheses, and the researcher sets out to test his hypothesis. This is not the approach I have adopted. Hypothesis can only be intelligently generated if the researcher has a great deal of previous knowledge regarding the phenomenon to be studied, or if he relies on theoretical formulation of his own or -- more usually -- other theoreticians. Jews for Urban Justice is a new group (less than five years old), and unique in that it is a subculture to a subculture; in other words, the established Jewish community -- a subculture in U.S. society -- has become a dominant culture to the JUJ; policies and statements of JUJ are geared primarily to the Jewish community, and not to American society as a whole.
Further, it seems to me, that any testing of hypotheses that is done, necessarily limits the scope of the investigation. The hypothesis defines the specific areas for research, and although this eliminates the necessity for a great deal of ground work by the researcher, it also gives him a 'distorted and incomplete' view of the phenomenon to be investigated.

My approach has been — as much as possible — bias free, in the sense that I have accepted prior attempts at theorizing or suggested hypotheses only as a guide to assist me in my understanding of JUJ and its ideology and the Jewish community in relation to it. The ultimate object of sociology is theory — if, indeed, this is possible; research must be conducted within a 'totalitarian' (i.e., of the totality of the phenomenon) framework. That framework, therefore, prohibits a priori decisions as to what areas are significantly important enough to warrant being studied.

I must make mention of statistical analysis and its place in my study. In researching this study, I was most interested in ideologies, their formation and their influence. This type of study is not one that lends itself — in the main — to statistical analysis for several reasons. Primarily, my concern is with the components of ideologies, and not their frequencies. Secondly, the sample included in this study is not sufficiently large to draw significant
statistical conclusions. There is, however, a certain value to statistical analysis, and that is using statistics to infer hints as to the development of the JUJ ideology; for instance, all the original founders of JUJ were involved in the Civil Rights Movement, etc.

As with all researchers, I have a built-in bias as to what I consider important. This is an outgrowth of reading, discussion, and participation in seminars. There is little I can do about past influences on me, however, I am fairly cognizant of them, and in some instances in the research and writing of this thesis, I have intentionally repressed them. Several of these influencing forces are included in the bibliography.

I have dealt with the methods that I tried to avoid in compiling my data; the methods I did employ deserve consideration now.

Upon my arrival in the Washington, D.C. area, I contacted Mr. Michael Tabor, one of the original founders and leaders of JUJ. I suggested that a series of interviews be arranged with him, and other members of JUJ; I informed him I was also interested in meeting with members of the Jewish community of the greater Washington area to ascertain their position vis-à-vis JUJ. Throughout my information-collecting period, Mr. Tabor was extremely helpful, and in addition to giving his time on several occasions to deal with my questions, he laid the groundwork for me to meet with other mem-
bers of the group. My encounters with the group are noteworthy, and will be dealt with below.

When asking sampling questionnaires, the control of uniformity in presentation and order of questions is necessary; however, the interviews I conducted were of a different nature. For much of the information gathered, large samples were unnecessary -- e.g., the history of JUJ, the age, occupation and education of the members. Ideally, questionnaires should have been sent to all the JUJ members asking them for specific information I might have used, however it was requested of me that I not do this, for there was what appeared to be a negative reaction towards me and the study I was undertaking. Although I did desire to compile and distribute such a questionnaire, I went along with the requests made of me and settled for a compromise position. That position was, that I interviewed only the people from JUJ who were interested in speaking to me. Because of the somewhat precarious position in which I found myself, I was forced to discard uniformity in my interviews with different JUJ members; i.e., I answered questions when they were asked of me if I felt they did not influence the answer of the respondent. I occasionally offered comments of a social nature if I felt they were necessary to develop a rapport between myself and the respondent. The point that is significant here, is that it became a requirement of me to utilize common-sense notions
of how an interview was progressing, and what was necessary, on my behalf, to insure the respondents' answering my questions fully. To be remembered along with this point, is the fact that I did not in any way influence a respondent's answer to any of my informationally-relevant questions.

In addition to my interviewing JUJ members, I was defacto invited to a JUJ steering committee meeting. Mr. Tabor invited me to his home to interview him, and suggested that following the interview I remain at his house for a dinner-meeting. During the course of our interview, which I was taping, several JUJ members entered the room in which we were sitting, and questioned what it was I was doing and towards what end. There was no opposition to my interviewing Mr. Tabor, however, when the meeting began, a great deal of vocal opposition came from several members as to my being allowed to listen in on the meeting, and also to my taping the meeting. Mr. Tabor several times informed the people my information was towards the completion of a Master's thesis. As the meeting progressed, some new people arrived, and, as each entered the room, were very concerned that I was allowed to be taping a JUJ meeting. The significant point of the above, is that, even after adequate explanation by Mr. Tabor and myself, Mr. Tabor subsequently noted, there was still a great deal of reluctance to speak freely at the
meeting, because of my presence. Several interesting obser­vations arise from this experience. For instance, radical groups, by definition, are a minority subgroup of at least one larger entity. Radicalism requires commitment on behalf of its members. Should no overt commitment be made to the goals of radicalism, radicals assume that the uncommitted is -- tacitly, at least -- a non-supporter of the radical group. I made no commitment to JUJ, and may therefore have been viewed with some trepidation as to my political leanings -- or, more specifically and impor­tantly-- on my impressions of JUJ. Although Mr. Tabor explained my objectivity research-wise, several JUJ members were opposed to my recording their comments, for although I wasn't an enemy, neither was I a friend.

As was mentioned above, because of the numerical smallness of radical groups, non-members of any radical group are considered a supporter of the radical groups' enemies. Radicals -- as do many others -- tend to place outsiders in "either-or" categories. 'Either you're for us or against us.' This suspicion, I believe, led to the reluctance of members to commit themselves to tape. One girl, upon entering the room where I was taping, asked, 'What is the tape being used for? How do we know we can trust him?'

This apprehension may be attributed to interest; how­ever, the frequency and vehemence of this type of response
(even following an explanation) leads me to the conclusion that the concern of the group was more than of mere interest. I suspect, again, that the lack of commitment on my behalf to JUJ, indicated to the group that the material I was taping might fall into the hands of the group's perceived opponents -- the Jewish community.

The question of the group reaction to being taped is interesting. As with any group, or person, there are several apprehensions regarding being committed to tape. "Who will be hearing it?" is the key question in this area. Specifically, one is concerned with the notion of accountability. ("To whom will this recording make me accountable?") In the case of JUJ, it may have been a fear of accountability on two levels. Firstly, a recorded transcript of one's comments commits that person to previous statements. He is denied the opportunity of claiming he was not quoted properly, or his remarks were taken out of context. The first area of accountability is at a primary group, present and future level. The second level of accountability is futuristic in that the spokesman can be accountable to people not necessarily present at the time of the original comments.

Ideally, of course, one's comments are well-conceived and no retraction should be deemed necessary. However, again, the question of who hears the comments and under what circumstances is relevant. For example, JUJ members may, for var-
ious reasons, be concerned with non-JUJ members relations
on a personal level at some future date, and a recording
of that person in a JUJ meeting may limit his alternatives
regarding his position of JUJ.

Two levels of opposition to taping have been de-
lineated. The first level -- 'the primary group' -- may
be characteristic of a certain element of human nature --
regardless of environment. The second level -- 'the futur-
istic' -- may be more characteristic of certain groups,
and therefore influenced greatly by environment. It is
the surrounding environment of JUJ -- i.e., the Jewish com-
munity specifically -- and its relationship with JUJ that
is of interest in this study.

These observations are sociologically significant
in two aspects: one, from the point of view of the sociology
of research and methodology; and two -- and perhaps the most
important -- the nature of the group and the pressures that
the group members perceive placed upon it by outside influ-
ences, e.g., U.S. society, the established Jewish community.

Concomitant with my interviewing JUJ members during
the late Spring-Summer of 1969, I contacted several leaders
of the Jewish community in the Washington, D. C. area. I
approached these people; leaders of Jewish organizations with
memberships over 200 people; rabbis of the seven largest
congregations in the Washington area (including Orthodox,
Conservative and Reform congregations), lay people whose names were suggested to me, and people who have had significant encounters -- both positive and negative -- with JUJ, with letters and telephone calls; in addition, I personally interviewed several of these people. The majority of my responses came through letters I received from the respondents. A copy of the two letters sent are included in the Appendix.

The results of these interviews, letters, discussions, telephone calls -- with both JUJ members, and members of the established Jewish community -- comprise the basis for the following study.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF JUJ'S DEVELOPMENT AND ITS ACTIVITIES

The seeds of the Jews for Urban Justice were planted in the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's. The first meeting of what evolved into the Jews for Urban Justice (JUJ) came out of an informal get-together of a group of people who were all involved in the Civil Rights Movement, Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC), Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and to some extent, people involved in the Office of Economic Opportunity (Anti-Poverty program), during Passover -- the Jewish holiday commemorating the Jewish exodus from Egypt (also, symbolically called, the holiday of freedom) -- (April) 1966 in Washington, D. C.

Significant here, is the fact that all the people involved in the initial formulation of JUJ, were professionally involved in the Civil Rights Movement. This indicates a deep commitment on behalf of the personnel involved to the struggle for civil rights. It also tends to indicate a thorough awareness of the problems caused by discrimination and the lack of civil rights. The people involved in JUJ had more than a professional interest in the problem of civil rights, for the concept of the group developed from a "leisure-time"
activity. We will return to the point of professionalism in JUJ below.

The people who met that Passover were all involved in a group called ACCESS - Action Co-ordinating Committee to End Segregation in the Suburbs; the purpose of ACCESS was to work towards apartment housing de-segregation. As Michael Tabor, leader of JUJ, reported, "An awful lot of the people who owned the apartment developments were Jewish; almost every guy that we were putting pressure on was Jewish... We were concerned with, at that point, the whole question of, 'what were the institutional Jewish groups doing about those Jews? The type of things we were thinking about at that time, were, 'What is a group like the Anti-Defamation League doing about Jews who were discriminating?' ACCESS was not a specifically Jewish group, however, a great many people in ACCESS were Jewish.

As a result of the Passover, 1966, meeting, one person from ACCESS wrote to the Anti-Defamation League, and asked what the Anti-Defamation League was doing about discriminating Jews. A second person, a deputy to the head of the O.E.O. Civil Rights program, wrote on O.E.O. stationary, a letter to the A.D.L., and said, "I've been travelling around the country a lot and I see what appears to me to be

---

1Statement by Michael Tabor, original founder of JUJ, personal interview, May 24, 1969, Washington, D.C.
increasing anti-Semitism in black communities; and one of the reasons, I think, is because of the problem of Jewish slum lords and the fact that the only Jews with whom they come in contact are bad Jews."²

The A.D.L., and groups like it, have been concerned with discrimination against Jews; JUJ is concerned with discrimination by Jews. The point appears consistent with Herberg's notion of generation and religion. JUJ feels sufficiently secure with its Judaism that it can "afford" to attack another Jewish group. Third generation Jews -- A.D.L. personnel -- have been somewhat less secure in their Judaism and established institutions to counter anti-Jewish sentiments and activities. The conflict here lacks the clarity of issues of former inter-group conflict, for conflict is no longer a "we - they" (Jew vs. non-Jew) confrontation, but an intra-group (Jew vs. Jew) conflict.

ACCESS members, as professionals in the Civil Rights Movement, were aware of the discriminating practices of Jews in business and rental policies, and were in a position to offer well-documented evidence to that effect. The notion of professionalism adds another dimension to the intra-group conflict between Jews. The A.D.L. -- and groups like it -- were not only being criticized by Jews, but by Jewish pro-

²Mike Tabor interview, op. cit.
professionals. The strength of the argument by a Jewish group was weighty, but opposition by a Jewish professional group was Atlasian. A strong A.D.L. response was to be expected.

In response to the two letters sent, the A.D.L. sent back two letters saying that they were concerned with the problem of anti-semitism, but that they were not responsible for the actions of other Jews; they refused to interfere with the personal lives of any Jews.

Following the exchange of letters with the A.D.L. (Summer, 1966), Mike Tabor, as representative of the group, approached the rabbi (Rabbi Werstenfeld [deceased]) of a large Washington congregation (Washington Hebrew Congregation) -- the congregation in which one of the landlords prayed -- and wanted to discuss with the rabbi the responsibility of Jews vis-à-vis 'slum-landlordism.' The rabbi refused to discuss the issue with Tabor, claiming, "... you (Tabor and the group of people with him) have set the Civil Rights Movement back 30 years; I will not get involved with this -- this issue of fair housing, I just don't want to say anything about it."³

Tabor, dissatisfied with the rabbi's response, spoke with other people in the group, and decided that on the High Holy Days (September, 1966), they would go to that rabbi's

³Mike Tabor interview, op. cit.
synagogue and distribute leaflets explaining and denouncing the presence of slum-landlords among that particular congregation. Following the distribution of the leaflets, many worshippers approached the group offering statements of support or denouncement. At the following morning's service, the group was invited into the synagogue to worship with the congregants; the rabbi, during his morning sermon, indicated that he would not speak out on the issue of fair housing until a law is passed; he chose not to interfere with the folkways of individuals, "meaning, if people thought they should be segregationists, then let them be segregationists."

Tabor felt that many congregants disagreed with the rabbi, however, except for some discussion on the question, nothing was done.

Following this incident, JUJ, during that year (1966-67), "really didn't do much; there was no organization formed; a number of us came together and talked as friends."

The group did decide, however, to return to the same synagogue on the Jewish Day of Atonement, 1967; this time, however, with recommendations as to what that congregation could do. They claimed that things hadn't changed; the rabbi still had not taken a stand on fair housing. Among the suggestions offered were that the congregation form a social-

---

4 Mike Tabor interview, op. cit.
5 Loc. cit.
action group, or that the congregants open the synagogue as a head-start center. Again, there was a strong reaction to the group's actions. The regional director of the Anti-Defamation League (Mr. Jason Silverman) sent to Mike Tabor a letter, in which one of the points he made was, "... As I told you before, I regard such activities by Jews on this day (Yom Kippur) as profanation -- for to engage in such activity on this day is violation not only of all religious ethics but prostitutes the very purpose you profess to serve."\(^6\)

Upon receiving Mr. Silverman's letter, a group of sixteen people wrote a group-letter response to him (November 15, 1967), and signed their letter, "Jews for Urban Justice." This marked the beginning of the group, Jews for Urban Justice, which, significantly, was formed as an outcome of intra-ethnic group conflict.

At this time, there was some indecision amongst the people involved as to whether or not the formation of a specific group was necessary, or, even, a good thing; they did, however, decide to form the group because they felt there should be a group in the Jewish community that should speak out and represent some progressive feelings about exploitation of Blacks, as well as sensitize the Jewish community and work

\(^{6}\) Based on personal correspondence between Mike Tabor and Jason Silverman, November 1, 1967.
with them on direct action projects. They looked at the Jewish community as "virgin territory for organizing; there were no militant groups within the Washington Jewish community; there wasn't much action going on of any sort; that the Jewish community wasn't dealing with things we thought they should be dealing with -- like segregation, like Jewish exploiters, slum-lords, like merchants." The exact nature of the group and its structure will be discussed in a later section of this paper.

In their response to Mr. Silverman, JUJ stated that they felt it was, indeed, within the tradition of Judaism to protest and to state a point of view on the Jewish High Holy Days; they further attacked Mr. Silverman for his "... lack of constructive criticism. ... Your letter does not leave the door open for much discussion and dialogue between your groups." 8

Mr. Silverman, responding on A.D.L. stationary, stated that the methods employed by JUJ were, "... actually counter-productive of the goals we mutually seek to achieve. ... (that being that). ... no one can do enough to further the cause of civil rights." 9

---

7 Mike Tabor interview, op. cit.
8 Based on personal correspondence between JUJ and Mr. Silverman, November 15, 1967.
9 Based on personal correspondence between Mr. Silverman and JUJ, November 20, 1967.
Mr. Silverman's letter was brief and he did not explain why, or in what ways, JUJ actions on the High Holy Days were "counter-productive" to furthering the cause of civil rights. Several interpretations come to mind -- e.g., do people stop their support of civil rights because of actions of others? Or is the support of civil rights linked to the condition that Jews -- even if they are discriminating -- are not to be confronted? etc. Attempts at interpreting the comments of Mr. Silverman are merely second-guesses. It is unfortunate he did not indicate precisely in what way JUJ actions were counter-productive. In any event, JUJ's first contact with the established Jewish community was negative, and, as shall be shown, remains until today, a strained relationship.

In January-February 1968, the group undertook its first action project: that was a study of the level of commitment among social action groups of synagogues and every Jewish group in Washington. From the study, JUJ became convinced that most Jewish organizations in the Washington area, whether religious or secular, were not concerned with problems of social justice; "they (the Jewish community) tolerated Jewish merchants who used unscrupulous practices in their businesses, Jewish 'slum-lords' who continued to collect rent for unsafe and unhealthy housing, and Jewish landlords who continued to practice residential segregation. We
found particularly objectionable the practice of letting well-known slum-lords be accorded the honor of carrying the Torah at services.\(^\text{10}\)

Again, we see fourth generation JUJ attacking third generation Jewish institutions. JUJ's commitment to Judaism found the connection between business ethics -- basically unsatisfactory to JUJ members -- and synagogues (Jewish institutions) unacceptable. It seems as though it is discrimination that JUJ opposes as radicals, and institutional complicity that JUJ opposes as Jews.

Their study, published in May, 1968, concluded that:

1) the 'Jewish Community Council of greater Washington was crisis oriented and did not implement its own 1964 statement on "policy and action" (i.e., reach a policy decision and work towards that decision's implementation);

2) most synagogues lacked social action committees, and those in existence were ineffectual;

3) there was a problem of 'white backlash in the Jewish community to which Jewish groups have to address themselves; and

4) many charitable, service and social Jewish organizations were concerned largely with fund-raising, and were lacking "up-to-date information on the needs of the community and specific information on the possibilities for their involvement." \(^\text{11}\)

\(^{10}\) Opinion expressed by Arno Winnard in an address, February 23, 1969.

\(^{11}\) Ibid.
Following the publication of their survey, JUJ "wanted to engage in some dialogue with the Jewish Community Council (of greater Washington)."\textsuperscript{12} When, however, the Executive Director of the Jewish Community Council (Issac Franck) was approached about discussing the report, he was, states Tabor, disinterested in the report, "and in talking with us."\textsuperscript{13} Because no one was interested in discussing the findings of the survey, JUJ decided at the end of May 1968, to call a Press Conference. Following the Press Conference -- to which not only Jewish newspapers, but also secular papers, e.g., \textit{The Washington Post}, \textit{The Washington Star}, were in attendance -- newspapers throughout the Washington area reported that a Jewish group had called the Jewish community unconcerned.

The reports of the Press Conference caused a major reaction in the Washington Jewish community. Many telephone calls were made to members of JUJ: some voiced dissatisfaction with the statements made at the Press Conference (e.g., "Nigger-lover," "Are you trying to impose another Nazi regime on us?"); others were more violent, e.g., Mike Tabor had three threatening telephone calls (one to burn down his house).

\textsuperscript{12}Mike Tabor interview, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{13}Loc. cit.
This, JUJ's first contact with the non-institutionalized Jewish community, as with its first contact with the A.D.L., was a relationship born out of conflict, and in many ways presented to the Washington Jewish community a poor view of JUJ.

Beginning with the Summer of 1968, and continuing through until the present, JUJ has instituted a series of programs which have been geared towards developing the kinds of activities that the May 1968, survey found to be lacking amongst the Jewish community. These programs include a position on the California grape boycott, a Passover Seder in the Washington Negro ghetto, including the publication of a Hagadah, the organization of a national conference of radical Jewish youth to fight white racism among American Jews, and the establishment of a Jewish afternoon school to offer an alternative form of education to Jewish youth. In addition to these, JUJ has started a newsletter-information sheet, weekly study sessions to study Jewish laws and other aspects of Jewish life, and participated in several protest demonstrations.

Consistent throughout JUJ activities is the presence of Judaism as was discussed in Chapter I. JUJ has politicized its definition of Judaism -- what I would call a characteristic of fourth generation Jews living in North America -- and it is this difference in definition between third and fourth generation Jews which emphasize this intra-ethnic group con-
flict. The differences in definition and approach of JUJ and the established Jewish community delineate the split within the Jewish community.

Since 1965, when grape growers refused to negotiate with a grape picker's union, a boycott was declared on all California table grapes. The issue received minimal support, and until rather recently was somewhat unknown by most segments of North American society. There have been, in the last year or so, several significant encounters regarding the boycotting of grapes -- including incidents with the U.S. Army, and several White House functions.

JUJ released a flier entitled, "keep your home clean, don't use California grapes." JUJ has explained their anti-grape position by using the Jewish concept of "Oshek." "Oshek," literally translated from the Hebrew, is a derivative of the word "Asuk" meaning busy. "Oshek," as it is described in the Talmud, refers to the exploitation of the hired man, which is forbidden by Jewish law. On this basis, several JUJ members organized a picket-protest of a larger supermarket chain (Giant Food) owned by a Washington Jew (Joseph Danzansky). Four JUJ members are now being sued by Mr. Danzansky for "entering the premises of the plaintiff (Danzansky) and directly or indirectly engaging in disruptive practices."\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14}Civil Action Complaint No. 50-'69, Giant Foods Inc., vs. COMPEERS Inc., Jews for Urban Justice and Montgomery County Alliance for Democratic Reform, Washington, D. C., January 8, 1969.
As with JUJ's initial contact with the A.D.L., here too, is an example of JUJ perceiving the established Jewish community not as a subordinate (or discriminated against) group, but instead as being in a position of domination or power (discriminating). The explication for this perception can be interpolated from Herberg's thesis. Third generation Jews are quite secure in their Americanness; so secure, in point of fact, that they have become a part of the power establishment in many fields. The Jew no longer suffers from overt anti-semitism from the integrated American community (although there have been recent incidents of what has been labelled "Black Anti-Semitism") and has reaffirmed his religiousness — primarily by joining and taking an active role in the synagogue.

As fourth generation Jews, JUJ is not concerned about being accepted as Americans, and they too want to reaffirm their Jewishness. Their perception of Judaism, however, is not limited to a religious interpretation, but a moral-political analysis. They are most concerned with the actions of Jews and the Jewish community. Therefore, when a Jewish businessman performs acts that they perceive as anti-Jewish (based on their definition), they resort to intra-ethnic group conflict.

Passover is symbolically referred to as the "Holiday of Freedom" amongst Jews, for it marks the Exodus from Egypt.
JUJ, in an attempt to reactivate this notion of freedom into what they feel has become solely a traditional occasion, organized a Passover Seder in the Washington Negro ghetto in April 1969. The function was well-attended (by over 700 people), and the Hagaddah (prayer book) utilized, was one written especially for the occasion. Dr. Arthur Waskow, a resident fellow at the Washington Institute for Policy Studies, wrote a new Hagaddah (which was published in the April 1969 issue of Ramparts Magazine), which he labelled the "Freedom Hagaddah." It attempted to emphasize the quest for freedom going on today -- especially with the Black community in the U.S. -- rather than the escape of the Israelites from Egypt several thousand years ago.

The Freedom Seder was held on Good Friday, 1969. As is stated in the program notes to the Seder,

"Tonight is different from all other nights for many reasons. First it is the third night of Passover, a holiday which marks slavery and celebrated freedom. The third night of Passover has traditionally been an evening when radical Jewish groups write their own "hagaddahs," and hold family or group seders. Second, it is the anniversary of the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., -- a man who, like Moses, had seen the promised land, and had been to the mountain top. Third, it is the anniversary of a rebellion by Blacks against the tyranny which they have known in this country (the Washing-

ton rebellion following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.). Fourth, it is Good Friday, a holiday of remembrance for Christians." 16

They have attempted to combine traditional Judaism with modern relevancy.

Among the participants were "... 700 Washingtonians -- the Free Community, government employees, members of the Black United Front, free lance radicals, a welfare mother or two, and assorted suburban Jews, nervous to be deep in the ghetto on the night of a predicted riot." 17

Waskow and JUJ's idea was to "attract young radicals, and shake up the conservative Jewish financial interests by stressing themes of liberation and resistance in Judaism and then demanding the community live up to them." 18 To this end, the Hagaddah quoted such "Prophets" as Eldridge Cleaver, Martin Buber, Hannah Arendt, and A. J. Muste.

An interesting comparison of prayers found in the traditional Hagaddah and Waskow's Hagaddah reveals the approach and emphasis of JUJ. The traditional prayer states,

"If He had brought us out of Egypt, and not done judgement against them, enough for us! If He had done judgement against them, but not their gods, enough for us! If He had done it against their gods, and not slain their first born, enough for us! ... If He had brought us to Mount Sinai,

---

16 Statement of welcome by JUJ to all those participating in Freedom Seder, Washington, April 4, 1969.


18 Ibid.
and not given us the Torah, enough for us! If He had given us the Torah, and not brought us into the Land of Israel, enough for us! If He had brought us into the Land of Israel, and not built the chosen Temple, enough for us! How much more so, then, must be to acknowledge God's goodnes ses to us!"  

The constant satisfaction found in the Hagaddah is foresaken in the Freedom Hagaddah.

"If we were to disarm the nations but not to end the brutality with which the police attack black people in some countries... it would not be sufficient! If we were to end outright police brutality but not to prevent some people from wallowing in luxury, while others starved, it would not be sufficient."  

The traditional Seder (Passover meal) ends with the chant, "Next Year in Jerusalem;" the Freedom Seder ended with, "We Shall Overcome," and the last words of the Freedom Hagaddah were: "Liberation now; next year in a world of freedom!'"  

JUJ is a regional (Washington) phenomenon; there are, however, other groups with similar ideologies located in other regions of the U.S. and Canada. In an effort to

---

19 From Third Seder evening program.  
20 "A Radical Hagaddah for Passover," op. cit.  
21 Loc. cit.
unify ideology and policy with these groups, JUJ organized a national conference of radical Jewry -- the Jewish Organizing Project -- on April 6-7, 1969. The conference was attended by 35 radical Jews who came together from the Northeast, Midwest, and the Pacific Coast. The conference dealt primarily with attempting to define Jewish radicalism, and adopting a position regarding Jewish racism.

The conference had a built-in inherent philosophical problem; that was the definitional division between "those who consider themselves to be radicals who are also Jewish, and those who believe themselves to be Jews who are also radicals." This division was present throughout the discussions at the conference, and was best summarized by Robert Dudnick's observation in *The Guardian*, an underground paper. Dudnick noted:

"Some of the movement types argued that their main responsibility is to radical politics, but that they also feel a specific responsibility to their own people... Those who come from a more heavily Jewish background argued essentially the opposite, that Jews must be organized for their own sake because they too are oppressed." 23


23 Ibid.
The issue, however, was left unsettled, for nobody wanted to create a major divisional factor in the conference. A joint statement was adopted (see Appendix to Chapter II), and a national newsletter organized. JUJ favoured the "Jewish also radical" approach; however, all statements of disension were subjugated to the will of the group. This will, it seems, be a major obstacle to overcome if a coalition and, indeed, merger, are to come about. It is possible—and easy—to attack racism, however, in order for a group (such as the conference) to become unified, they must adopt a common perspective on basic issues and develop this into an accepted ideology. Whether or not this rapprochement can develop is as yet questionable.

An additional stumbling block to the conference was the question of radical group-Jewish community relations. Some argued that militant action is necessary; others felt it better to influence the existing Jewish agencies. This problem is probably solvable only on a regional basis, and therefore, may also prevent a radical Jewish group coalition.

Opposing established Jewish institutions may degrade the institution in question; however, an alternative is required for the criticism to be meaningful. To this end, JUJ is currently attempting to develop a Freedom school as an alternative to Jewish religious schools. A JUJ flier sent to Washington Jewish youth begins with the question:
"What does Judaism say about resisting the draft, drugs and ecstasy, women's liberation, abortion, communes, Black Power, the grape boycott?" The answers, of course, are discussed in the Freedom school.

In an effort to make Judaism relevant to the Washington Jewish youth -- and concomitant -- with JUJ ideology, JUJ is attempting to revamp the curriculum of Jewish schools. A further statement in the flier to the youth states: "Work out how to replace those (dangerous, irrelevant, destructive) (choose one or add your own) 'Jewish' institutions that support one-dimensional America." The school was scheduled to begin in September, 1969. (Letters have been written to JUJ members regarding the status of the school, but as yet, no answer has been received).

JUJ, with the help of a local rabbi (Rabbi Harold White) has instituted a study session. These sessions, held on Monday evenings, deal with a variety of issues. At least one session a month is devoted to a Talmud study class; these sessions have been devoted to the study of Jewish scriptures and their applicability to present-day society in North America. Other study sessions are devoted to various issues ranging from discussions about business methods used by credit lenders, to synagogue policies, to Israel and the Middle East. These sessions are usually led by an expert in each area and are designed to give JUJ members a better understanding of issues confronting Jews today.
JUJ has also been involved in several protest demonstrations. They were one of the groups representing the Jewish community in the preparation, organization and running of Resurrection City in 1968. They have protested U.S. government policy on many occasions including the Viet Nam War, the grape issue and Civil Rights. They have also protested in front of the Russian embassy protesting the treatment of Soviet Jewry. As was mentioned above, they have also protested several Jewish institutions, including synagogues on their non-commitment regarding Civil Rights.

In sum, JUJ has organized activities which are intended to inform themselves, oppose perceived wrongs in the Jewish, as well as, American community, educate others, and add relevance, as they see it, to contemporary Judaism.
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES OF THE JEWISH ORGANIZING PROJECT

Judaism is a religious civilization based on action. In Biblical times the Israelite community was pledged to live in accordance with Divine Law regulating all aspects of personal, social, political and economic life. Normative Rabbinic Judaism is based on Halachah, a system of concrete formulas for action, not merely on professions of faith. In contemporary society, Judaism can no longer function as an exclusive legal system, but the spirit of its commitment to a life of positive action based on ethical principles can operate as a stimulus for creative participation in today's socio-political struggle.

Jewish activism has traditionally served certain fundamental social values. The Biblical ideal society was one based on justice and community solidarity. Throughout the centuries, Judaism has always mandated institutionalized concern for the welfare of the entire community. Beyond this, however, we can point to the characteristic Jewish insistence on the absolute nature of the Divine command for social justice. The prophetic social ethic constitutes a categorical refusal to discard principles of economic and political justice and humanitarian concern in the face of economic or political expediency.

In America we have been both coerced and cajoled into abandoning the prophetic legacy. Our people have been frightened into allowing themselves to be purchased, and they have been purchased at such affluent prices that they have forgotten to be angry. And so, like the people of Israel whom Samuel warned against choosing a King -- but who chose one anyway -- we have bent our knee to "our own" politicians over whom we keep no democratic controls; "our own" military men to whom we sacrifice our sons and treasure; "our own" businessmen who exploit us and others whom they hire and sell to; "our own" modern priests and editors who lie to us in the name of the Holy Truth.
That solution, with its illusory comforts, is no longer possible. The United States today faces a political crisis of major proportions. Discontent is rising among students and workers, the impoverished and the middle class, racial minorities and the 'forgotten' majority. This crisis grows from the fundamental characteristics of the American economic and political systems. Militarism abroad and racism and poverty at home are at the root of the failure of these systems. A comparison of the principles of Jewish social ethics with the practice of American society leads inevitably to the same critical conclusion: the American political and economic systems provide neither justice, nor equality, nor a sense of community.

The authors of injustice and oppression in America are not Jewish, but sometimes the men who serve these systems are Jews. They are serving a set of social forms that is destroying Jews, and all Americans, as the Pharaohs destroyed the Israelites and all who lived in Egypt. We name the Pharaohs in Congress and the White House, who multiply the weapons that will someday burn us all to death. We name the Pharaohs in the hospitals, who condemn Black babies to die at twice the rate of whites. We name the Pharaohs in our great auto companies, who condemn the public to be mangled and die rather than spend their profits on a car that would protect its occupants. We name the Pharaohs in a hundred county courthouses and city jails and college administration buildings, who harass the young and break their freedom of speech and press. We name the Pharaohs who poison the air and water, the Pharaohs who build pyramids of steel and canals of concrete where once a neighborhood stood.

But as in Egypt before Moses, Miriam, and Aaron began to organize; as in Babylon; as in Hellenized times; as under the Roman Empire; as even under Hitler -- some of our people have collaborated. For the sake of a mess of pottage, they have abandoned their birthright in the Prophets and Covenant. They have been given permission to survive and prosper -- if they will stop practicing Judaism. And some of them have agreed. We do not see them as our enemies, but we do believe that they must stop collaborating. Jewish businessmen must not buy grapes from farmers who exploit their hired laborers; Jewish organizations must not lend money to banks that oppress Black people; Jewish political leaders must not serve the military-industrial complex. Jews and Jewish institutions must not adopt the worst principles of American society -- racism, elite domination, cutthroat competition, exploitation -- as their own. Like Micah,
who loved the people of Israel, we must warn that Zion will be plowed as a field if the heads of the House of Jacob con-
tinue to abhor justice and pervert all equity. Like the prophets, we must remind each other that the people of Israel can flourish only as an ethical nation.

Moreover, we must remind our people that our real allies are those who stand along with us, all of us strangers in our own land. Our allies are not those who grant us -- as a measure of grace -- suroese from official anti-Semitism, on condition that we behave, and who then inflame the weak to be anti-Semitic. We must speak to our people about the attempts to pit Jews and other Americans against each other in self-destructive battles. For example, when a Rockefeller decides to slash the budget of City Univer-
sity of New York, he knows perfectly well that Blacks and Jews will begin to fight over the pitiful leavings. We must say to our people -- and to Rockefeller -- that the CUNY budget must be increased; the budgets that must be slashed instead are those of the oil companies, the mili-
tary contractors, the Chase-Manhattan banks.

Finally, we must see that the American life-style tries to remake us in one dimension -- bureaucratic, cere-
bral, technological, flat. As Jews we must recover that sense of the Transcendent which the American powers have tried to crush in all those who brought their various tra-
ditions to these shores. We are interested neither in the melting pot, nor in a false pluralism that allows Jews to stay separate from Irishmen, Italians, and Poles so long as each will think and act like all the others -- separately. The survival of Judaism, not merely of a brood of suburban Bar Mitzvah boys and girls, demands a reunion between that sense of mystery, communal feeling, and tradition that we knew as children and the intellect, reason, systematization that we have learned as adults. But the burst of energy that was Chassidic is as much ours, as necessary, as the burst of energy that was Prophetic. The salvation of us all requires that the technology that is now destroying Mankind and poisoning the Earth be connected to a sense of love, joy, community.

We are Jews committed to other Jews, to the Jewish tradition, and to humanity. We believe that the American Jewish community could combine a tradition of critical social cancer with real economic and political resources. The social commitment of our community must be mobilized to attack the injustices of American political and economic life. In our
efforts we will seek allies among those in other traditions -- Christian, Muslim, Humanist, Existentialist, Anarchist -- who have rebelled against abandoning their own ethical ideals in the face of the seductions and coercions of American practice. We will join with them to seek liberty, justice, and community for all.

"If we are not for ourselves, who will be for us? But if we are for ourselves only, what are we? If not now, when?"
CHAPTER III

JUJ AND ITS STRUCTURE

Abbie Hoffman, writing as Free, in Revolution for the Hell of it, speaks of the lack of structure and premeditated organization in which he writes. "It [the book] flows out like poetic garbage. It is written on the run... The book is just another part of life. A kid tells a story, a trigger flashes in my head, and in goes another page of garbage."¹

Hoffman's approach is indicative of the radical movement in the U.S. Originating with the "Hippie" notion, 'Do your own thing', the group has stressed informality, and a break from large-group or central planning and the confinements of bureaucratic procedures and rules of order.

The position of JUJ within this framework is interesting. On the one hand, JUJ strives towards informality and lack of central planning. There is no president, vice president, board of directors, etc. No person is group chairman, there is no JUJ office, and no one person is responsible for JUJ activities. Alternatively, however, there are structures inherent in JUJ.

Meetings are held in members' homes; the person whose home houses the meeting is the chairman for that session. He is responsible for conducting the meeting and writing minutes of that meeting to be presented at the next meeting.

This apparent contradiction may be explained by looking at the background of JUJ members. Meetings that are not community activities, i.e., steering committee meetings, are open to all JUJ members. Although JUJ has had up to 700 people at at least one function (the Freedom Seder), the actual membership of the group is the steering committee of 16 people. Of the 16 people actively involved in JUJ, 15 have college degrees (at least Bachelor degrees); the sixteenth is currently attending university. Eight of the group have at least one degree beyond the Bachelor's level. The group includes university professors, rabbis, historians, social workers, attorneys, teachers, engineers, and other professionals. The JUJ members range in age from 22 to 43, the mean age being 28, with two people past 30 years of age.

The JUJ members are forced to maintain rigid schedules, and abide by bureaucratic procedures during their working hours; efficiency at work requires their submission to the confines of an organized structure. Abbie Hoffman, on the other hand, is relatively free of occupational restrictions; radical students, it might be argued, are forced to participate in one
of the most bureaucratic of institutions -- the university; there is, however, a significant difference between radical students and JUJ members. Radical students can be radical at their vocation (studying), whereas the JUJ member cannot. The radical student can surround himself with other radicals during his school hours, and they together can participate in radical activity; the JUJ members, already committed to an employer, can only surround himself in the job outlined for him. Furthermore, JUJ members have been through university and in a position where organized and structured activity were the most efficient way of producing results; they have had no experience in "doing their own thing" -- except, of course, during leisure time. JUJ subscribes to notions of informality; however, because of a sparcity of time available to them as a group, they are often forced to compromise this commitment, and adopt bureaucratic procedures; in addition, they seem to feel most competent operating within an organized structure. It is for this reason, it might be argued, that although there are no elected organization heads, there are chairmen to all activities; JUJ has combined the ideology of informality with -- for her -- the necessary reality of organization and structure.

The steering committee is the nucleus of JUJ. The steering committee is the decision-making body in JUJ. The committee, directed by the meeting's chairman, discusses relevant issues of immediate importance to the group -- including projects and programs, and decides by a vote, with
majority rule, where need be, as the key to decision. Within the framework of informality, it is significant to note that -- at the time of my research, Summer 1969 -- no vote had been taken on any issue for nine or ten months. Instead, the group has tried -- and succeeded -- to maintain a policy of consensus decision-making. Tabor stated, "...we feel we'd really get into problems if we took votes. We have consensus! People gradually agree, or people realize...that when other people agree, they tend to go along. I've said a number of times, a lot of things would be lost if we took votes on things."2

The steering committee is made up of all people interested in being on the committee (again, a commitment to informality); however, the people on the committee must be prepared to commit themselves to JUJ activities and functions. The committee meets whenever necessary, as determined by an action of another group, e.g., Jewish community, approach by a JUJ-type group, etc., or, at least, monthly. Although there is no chairman of the steering committee, Mike Tabor is regarded as the tacit leader of the group, and should there be problems or questions by other JUJ members, or the established Jewish community, the person they contact is Mike Tabor.

2 Statement by Michael Tabor, original founder of JUJ, personal interview, May 24, 1969, Washington, D. C.
Although there is no elected group chairman, it is beneficial to look at the leadership of the group. The person who perhaps more than any other gives the group its direction is a rabbi. Rabbi Harold White, the accepted 'Spiritual Advisor' to the group, leads the group in study sessions and directs the group's religious position and understanding. The ultimate object of the group is to develop an ideology stemming from Jewish scriptures, and it is Rabbi White who is in the most instrumental position in developing that ideology.

Significant also in the development of the nature of the JUJ, were the original founders of the group. Important here is the occupation of the founders. All of the original JUJ members were employed in social welfare organizations. This affiliation was instrumental in the adoption of the original JUJ goals -- anti-racial discrimination. This does not mean to imply that all people employed in social welfare agencies are a priori anti-discrimination. The people who did work in this type of agency who were instrumental in the establishment of JUJ, were committed to the principle of anti-discrimination, and felt that the work that their agency was performing wasn't sufficient to satisfy their commitment in this area. This goal, in point of fact, has remained at the forefront of the group until today, and its original development can be attributed to the original social worker members. For a more detailed discussion on the nature of the members of the group (age, education, occupation, etc., see Chapter IV).
There has been some turnover of membership in the steering committee. In June 1968, a group of 15 people joined the group en masse to try to change the nature of the group. Tabor, "... think(s) they were trying to take over the group... People in their early 20's, who thought the group was a little too strong on social action and not acceptable enough to work within the established Jewish community."³ This role -- of working within the established Jewish community -- was inconsistent with original JUJ objectives. "(We wanted)... initially to be a gadfly group, (although) now we are seriously considering joining the Jewish Community Council."⁴ This group's efforts, however, were defeated by a vote and they left. It should be noted that the vote taken in this case was a tactical maneuver relating to inter-group conflict; as was mentioned above, votes are not customary procedures in JUJ meetings for solving intra-group conflict. This, incidentally, was the reason for the formation of the steering committee -- "to avoid the danger of another group coming in and taking over."

Other members have left the organization and new ones joined; a basic nucleus, however, has remained in the group and several of the original founders are still involved -- some peripherally -- with JUJ.

³Mike Tabor interview, op. cit.

⁴Loc. cit.
The steering committee members serve on various other committees regarding the programming of JUJ; there is a finance committee, newsletter committee, program committee, and other committees chosen to deal with specific issues (e.g., Passover Seder, etc.).

There are no dues to belong to JUJ; however, people have put money into a fund to establish programs. In addition, people have been asked to put $5.00 into the establishment of a newsletter which appears irregularly. JUJ is a self-sustaining organization; when funds are needed, the members of the group contribute to meet that necessity. As soon as enough money is reimbursed into the group — from admission fees, charging to receive the newsletter, etc. — the money laid out is refunded to the member. Should there be a profit from some activity, that money is held by a treasurer until funds are again needed.

The question of membership within JUJ is interesting. There is only one requirement of members, and that is, that they be Jewish. There was in 1968 one non-Jew who wanted to join JUJ, and his application was considered. He attended several functions of the group, and was known personally by several members. When the question of his membership was discussed at a steering committee meeting, there was considerable opposition to allowing non-Jews into JUJ; indeed, several JUJ members spoke of leaving the organization should...
it be open to non-Jews. The issue was not formally settled, for the non-Jewish candidate withdrew his request -- because of the controversy surrounding his application, and no final decision was reached by the group.

Several JUJ members, with whom I spoke, were adamant about the issue of non-Jews; others, alternatively, favoured an open group -- one open to all interested people. Because of a desire to avoid internal conflict, the issue was tabled; however, the question may arise again, and it appears that the solution will not be unanimously accepted by all the JUJ members.

There is an interesting dichotomy involved in this issue. This conflict appears to be an issue that split into radical ideology vs. the Jewish nature of the group. The radical approach would be of universal membership to all people interested in joining the group; the Jewish approach is most concerned with preserving the Jewish nature of the group. Although, as shall be shown in Chapter IV, JUJ strives to develop its ideology from Jewish sources -- including the study of Jewish scriptures and commentaries -- the group does not appear to completely support the notion of a strictly Jewish membership. It is felt that the same issues can be discussed and programmed with a non-Jewish membership included in JUJ. Relating to Herberg's arguments, this is an especially interesting phenomenon. The people in the group with the "Jewish
approach" are the older members (one member, a 40 year old lawyer, threatened to leave the group if non-Jews were allowed to participate); the members favoring the admission of non-Jews are most of the younger people in the group. The older members are less secured in their 'Americanness' than the younger members, and therefore less committed to Judaism as scripture rather than organization. The younger members are more secure in their 'Americanness,' and can therefore, be more committed to Judaism.

Will Herberg's analyses intra-ethnic group conflict on the basis of generations, i.e., the numbers of generations having been settled in North America. Herberg's thesis is that as each generation of Jews approaches maturity, they, collectively, return to Judaic values. This analysis applies to JUJ and the Washington Jewish community.

JUJ (fourth generation) is dissatisfied with the lack of commitment of the third generation Jew to Judaism; they criticize the third generation secularism, intermarriage and assimilation. JUJ, therefore, being fourth generation Jews, is desirous of reasserting its Judaism. JUJ members are no longer interested in their co-optation, assimilation and acceptance by the non-Jewish American culture. JUJ feels secure in its Americanness, and therefore no longer (sees) any reason for

---

the attitude of rejection characteristic of their predecessors." Heberg points out that third generation Jews, "... began to reassert their Jewish identification and to return to their Jewishness;" JUJ members are beyond the level of beginning to undertake this process. The older JUJ member, it might be argued, is not concerned -- as are his contemporaries outside JUJ -- with acceptance as Americans, but with a stronger commitment to Judaism; in order to achieve that level of commitment for the group, the group must maintain a pure Jewish character. The younger JUJ member, on the other hand, already possesses a strong commitment to Judaism, and does not have to depend upon organizational restrictions to ensure the Jewish nature of the group.

This phenomenon appears to contradict Heberg's notions of succeeding generational commitment to Judaism; however, it must be remembered that it is the younger JUJ members who are not frightened of losing the Jewish nature of the group -- because of their strong commitment to Judaism. The second point to remember in this discussion is the change in the definition of Judaism. JUJ defines its Judaism not solely on the basis of religion, but in political terms. Again, it must

---

6 Heberg, op. cit., p. 189.

7 Ibid., p. 187.
be mentioned, that Herberg writing in 1954 could not foresee this change in American youth, and the extent to which this change does not relate to JUJ development, Herberg's projection and observation appear accurate.
CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF JUJ IDEOLOGY

This chapter will attempt to deal with the development of JUJ ideology from two perspectives. First, concern will be with environmental, or societal, influences on JUJ's ideology; the second level of analysis is internal JUJ, i.e., the background of the JUJ members vis-a-vis religious training, education, age, etc.

JUJ is a radical group. The definition of radical employed in this paper is the delineation as set forth by Horace M. Kallen in the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.¹ Kallen states that radicalism is:

1. "A conspicuously stressed attitude or frame of mind... which may envisage the entire complex of a society or a culture... (or) tends to expand in scope until (its) field is coincident with the entire setup of a society;

2. "A distinct philosophy program of social change looking toward systematic destruction of what is hated and its replacement by an art, a faith, a science or a society demonstrated as true and good and beautiful and just..."

Egon Bittner takes "... from this reference that a definitive feature of radicalism is that it differs from the

normal, ordinary, traditionally sanctioned world-view prevalent in any society and that this is not a difference of degree but a juxtaposition of opposites."²

A second explanation regarding this question may be found through an understanding of social mobility. When the people the age of JUJ's parents were approaching maturity, they were very interested in upward social mobility; they strove to improve themselves financially and socially. Implicit in attempts at social mobility is a trust of the system in which one operates.

JUJ is not interested in social mobility within the U.S. system; JUJ members are basically self-sufficient and living comfortably. They needn't, and do not, trust the American way of life. Whereas it was in the interest of their parents' generation to trust the system, JUJ members feel no dependence on the American system, and can therefore be critical of it. This phenomenon and theory answers the oft-stated question of why it is primarily upper middle to upper class youth who are in the New Left Movements; quite simply, they can afford to be.

JUJ is part of the radical movement in the U.S. They therefore feel alienated about the outlined variables along with the rest of the left. In many cases, there is no direct

feeling of alienation from any of the five factors to JUJ members; however, their identification -- if nothing else -- with the people who do perceive these issues as alienating, is sufficient to make them sympathetic to these feelings.

An additional reason for feelings of alienation by JUJ's generation is the expanding influence of the mass media -- especially television. The coverage of news, news reports, special features, etc., is of increasing quantity, and seems to better inform the American public regarding crucial issues of the day. JUJ's generation was the first to be so influenced by this expanding mass media -- at least in their formative years. Previous generations to JUJ were not as influenced by the mass media to the degree the JUJ generation has been influenced. These variables coinciding with the societal variables discussed below explain why it is at this time that youth feel alienated to U.S. society, and did not share these feelings to the same degree as in generations past.

In studying radicalism, then, we must look at the relationship between JUJ and its milieu. JUJ is concerned with the nature of society; however, the group is more interested in the Jewish community and the role of the Jew within American society. Attention will be focused on JUJ's opposition to the Jewish community; however, it is worthwhile to investigate the nature of JUJ's opposition to American society.
Thirteen of the 16 members of the JUJ steering committee are 30 years of age and younger. This fact is significant in that it shows that the majority of JUJ members were becoming politically aware during the 1960's. In fact, there was little — if any — political consciousness among youth in the 1950's although some of the 30 year and older JUJ members were involved in political activity during the 1950's (e.g., opposition to McCarthyism, and 'Ban the Bomb Movements'); political awareness -- and radicalism -- is more of a central phenomenon of the 1960's. In question form, the notion to be investigated is, "what developments have there been in the 1960's that have led to feelings of dissatisfaction and opposition to American society and has attached such feelings to radical perspectives?"

It is my contention that several variables have developed in the 1960's which account for opposition to U.S. society; these variables are: major technological advancements, e.g., automation, the quest for equality, the threat of a nuclear holocaust, an unpopular war (Viet Nam), and political assassinations. It should be mentioned that although some of these variables have been present at one time or another in U.S. history, at no time, were they ALL present; indeed, the intensity and concentration of feelings of alienation among youth has been greater in the 1960's due to the combined presence of all the above variables.
Although it might be argued -- with validity -- that the above variables are alienating for a large aggregate of adults, the 60's were the milieu of youth. Whereas other generations have undergone experiences in an era where there was little feeling of opposition to the American society (e.g., World War II), the cognizant experiences of American youth in the 1960's has been moulded by the alienating variables outlined above. It is therefore significant, that the majority of JUJ members were approaching political awareness during the 1960's.

Technological Advancement. John G. Stoessinger has stated that, in order "to develop a powerful military establishment, nations must first command an advanced technological base." While Stoessinger's analysis is accurate, his main concern is international in scope; in assigning priorities to policies, the U.S. places high value on international power, and much less concern on the notion of what effect the development of that power has on the citizens living in the U.S.

The need for efficient operation in the development of a military potential, coupled with the competitive nature of a capitalist system has led to major technological breakthroughs in the past few decades.

---

Pitrim Sorokin has demonstrated in his classic work, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, that technology doubles every 150 years. Through 1900 — that last of the 150-year cycles Sorokin discusses — Sorokin's empirical observations support his theory; however, the first two-thirds of the 20th Century show that technology has changed in its effect on the United States — and indeed, world — citizens. Man has constantly evolved in his technological developments; however, the development of two related major variables are significant in causing man's alienation; these factors are: assembly line production and automation. Both of these variables are causational factors in feelings of powerlessness among industrial workers.

In assembly line production, the worker has no control over the pace of his work; he must keep up or slow down the entire process. This is crucial to an individual's maintaining control over his environment; as Robert Blauner states, "the pace of work is probably the most insistent, the most basic aspect of a job and retaining control in this area is a kind of affirmation of human dignity."  

---


Assembly line production removes meaning for the worker; he needn't -- and often doesn't -- know what part in the overall production of the commodity he performs. This results in the decline of the individual, as Manheim states, "... to act intelligently in a given situation on the basis of one's (his) own insight into the inter-relations of events."^6

When the worker is controlled by an assembly line, he becomes machinated or mechanical. As Blauner states, "re-acting to the rhythms of technology rather than acting in some independent or autonomous manner, he (the worker) approaches most completely the condition of 'thingness,' the essence of alienation."^7

Automation is also instrumental in creating feelings of powerlessness. It is alienating in at least two distinct ways. Firstly, individuals live in fear that they may be replaced by machines, and therefore are powerless to mould their futures; the second alienating factor inherent in automation, is, as automation increases, the less humanized society tends to become. "The most critical feature of automation is that it transfers the focus of emphasis from an individual job to the process of production."^8


^8 Ibid., p. 143.
The Quest for Equality. Although racial discrimination was outlawed *de jure* by the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, it has — *de facto* — still not been eliminated in the U.S. The struggle for the Black Man's Civil Rights is not in itself new; however, the trends within the past 15 years — and especially the last six years — in this struggle have taken on several new dimensions. These dimensions are the involvement of youth in the struggle and the development of Black militancy.

C. Van Woodward, in discussing the Civil Rights Movement, calls it a "generational rebellion that cut across racial lines and transcended racial objectives." Further, Van Woodward attributes the rise of the Civil Rights Movement to two major variables, "the predominance of the Negro and the predominance of youth."

Youth in the early 1960's "envisioned the struggle for Civil Rights as their struggle. Mario Savio states: "Last summer (1964) I went to Mississippi to join the struggle there for Civil Rights. This fall I am engaged in another phase of the same struggle, this time in Berkeley. The same rights are at stake in both places — the right to participate as good citizens in a democratic society and the right to due process of law." 

---


It might be argued that youth's active involvement in the Civil Rights Movement during the first half of the 60's was a form of integration rather than alienation, for these people were actively involved in the mechanisms and institutions of the society they were trying to change. The 'theme song' adopted by the Civil Rights Movement, "We Shall Overcome," indicates something being wrong, but the possibility existing to alter (overcome) the enigma. The means for effecting change, Civil Rights leaders maintained, was by revising laws. It is significant that the founders of JUJ were involved in this aspect of the Civil Rights Movement, and ideologically at least, abandoned the integrative approach.

In 1964 and 1965, the Congress of the U.S. passed the long-sought Civil Rights legislation. The results of these bills, however, were minimal, and Blacks, for the most part, felt few changes of major consequence regarding the issues they considered relevant (e.g., education, voting privileges, etc.). It is a truism to state that while these laws were 'on the books,' people's attitudes were not changed.  

The realization that changes in the law were essentially meaningless, begged the following question by many concerned youth: 'if the passage of new laws hasn't helped

---

alleviate the existing problems, then in what direction should we channel our energies to manifest changes? The adopted answer to this question was that there are no avenues open within the system that these people can work in to effect their desired results. This resulted in feelings of powerlessness, and consequently involvement in other than systemic institutions as a means for determining the outcome of the problem in a way consistent with their desires, i.e. militancy.

The adoption of militancy is another form of alienation -- as defined by Seeman. The notion of supporting an anti-societal phenomenon corresponds to Seeman's classification of isolation, for these people, "assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically valued in the given society." In discussing radical estrangement from society values (in the case of intellectuals), Robert Merton's description is appropos to those youth supporting militancy in the issue of Civil Rights. Merton states that rebellion "... leads men outside the environing social structure to envisage and seek to bring a new, that is to say, a greatly modified, social structure. It presupposes alienation from reigning goals and standards."

---


13 Ibid., p. 789.

Civil rights represents the area in which JUJ members have felt — on a personal level — alienated. As was discussed in previous chapters, the original founders of JUJ were actively involved in the Civil Rights Movement, and several other JUJ members were also involved in that struggle. The JUJ members have felt frustrated in this area and agree that the government is not doing enough to alleviate these problems. The civil rights workers who joined JUJ did so because of their feelings of powerlessness to influence government policies and manifest change in the area of civil rights. It is significant, that the majority of JUJ activities are centered around the area of racial equality.

The War in Viet Nam. The major issue concerning American youth in the mid-60's (1965-1968) has been the U.S. intervention in the War in Viet Nam. Throughout her history, the U.S. has met internal opposition to her policies; however, the War in Viet Nam is probably the singularly most unpopular policy the American government has pursued.

Throughout U.S. history there has been opposition to certain policies (e.g., refusal to allow women the right to vote, etc.), and laws (e.g., prohibition); however, these issues have been internal to the U.S. The significance of this can be seen in the widely accepted 'political science' notion that it is in times of war, that countries become internally unified, and, indeed, by focusing attention on ex-
ternal affairs, governments have removed the emphasis from parochial differences of policies within the country, to wide public support of foreign policies. Although there has been opposition to U.S. policies during wartime, this was usually restricted to a very small minority, and usually based on a 'political' rather than 'idealistic' analysis; i.e., major objection to the U.S. involvement in wars, prior to Viet Nam, has come from pacifists and/or international isolationists, but very seldom even from those feeling that the U.S. was supporting the 'wrong side.' This is not the case regarding the War in Viet Nam.

Feelings of opposition to U.S. policies -- expressed publicly -- are unique to the War in Viet Nam. Albeit that certain segments felt the U.S. wrong in all other wars, never before have these feelings been voiced as publicly as they are vis-à-vis Viet Nam. Even at the time of the U.S. usage of the Atomic Bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, the public outcry was less articulate than the statements of opposition to U.S. policy in Viet Nam.

The actions, statements, songs, etc., appear to be symptomatic of youth's feelings of isolation (and therefore alienation), vis-à-vis American society.\(^{15}\) The milieu of

\(^{15}\) For a detailed list of these songs depicting societal alienation, see, Stephen Schreier, "Alienation in the 1930's and 1960's," (unpublished study), University of British Columbia, 1969.
American society today is Viet Nam oriented. Television broadcasts show filmed footage of the War in Viet Nam. The press and major magazines deal with Viet Nam in each issue (either in news reports or editorial-type accounts). Radio and television stations run specials on varied aspects of the War. The 26th Annual Pictures of the Year competition awarded first prize in the "spot news" category to E. T. Adams of the Associated Press for his picture of a "Viet Cong Officer Executed." Viet Nam, in a real way, is central to the society and culture of the U.S.

Although there is some criticism of the American position in Viet Nam in the news media, the coverage given the War is basically positive vis-a-vis the American position in the War.

American youth feels isolated towards this society. Even songs have been written which attack the War and Selective Service System. It is almost inconceivable to imagine any songs making light of the Selective Service during any other war in America's history. The Selective Service, is, in fact, one of America's basic institutions; it is the only institution that affects every male individual at one time in his development -- albeit to different degrees. So this aspect of U.S. society then creates opposition by individuals, thereby creating feelings of isolation, and thereby, finally alienation to the American system.
An additional dimension of alienation regarding Vietnam is that of powerlessness. Initially, the feeling of powerlessness manifests itself in the inability of youth to alter the course of the War. Due to this inability, a second kind of powerlessness develops, and that manifests itself in the form of apathy.

**Threat of Nuclear Holocaust.** The 'atomic age' was introduced on August 6, 1945; on that date, the U.S. saw fit to drop an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan. Three days later, a second bomb was dropped on the Japanese city of Nagasaki. The potential danger to the world is obvious to all those concerned; nuclear weapons with destructive power able to destroy the world's population have been developed by several of the world's powers.

The policies that the nuclear powers have adopted vis-à-vis each other is one of 'deterrence,' i.e., attempting to convince one's potential enemy that it is in his best interest not to attack the deterring nation. This is accomplished by developing a large nuclear capability that will be able to destroy a given segment of an enemy's population (or perhaps nuclear force) regardless of what happens to the deterring country. Consequently, vast sums of money are spent on new research developments, and it is precisely this that isolates and alienates cognizant individuals.
The U.S., as does every nation, assigns priorities. Significant in this, is the amount of money and manpower put into specific projects. Paramount on the list of priorities for the U.S. is its deterrent force.

Concerned youth and youth groups also assign priorities. These priorities are concentrated on what might be called "social justice" -- the elimination of poverty, discrimination, and war. The obvious conflict between the two sets of priorities is the isolating factor of American youth. Most recently, for example, President Nixon, in opposition to the testimony of many experts, has guided an Anti-Ballistic Missile system through Congress; the cost of this project is as yet undetermined, but will at least be $6.8 billion, and may, by the time all the manifestations and extensions have been completed, cost as high as $500 billion.16 This is unacceptable to segments of American youth, for the Council of Economic Advisors, for instance, suggestion in 1965 that to put all Americans at a minimum standard of living would cost the U.S. approximately $11.5 billion. The commitment of the U.S. is towards dealing with deterrence and nuclear weapons rather than solving the internal problems frustrating youth.

More significant, however, than isolation as an alienating factor, is perception of powerlessness. Proponents of

deterrence and the development of more sophisticated weapons argue that this policy has been successful (so far) in preventing a nuclear war. Accepting this point does not reduce the fear resulting from the possibility of a nuclear war, or perhaps, more real -- from a nuclear accident. Protest movements, letters to Congressmen, etc., have had little influence in changing the U.S.'s policy vis-a-vis nuclear weapons; American youth (and many adults) are essentially powerless to influence any change in this area.

American political scientists and sociologists point out -- usually in introductory courses and textbooks -- that the unique value of the American political system is in the fact that change in the government positions takes place via peaceful elections. It might be argued, however, that from November 23, 1963, the U.S. has not had a president who, indeed, was wanted.

Lyndon B. Johnson became President of the U.S. following the assassination of John F. Kennedy. It is highly unlikely that Johnson would ever have been president had it not been for Kennedy's assassination. Kennedy developed a rapport with youth; he was youthful, supported youth, and was aware of the problems of American youth. Johnson was not trusted by American youth; his policies were attacked, and he personally was characterized as an enemy to youth in underground papers, statements by youth, etc.
In 1968, Robert Kennedy was assassinated. Robert Kennedy, like his brother, had a strong rapport with American youth. He was certainly one of the two major candidates receiving most of American youth's support. In fact, Abbie Hoffman, a leader of the YIPPIE (Youth International Party) Movement, stated that Bobby Kennedy, "... was the real threat. A direct challenge to our theatre-in-the streets, a challenge to the charisma of Yippie!"¹⁷

To speculate on the possibility of Kennedy's becoming the 37th President is fruitless; however, certain built-in systemic structures justify a brief venture in the world of "what might have been." Kennedy had asked his opponent, McCarthy, into joining him in a coalition to oppose together the policies of the Johnson-Humphrey administration. McCarthy had refused, among other reasons, waiting to see the results of the California Primary. There was no chance for the two dissident Democrats to talk after Kennedy's California victory. Had a coalition been formed (probably with Kennedy as its leader), the two might have been able to spoil Humphrey's bid for the Democratic nomination. Kennedy had pledged to himself those states which he had won in the Primary elections; in addition, it is generally accepted that the Kennedy campaign organization was the best organized of all candidates, and, as

in the nomination of John Kennedy, may have been instrumental in securing for Robert Kennedy the Democratic nomination. Kennedy appeared to be — and, indeed may have been — the only candidate who might have prevented Humphrey's winning the nomination. A *New York Times* headline of June 9, 1968 tends to support this notion; it said, "Now it seems inevitable: Humphrey vs. Nixon."¹⁸

The American people were not given the chance to choose Robert Kennedy as a president. The bullets of an assassin once again — as in 1963 — forced the American people into a situation of reaction — rather than action. Those refusing to vote in the 1968 Presidential Election did so as a protest against reaction. The candidate(s) they wanted were not on the ballet.

In addition to the two Kennedys, there have been other assassinations in the 1960's. Included among these were: Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, two men who represented a possible answer to the alienation of American youth.

Assassinations are not an inherent structure within the American political system, yet the milieu of youth approaching "adulthood" has been characterized by murders. Is there a conspiracy afield to eliminate certain leaders, as has often

been argued by radicals and others? Alternatively, are the assassinations performed by unsponsored individuals? More significantly, the question must be asked: "Are the assassinations of the 60's symptomatic of a developing current in the United States?"

The following question arises, "why these conditions lead to radical action?" The answer is, they needn't necessarily lead to radical action; however, the course of events in the 1960's has been such that no alternative but radicalism was possible. The tracing of this development may be seen in the Civil Rights struggle.

Originally (from 1953 until 1966), there were strong feelings of integration with the American way of life. Negroes and many concerned people were dissatisfied with the plight of the Black Man in the U.S.; however, there existed a basic feeling of confidence in the U.S., and the American system. 'With the passage of laws,' the sentiment ran, 'significant changes would occur, and allow the Black Man his fair place in society.' This was untrue; the Civil Rights legislation changed very little of the basic malaises of the Black Man. The trust in the American system began dissipating.

As the distrust in 'Americanism' developed in this area, concomitant with the distrust inherent in the other variables outlined above, it was almost inevitable that radicalism would be a major current in American social thought.
(The author is indebted to Miss Sharon Rose, of JUJ, for her assistance in compiling the statistical details on JUJ presented below).

The ideological development of JUJ is interesting to analyze in relation to JUJ members themselves. Concern in this portion of the chapter will be on the following characteristics of JUJ members: background in the Civil Rights Movement, age, education, and Jewish background.

Of the 16 members now involved in the steering committee of JUJ, 13 are age 30 or under. The mean age of the group is 27.03 years. This age puts the group within the boundaries of what Jerry Rubin defines as "youth." Significant in this, as was indicated above, is that the majority of JUJ members approached political maturity and awareness in the 1960's. The events described in the first part of this chapter are events of the 60's.

In a similar vein, the education level of JUJ members indicates that indeed it was the JUJ member who was aware of the alienating nature of the events outlined above. Of the 16 members, 15 have at least one college degree; the sixteenth member left university after one year to work full time for the Civil Rights Movement (she now is attending university in the evenings). At least half the group have advanced degrees beyond a baccalaureate. It is precisely the
people with strong education who tend to feel alienated by the events of the 1960's.

The development of JUJ as a uniquely Jewish group is interesting to analyze. Only six of the 16 members of the JUJ steering committee have a Jewish background; Jewish background here denotes a member holding a position with the established Jewish community, or training in Jewish education or Jewish organizations. JUJ members have indicated that the Jewish nature of the group may be explained by the knowledge that, concomitant with developments in the 60's, the JUJ members searched for an identity for themselves. Another identity-crisis which JUJ underwent was a grasping for a position on non-Jewish membership (see Chapter III). They had a commitment to radical politics, but that commitment requires an explanation -- a prior step from which their radicalism developed. These particular people found their basis in Judaism.

Judaism, to JUJ, is not solely a religious institution, but instead a religio-political framework offering an explanation to their radicalism. It is significant that their Jewishness is not the same as the generation preceding them. It could be argued that for third generation Jews to be involved in Jewish activities and organizations, a strong Jewish background would have been a pre-requisite. For fourth generation JUJ however, the political events of the 1960's eliminate the pre-requisite of a Jewish background. It is
significant along these lines to note that more people on JUJ's steering committee have been actively involved in the Civil Rights Movement than in Judaism. A question that must now be answered is, "Why does JUJ remain a Jewish group?"

To answer this question, we must revert to Herberg's theory of generational differences in ethnic group behavior. Two areas must be considered here; they are: JUJ and non-Jewish radical groups, and JUJ as a politico-religious group.

First, to deal with why JUJ is a distinct group and why JUJ members did not join one of the other political left wing movements.

JUJ members have evolved an ideology of Jewish radicalism. As was discussed in Chapter III, JUJ members are in need of a structure, and this structure translates itself as an ideology, i.e., JUJ members are most comfortable working within the confines of ideological framework. In addition, JUJ is a positivist organization in the sense that they are prepared to work toward the development of the type of system that follows from their ideology.

There are, broadly speaking, two groups with whom JUJ could identify; they are: the New Left and Hippie Movement. The New Left are alienated from U.S. society and desire a "Revolution for the Hell of It," but spend little time in postulating the aftermath society of a revolution -- Jerry
Rubin in 1968 mentioned that he knew certain things he would avoid following a revolution (e.g., Fascism); however, no systematic plan has been developed based on an explicit ideology.

The Hippie Movement is anti-ideology. They have developed a new consciousness which flows from drug experiences; their concerns, however, are essentially apolitical.

A diagramatic view of the differences between the Hippie and New Left Movement and JUJ may be seen in a scheme borrowed from Max Weber's Protestant Ethic.\(^\text{19}\)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Ascetic (self)} & \text{Political (group)} \\
\hline
\text{Hippies} & \text{New Left} \\
\hline
\text{Middle-Class Ethic} & \text{JUJ} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Figure 4

So for reasons of ideological opposition and group focus regarding time and goals, JUJ could not be a part of the Hippie or New Left Movement.

\(^{19}\) Much of the application of this diagram stems from a graduate seminar in the Sociology of Change, led by Professor Howard Boughey, University of British Columbia, 1969-70. Max Weber, Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, (Trans, Talcott Parsons), New York: Scribner and Sons, 1958.
The second question to be answered is why JUJ emerged as a Jewish group. Herberg describes the relation of religion in the U.S. to U.S. society as supportive; U.S. society is a roof or umbrella to the three major religions which serve as the walls or spokes to that cover. The three religions are basic to the nature and character of U.S. society; former President Eisenhower stated the relationship well in 1952, when he declared, "Our government makes no sense unless it is founded in a deeply felt religious faith." 20

JUJ perceives the democratic ideals of the U.S. as failing. Therefore, JUJ can only fall back to its most basic institution -- religion. JUJ does not revert to the U.S. Constitution, because it is not as basic or intrinsic as religion. In addition, these Jews do not choose to identify as Americans -- as did their previous generations -- but instead as Jews, whose ideals, they feel, have not been corrupted. 21

In sum, then, the development of JUJ may be attributed to societal events of the 1960's, augmented by the radical nature of Judaism which serves as a justification for radicalism of JUJ members.


21 The return to religion is also true of hippies, who have turned to the 'religion of drugs,' the New Left has developed the 'religion of confrontation as fun.' My titles are not scientific; however, the significant factor in each of these cases is the return to religion-deserting U.S. society as a framework for an ideal type.
CHAPTER V

JUJ AND THE COMMUNITY

In preparing this chapter, I sent questionnaires to the leaders of the Washington, D.C., Jewish community. All groups with membership exceeding 200 received a questionnaire. In cases of synagogues with over 200 adult members, the rabbi from that particular synagogue was the person I questioned; the reason for this is primarily because the rabbi is the only official of the synagogue whose position is permanent (although rabbis do move to different congregations, their position is not determined on the basis of terms -- usually one or two years).

In the case of youth groups, the questionnaire was sent to the indigenous youth leaders of that group. For example, in the case of one Zionist youth group, the group is led by a local Washingtonian (age 22), and a Shaliach (youth worker from Israel) here for two years solely to work with that organization; the Shaliach returns to Israel as soon as his two-year stay is complete. (For an estimation of the relationship between JUJ and the non-Jewish leadership, See Appendix III).

A copy of the questionnaire appears as an appendix to the paper (Appendix I). I received answers -- either ver-
bally or in writing -- from 32 of the 47 people questioned. In some cases, the respondent did not answer the questions on the basis of what he felt to be insufficient knowledge of the group. Some of the respondents suggested that their responses be treated in an anonymous fashion. Other people interviewed -- aside from community-group leaders -- include businessmen, professionals, who have dealt with JUJ and others who were recommended by other respondents as valuable people to question regarding JUJ.

In a real way, implicit in JUJ's philosophy is a constant questioning of motives and policies of the Washington Jewish community. JUJ members maintain that the Judaism of the established third generation Jews is irrelevant to young people, and they view it as their goal to make Judaism relevant. In addition, JUJ has attacked various aspects of the Jewish community for what JUJ felt were discriminatory practices. With this introduction to JUJ's approach to the Jewish community, it would be surprising to find the reception of the community a warm one, and, in point of fact, the findings in this area indicate that most of the Jewish community are critical of JUJ.

The position of the Jewish businessmen was anti-JUJ. Businessmen felt that JUJ was "... not cognizant of realities" when they attacked Jewish-owned businesses. Some businessmen felt that "JUJ is misdirected in their attacks on
Jewish storeowners;" this argument continues to the conclusion that any attack on any Jew will lead to a "... re-emergence of Naziism."

One businessman, a president of a supermarket chain, stated that, "... JUJ is a well-meaning but deluded group. ... They seem to believe that they have discovered THE REVEALED TRUTH, and that somehow they have been endowed with the ability to put the one and only correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures." It is significant that it was this gentleman's chain that JUJ boycotted because of his sale of California grapes based on the principle of "Oshek" (see Chapter II).

Regarding the use of Scriptures and the boycott, he continues, "I do not believe that JUJ has used the Scriptures fairly, at least in the way they have been applied to our case. ... I think it is fair to say that there are as many interpretations of the Scriptures as there are words in it. Nevertheless, JUJ seems to feel fully qualified to determine the meaning of the Scriptures and then to apply that meaning in specific circumstances in furtherance of their own political, economic and social philosophy."

This comment serves as an illustration of the division between third and fourth generation Jews. The third generation Jew, somewhat more insecure in hisAmericanness, is flexible in his interpretation of the Scriptures and other Judaic
laws. The fourth generation Jew, more secure in his Americaness, adheres rigidly to Judaic laws and Scriptures. The third generation Jew uses Scriptures to fit whatever case with which he happens to be dealing (e.g., "... as many interpretations... as there are words in it") -- which leaves sufficient flexibility to adopt whatever approach may be convenient. JUJ, as fourth generation Jews, when using the Scriptures, use them as a complete entity -- i.e., not selectively or adopting whatever interpretation to be most useful at a given time.

He goes on to state, "what is regrettable about JUJ... like so many of its kindred radical groups, is a blind, dogmatic, self-righteous, uncompromising approach which can only exacerbate our (society's) problems." Although responding to my questionnaire, this businessman might be considered a spokesman for the Washington Jewish businessmen.

There was one exception among businessmen to a strongly anti-JUJ position. A real estate broker, and owner of his own realty company, feels that JUJ is "performing a positive function for our community." He stated that he thought JUJ was one of the only Jewish groups in Washington "genuinely trying to aid the Negro." This respondent, as a matter of fact, has attended several JUJ meetings -- including the 1968 Freedom Seder -- and was "quite impressed with the group."
A member of B'nai B'rith, a Jewish fraternal organization, composed mainly of businessmen, he persuaded his lodge to invite JUJ representatives to a meeting to discuss the group's goals and projects. He "... was disappointed, but not surprised" at the lodge's negative reaction to JUJ; however, he explains the feelings of hostility by the fact that many of the Washington Jewish businessmen are the same people JUJ criticizes.

The Jewish professional, i.e., those employed by Jewish groups in a leadership capacity other than rabbis (usually a social worker), was basically anti-JUJ. This is not surprising as JUJ has often-times taken anti-Jewish community positions, and has been critical of the Jewish community. The specific people of whom they are critical are the Jewish professionals, for the Jewish organization is personified and administered by the professional, and it is from the Jewish professional and organization, that they expect the closest identification with their philosophy, and have not received this comaradery.

The Regional Director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith stated, "I feel now even more strongly that the thrust of this movement -- as I stated earlier to [Mike] Tabor -- is counterproductive of the basic goals sought to be achieved by the Jewish community." An example of a professional's reaction to a JUJ position may be seen in his
statement: "... The group (JUJ) represents no more than 35 - 50 persons, no one of whom had theretofore been involved significantly or otherwise in Jewish community activities or institutions (see Chapter IV for an exact breakdown of JUJ members and their involvement in the Jewish community). Its survey (the JUJ 1967 survey) ... was largely a series of telephone calls, and when publicized brought varied and intense reaction about its allegation that Washington Jewish organizations are too little involved in social action. Major criticisms were that the study shows [a] lack of understanding of the Jewish community and their Jewish organizations function; failure to mention traditional activist organizations; and/or its stop beating your wife approach."

Other Jewish professionals were equally vocal about their dissatisfaction with JUJ. One respondent said: "JUJ is a problem group in the Jewish community. Their entire approach presents special dangers to individual inner-city Jews. As a group committed to revolutionizing urban society, their interest in the Jewish community is mainly for the purpose of helping to achieve this larger goal. From their point of view if the "revolution" required the sacrifice of the Jewish community, they would be prepared to work for this for the greater goal of mankind. ... In this writer's opinion the Urban Justice they preach can more aptly be called Jewish injustice."
The youth leader interviewed expressed an interesting opinion. He felt that JUJ was "youth group oriented;". JUJ, he argued, is less concerned with reaction of adults in the community rather than with the community's youth. "They are hoping to involve young people in their organization," and therefore must appeal to young people. The youth worker felt that "JUJ offered an alternative to being part of the established Jewish community" which he felt necessary; however, he was opposed to JUJ's "continual anti-Jewish comments."

The Jewish professionals, even the youth leaders, felt that JUJ was, at worst distorting the Scriptures (Bible), and at best, unconsciously misusing them. One respondent stated, "Only some of the policy statements and actions are based on Scriptures. Like most revolutionary groups, JUJ feels justified in using every technique available to them to accomplish their ends. Using Scriptures is part of their approach."

A second respondent noted "Just as much as any other Jewish organization or individual Jew, JUJ is entitled to complete freedom in interpreting and using the Scriptures. Whether it uses them with good effect depends entirely upon its achievements. I do look askance upon . . . [some of the applications they have made based upon the Scriptures]."

Mr. Silverman of the Anti-Defamation League added, "My observation of its [JUJ] activities is that it is not based as it alleges on the Jewish Scriptures but that it rather elects
to engage in some program which will telescope some kind of a public image, after which it leans on Scriptural material seeking to justify its posture."

The position of Washington’s rabbis vis-a-vis JUJ is interesting to note, in that the only group in the established Jewish community that has a large number of its members supporting JUJ is the rabbinate. This does not mean that all Washington’s rabbis support JUJ, but most of the professionals who do favor JUJ are rabbis. It appears to be worthwhile investigating this phenomenon. A significant difference, between rabbis and other professional Jewish community workers, is that rabbis are trained in broad and universal aspects of Judaism, e.g., Scriptures, Jewish history (in which, incidentally, some rabbis have traditionally served a gadflyish role — e.g., 19th Century Rabbi David Einhorn of Baltimore, Maryland); rabbis, it might be argued, are concerned with basic principles of Judaism, while professional community workers are concerned with narrower — or community — aspects of Judaism. For instance, whereas all the Jewish professionals interviewed mentioned in some form the effect of JUJ on the non-Jewish community and anti-Semitism, not one of the rabbis interviewed mentioned this — even in passing.

A second significant difference between Jewish professionals and rabbis is the scope of their involvement — i.e., with whom they deal, and towards what ends. The Jew-
ish professional deals with individuals and groups that associate with his organization; the professional reacts either positively or negatively to a person or group depending on how he perceives the individual's connection with his organization. An individual that, the professional feels, will be detrimental in any way to his organization will be viewed negatively by him.

A rabbi, on the other hand, is committed to the interests of all Jews in his community, as well as his congregation. Rabbis are concerned with alienated Jewish youth as well as his board of directors. The rabbi supports all Jews and all Jewish causes; this support may be tacit, or even non-existent; however, the rabbi -- at least -- supports their right to exist. ¹

This difference in approach between rabbis and professionals may be seen through Herberg's analytical framework. The Jewish professionals are third generation Jews and deal primarily with third generation Jews. Rabbis, alternatively, although members of the third generation in Judaism, must deal with all generations; their congregation, in short, is cross-generational. Whereas the rabbi may have a deeper identification with one or the other generations, he must be sufficiently neutral in his approach towards all generations

¹There are, of course, exceptions to this rule; however, I maintain that most rabbis do follow this approach.
so as not to hamper his effectiveness in operating with all his congregation.

This proved to be the case with rabbi's response regarding JUJ. Rabbis' comments varied from critical to praising; however, the one common variable to all the responses was the notion that JUJ should continue to exist. One rabbi of a Reform congregation, for example, stated: "... JUJ has on occasion performed useful and important actions. On other occasions they have been destructive and less than honest. I suspect this will continue to be so in the future. ... If I had power to decide whether or not the group should operate in Washington, I should vote decisively to have them operate."

The National Director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, said that although "... my contact with the organization has been quite limited... what I know of the organization recommends it to me very warmly, especially what appears to be its philosophy that Judaism has something to say in the attempt to correct the inequities of our social situation."

A third rabbi paralleled JUJ to the prophets of ancient Israel, thereby legitimizing their program and projects from a Biblical approach. He stated: "They do not want to disassociate themselves from Judaism though they are uncomfortable with the Jewish community as they see
it, and therefore, in the prophetic tradition, they are acting out their opposition as critics of the Jewish community and of its values."

This rabbi maintains that JUJ... share(s) the strength and weaknesses of much of the New Left. Their methods cause anger. Their means may be counter-productive. They sometimes are interested in confrontation for the sake of confrontation. They disturb people. They make people uncomfortable. What is good about the organization is that it provides a means whereby alienated and angry young people can express their idealism and their dissatisfaction as identified Jews. What is bad is that the New Left is sometimes doctrinaire and slogan-slinging, and these young people are no exception."

The attitude of the rabbis seems to be most concisely stated by Rabbi Harold White, who, in addition to holding a congregation of his own in Washington, is also "religious advisor" to JUJ. White states: "I believe that JUJ can bring marginal and alienated Jews back to Jewish identification. The group must learn how to function in association with the Jewish establishment so that the latter is not "turned off" as has been the case in the past."

In sum, the rabbis support JUJ's existence as beneficial to the community; however, in order for JUJ to have the kind of success the rabbis envisage, JUJ will have to change their methods of operation.
One of the most interesting phenomena present throughout the responses of the rabbis was in regard to JUJ's usage of the Scriptures. Although there were differences of opinion as to what and how much usage JUJ was making of the Scriptures, all the responding rabbis felt that JUJ's usage of the Scriptures was fair, and "... do not represent a false application of Scripture and Talmudic source."

In sum, whereas the rabbis of Washington view JUJ with favor -- or at least not unfavourably -- the Jewish businessman and professional administrator are dissatisfied with JUJ. The professional especially, views JUJ as a threat to him and fears JUJ criticism and its entire focus; i.e., the professional, perhaps motivated by feelings of self-interest, is of the opinion that change and programs affecting the Jewish community should proceed through established channels and organizations. The professional discredits criticism of himself -- and the Jewish community -- on the grounds that they are unjustified, and that criticism of Jewish groups necessarily leads to development of anti-Semitism amongst the non-Jewish community.

This concern with anti-Semitism is a characteristic of third generation Jews. The third generation Jew, still somewhat insecure in his Americanness, worries about the reaction of the non-Jewish community to his actions, and therefore acts in such a way as to attempt avoiding inter-ethnic group conflict on the basis of his actions.
The fourth generation Jew, secure in his Americaniness, is not overly concerned with the reaction of non-Jews to his actions or statements. The fourth generation Jew is striving for a stronger Jewish -- rather than American -- identity.

The professional Jew, necessarily, must be antagonistic towards JUJ; this does not mean to say that JUJ, by individual actions and statements, has not warranted antagonism, but even if the group's community relations were handled so skillfully as to prevent criticism, the nature of the group and the goals of the group are such that the community must view them with apprehension.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMATION AND EVALUATION

This thesis has examined the Jews for Urban Justice, their philosophy, structure, activities and relations with the Washington Jewish community. Major concern in the paper has been with notions of generational conflict -- primarily, as espoused by Will Herberg -- as the primary level of explanation regarding JUJ and its existence. A second major area of explanation has centered on JUJ as a radical group and its relations with a non-radical milieu.

This paper has developed what the author perceives as the underlying causes of intra-religious group conflict; that is the level of commitment to the religion of different generations, and the effect of societal variables on these generations. The fourth generation Jew is more deeply committed to and secure in his religion than the third generation Jew -- albeit his definition of religion differs from his preceding generation; in addition, the nature of the societal events and its amount of influence (the medium -- television, etc.) seem to have a deeper impact on youth rather than adults. It is primarily for these reasons that JUJ developed the way it did, and especially, vis-à-vis the Jewish community.
It is JUJ's commitment to radicalism and Judaism that set it apart from the Jewish community. The basing of radicalism on principles of Judaism and an analysis of U.S. society is a marriage which the Jewish community cannot accept. As one respondent stated, "Those of us who have sacrificed much and, indeed, are up to the ears in a continuous battle for the separation of church and state, can have little respect for a group that breaches that separation."

In evaluating JUJ, there are two primary factors that must be considered; the role JUJ plays in the community and JUJ-community relations.

The reason for considering the role JUJ plays in the community, is that it is on this basis that JUJ defines its own success. The radical organization has had varying degrees of success with its programs; some, e.g., the Freedom Seder, were considered successful, while others, e.g., the grape boycott, were considered less successful. More important, however, is the role JUJ plays in an ideological framework. It offers alienated Jewish youth an outlet from their alienation within a Jewish context. What is important in this observation, is that rabbis and Jewish scholars throughout North America greatly fear the effects of Jewish assimilation into the non-Jewish society on Jewish life in North
America. They are of the opinion that Jewish assimilation will ultimately lead to the gradual elimination of Judaism. JUJ offers an avenue through Judaism for alienated Jewish youth who otherwise would have little -- or no -- connection with Judaism. For this reason, if nothing else, JUJ serves a useful purpose to the Jewish population of Washington, D.C.

The area in which JUJ has encountered its greatest difficulty is the field of community relations. If JUJ hopes to have a strong influence on the Jewish community, the group must be cognizant of community values and attitudes; JUJ must have a receptive community in order to affect change among Washington Jews. JUJ's programs and statements have been planned -- it seems -- without considering the receptiveness of the community. In other words, if what JUJ has to say (the message) is valid, then it must be more concerned with the transmission of this ideology (the medium).

1See for example:

Yehezkiel Kaufman, Golah v'Nekhar ("Exile and Alienhood"), Tel Aviv, 1954.


The general negative attitude of the community towards JUJ was apparent throughout my research. In addition to the opinions presented in Chapter V, at least two respondents tried to discredit the group by questioning the validity and relevance of my studying their role. One respondent stated, "Please forgive me, but I have an all-consuming curiosity as to how and why a university accepts a Master's thesis dealing with an organization that is so new and has had such little experience in the field of its own particular interest." A second respondent opined, "This respondent thinks that a small fringe group like JUJ doesn't warrant the serious study that is implied by the questionnaire."

It is true that this paper adopted primarily a case-study approach; however, the relevance of the study is testified to by the development of similar JUJ-type groups in several metropolitan areas throughout North America, including, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Seattle, Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, and several other cities. By understanding the development of JUJ and its problems, perhaps other groups will be able to better overcome some of their difficulties, especially in the area of community relations.

In returning to Herberg's thesis of inter-generational conflict, however, we must conclude that the basic differences between third and fourth generation Jews are irreconcilable; at least to the extent that the third generation Jew is not
prepared to accept the fourth generation's philosophy --
regardless of the presentation of that philosophy. The
religious and national security felt by the fourth generation
allows him to analyze his surroundings with a particular Jew­
ish ideological outlook; the third generation Jew, not sharing
the fourth generation's security, cannot accept the approach
and philosophy of the younger Jew. To accept the fourth gen­
eration's approach, the third generation Jew would have to
experience what the fourth generation feels, and being of a
different generation precludes that.

The differences between third and fourth generation
Jews appear to be irreconcilable, and no appeal (via the medium)
is likely to bring them closer together. Inter-generational
conflict is a fact of life, and so long as each generation
maintains its unique value system, there exists little chance
of eliminating this conflict.
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APPENDIX III

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JUJ AND JEWISH LAY COMMUNITY

The relationship between JUJ and the Jewish lay community is included as an appendix -- rather than an integral part of Chapter V -- because there has been little contact between the two groups; more significantly, JUJ has dealt primarily with Jewish organizations and some Jewish businessmen. In addition, much of the information assembled herein comes from secondary sources -- i.e., Jewish professionals and JUJ members.

This survey was conducted at a Jewish summer camp in August, 1969. All the people interviewed were parents of campers (minimum camping age: 10 years), and therefore third generation Jews.

Of the 100 lay people whose opinion of JUJ I asked, 22 (%) had not heard of JUJ; 10 (%) viewed JUJ favourably, 54 (%) viewed JUJ disfavourably, and 14 (%) were uncertain as to their feelings regarding JUJ.

Jewish professionals -- including rabbis -- felt that JUJ's policies tend to alienate the Jewish community. What association JUJ does have with the community, it has been said, is negative. JUJ adopts the position of the New Left -- at least as the community perceives it -- and this position is not appreciated by the Jewish community. Several
of the older people active in JUJ agree with this observation, and feel that JUJ must be careful in statements and actions not to further alienate the Jewish community.

One specific instance of JUJ relations with the Jewish community followed the release of the JUJ survey on the Jewish community organizations in 1968. Tabor tells of several calls he had from the community condemning the survey and JUJ for publishing it; Tabor recalls that the major opposition to the survey was the fear that its publication would bring new surges of anti-Semitism from the non-Jewish population. In addition, several of the people called Tabor and JUJ members "anti-Semitic."