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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

Historically, the study of rhetoric has involved an outward directed communication which had the purpose of persuading an audience to an action. This analysis of the rhetorical act developed from an Aristotelian definition and needs revision for contemporary rhetorical modes being used by minority groups in the process of developing an identity. In many of these groups we see a rhetoric composed of messages designed not to effect change in an external audience, but rather designed to define self. While self is singular in many sociological studies, it is used in a community sense by both Theodor Reik and Simon N. Herman in reference to identity. Thus, it shall be used in that manner throughout the study.

The prime directive of minority groups in the sixties and seventies has been the development of a recognizable profile which not only expresses their personality to a majority audience, but more importantly, creates an atmosphere of individual dignity and worth. In the Black civil rights movement, for example, this self identity is called "Black Pride."
For the American Indian, self-identity is expressed by a code which states:

It appears that what is needed is genuine contemporary creative thinking, democratic leadership to set guidelines, cues and goals for the average Indian. The guidelines and cues have to be based on true Indian philosophy geared to modern times. This will not come about without nationalistic pride in one's self and one's own kind.

This group can evolve only from today's college youth. Not from those who are ashamed, or those who have sold out, or those who do not understand true Indianism. Only from those with pride and love and understanding of the People and the People's ways from which they come can this evolve. And this' appears to be the major task of the National Indian Youth Council—for without a people, how can one have a cause?

This writer says this because he is fed up with religious workers and educationalists incapable of understanding, and pseudo-social scientists who are consciously creating social and cultural genocide among American Indian Youth.

I am disturbed to the point of screaming when I see American Indian youth accepting the horror of "American conformity," as being the only way for Indian progress. While those who do not join the great American mainstream are regarded as "incompetents and problems."

The National Indian Youth Council must introduce to this sick room of stench and anonymity some fresh air of new Indianness. A fresh air of new honesty and integrity, a fresh air of new Indian idealism, a fresh air of a new Greater Indian America.

The Women's Rights movement also has its own identity rhetoric expressed in the symbolic communication of "Ms." and "Chairperson" which is characteristic of minority self-definition. A 1971 work, Up Against the Wall, Mother,
makes the concept clear in its introduction where it states:

Rebellion--the focus of the present Women's Liberation movement--is the theme of this book; rebellion against the traditional definitions of woman; against male assumptions about her functions in society; against her systematic exploitation as a sex object, wife, mother, and worker; against the gigantic brainwashing that serves in place of her education and which begins so early— that, by the time she is five years old, she understands and accepts the fact that certain jobs are closed to her . . .

Thus, the struggle for identity has become increasingly significant to minority movements.

Identity rhetoric is necessary for the continuance of any program or campaign. If the individuals involved do not see reason for, or deem themselves worthy of, the goals of the movement, they cannot succeed in attaining the unity necessary to achievement. This is to say that unless the members of a minority group can reach a form of agreement concerning how they are to react to the majority society, they will be unable to deal with social situations which affect their daily lives. Beyond this though, it is imperative that the minority group member be certain enough of his own place in the group that he can have confidence that community action is in his own best interest. Because of this, minority members select identity groups which fulfill personality functions for them. Identity rhetoric, then, is both designed to attract members to a group and to unify the group which has already been bound together by external forces.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop a form of rhetorical model which can deal with rhetoric of identity. The concept of inward, rather than outward rhetoric is, I believe, unique in the realm of rhetorical theory and has merit as a significantly fresh area for study. While many sociologists have investigated concepts of identity building, relatively little has been done in the area by rhetorical theorists. The concept is alluded to in several Black studies works, but I have found few rhetorical models for identity rhetoric in the large number of sources that have been investigated.

An attempt is made herein to develop the concept of this rhetoric of self-identity and to demonstrate how it influences the doctrines of a specific minority group. The concept may not, however, apply solely to minority or special interest groups.

The following chapters define the study in terms of the development of the rhetorical situation, describe and analyze the rhetoric of the American Jewish Community, and develop a paradigm for identity rhetoric among minority groups from the observations of one specific minority.

Focus of the Study

During the 1972 Presidential elections a significant amount of energy was spent by the Democratic Party in an
attempt to woo the vote of the Jewish-American populace which has developed into an important segment of the American society. They have been oppressed under about every system of government since their history began and yet they have survived to develop strong power bases in many countries.

They have been chosen as the specific subject of this study as a result of an earlier course which was concerned with minority rhetoric and movements. A brief paper dealing with the rhetoric of the American Jew led to a belief that a significant, but relatively unstudied, body of material exists upon which to superimpose a critical analysis.

A research reading of approximately four hundred speeches encompassing the rhetoric from the 1930's to the present has resulted in the conviction that several categories of rhetorical strategy exist in the American-Jewish community and that the thread that ties them together is the existence of the nation of Israel as a geo-political and religious reality in the Middle East. This existence calls for the American Jew to adopt a specific rhetorical identity in reference to the importance of Israel to himself. Simon N. Herman has labeled this identification as a "marking off" of oneself in response to reference groups.

The rhetorical strategies are definable in the same general categories as those already established by Dr. James Golden and Dr. Richard Rieke in *The Rhetoric of Black*
That it may be seen as a rhetoric which establishes a Jewish identity in accord with separation, assimilation and revolution is possible. Jewish rhetoric is uniquely suited to this study in that with the exception of several radical groups of small size, the majority of the rhetoric tends to be directed primarily inward to the Jewish people rather than outward to the mainstream of American society.

The definable positions of the Jewish rhetoric are the "survivalists," the "near assimilationists," and the "Zionists." Simply stated, the survivalist strategy is separation, the near assimilationist strategy is adaptation, and the Zionist tendency is toward reaction. The latter's goals are often in reference to Palestine rather than to the United States. Categories of overlap exist in the rhetoric where definition is difficult, but the quest for self-identity is observable in each.

It becomes readily apparent, however, that in dealing with Jewish rhetorical strategies, the researcher cannot assume them to be identical to the Black positions of the Golden-Rieke study. A divided category must be used which splits the "assimilationist" strategy and in fact becomes very important to this study.

Because total assimilation is in reality anathema to the Jewish populace as a whole, there is no true rhetorical position for the Jewish secularist who wishes to renounce
completely his ethnic identity and be recognized solely as an "American." While these people exist, this transfer of reference point to a Gentile society removes them from the American-Jewish community both by their own will and by rejection from other Jewish people.

Thus, the strategy which is involved in the study is a "near assimilationist" position that depends upon a redefinition of Jewishness and removes the political ties with Israel to allow the person to operate freely in the American society. This strategy is divisive in the Jewish society, but remains as an important rhetorical position for a large segment of the American-Jewish community.

Lengthy study has led to the realization that the assimilationist stance, then, is significantly different for the Jewish population than for the Black population in America in regard to its goals.

In line with this, the assignment of guilt for being oppressed is often inwardly directed, rather than outward to the Gentile societies. So, unlike the position of many minority groups which blame oppression upon "Whitey" or "the man," the research indicates a rhetoric of self-motivation to overcome oppression instead of a rhetoric of blame.

In the rhetorical studies, speakers have been chosen primarily for the form of addresses that they have made. I looked particularly for primary sources which could be
readily verified, that had accuracy of content in that we know that they were transcribed directly from the speaking of the person, and were representative of the wide range of Jewish rhetoric.

Intensive study has indicated that the rhetoric has not changed significantly since the earliest of immigrants came to the United States. The focus has always been the negation or affirmation of Israel as an identifying object in relationship to the Judaic religion. Other sub-topics have surfaced at times, but a political state in Israel has singular prominence. Important rhetoric has been that of men who have been significant in American policy. Justice Louis Brandeis, for one, is very important to the structure. Abba Hillel Silver, a prominent Rabbi, was another person whose rhetoric has been exceedingly influential to the Jewish-American community and was inwardly directed.

I have found it better to limit the study to particular spokesmen who dealt with identity in relationship to Israel rather than attempting to cover a broad range of sub-topics concerning Jewish identity. Because of this, there will be some overlaps. The speakers are not highly consistent, as even in the Black movement Dr. Martin Luther King was not thoroughly consistent in his rhetoric of non-violence. The speakers often parrot the feelings of the majority of the people, (or the seeming majority of the Jewish people around them), and in doing so, they change their positions.
But generally, the rhetoric is singular in nature; it is specific; and it is worthy of research and study.

Further study indicates that in fact the identities are very much overlapping. The survivalist, for example, has espoused a Judaic tradition. Identity, then, is better analyzed for him in terms of a breakdown between the political concept of being an Israeli and the religious concept of being a Jew.

In contemporary times, especially those following the 1967 war, the Survivalists in their Judaic custom and their Judaic tradition see Jewish identity as more important than the nation of Israel even though they identify with Israel. Many Zionists turn to a political structure which is endeavoring to unite them with a national identity that is called Israeli. So the two have very similar goals in the maintenance of an identity which is held for two different purposes. Beyond this, many of the younger members of the Jewish community in America are found to be non-religious. Their affiliation with Israel is predominantly because of political interest. Yet, the older set of Jews and the upper-middle class financially are more orthodox in their religion. In the maintenance of an identity, the leaders have assumed an exigency. That exigency is the loss of those characteristics that they hold to be specifically Jewish.
There has been speculation as to whether the trend toward an identity persists in the third generation since 1948. While many of the second generation Jews have been in a conflict between immigrant parents and themselves, the third generation finds itself a product of an entirely new inheritance. Each new generation is a product of its environment. But among these younger people is found a generation of people who have benefited from improvements in Jewish education, Jewish day schools, and Jewish-oriented activities. Thus, they find themselves highly aligned with the ancestoral faith which gave substance to their Jewish identity for the parents. They must still, however, react to a relationship to Israeliness and Israel as a nation.

There is a wide difference in Jewish identities in the United States, and two contemporary problems have created this effect. One came in the late 1930's, early 1940's with the European Jews, especially those in Germany under Adolph Hitler in what has been termed the "Holocaust." The second problem which has brought about a crisis in Jewish identity was the 1967 war. The six-day war established the nation of Israel as a political entity which achieved prominence in world affairs. Israel became a factor in peace for the major nations whether or not they were aligned with either side. Thus, the recent oil crisis which stemmed somewhat from the alignment of some major nations with Israel has brought an even further political
impact upon the world thereby affecting the Jewish identity.

A renewal of identification with the Zionists towards the Israeli conflict has begun, and because of the rhetoric produced by the Zionists, some of the Survivalists are being turned more directly into an alignment with Israel both as a political entity and as a religious structure.

In Israel, the Jews have been somewhat free to shape their identity in whatever way they will. What form the Jewish identity is taking in America is really the purpose of this dissertation, and it is recognizable that it is predominantly rhetorical in nature.  

Many studies demonstrate that Jewish identity is being sought. The development of this Jewish identity is of interest to us because in the United States it is dependent upon rhetorical means rather than by any form of direct physical action. For the 1960's, and to some degree earlier than that, the establishment of the Jewish Defense League under Rabbi Kahane is one evidence of this search. But those activities have dwindled in recent years as Kahane has moved his headquarters to Israel, after having been arrested in a conspiracy plot that involved some violence, and his followers have rapidly fallen off to small local groupings of people which primarily are inner-city in nature and are protective for neighborhood residents rather than seeking a Jewish identity as such.
Methodology of the Study

The method of the study has been the usage of the analysis by Lloyd Bitzer of the rhetorical situation and its application of each message to its individual audience among the Jewish groups. Thus, the development of the audiences is crucial to the analysis of the messages.

The study is both historical and critical. Data have been gathered on the important events influencing and influenced by the Jewish rhetoric over the past three decades in the United States. This involves a collection of speeches and articles from Jewish sources similar to the materials found in the Rhetoric of Black Americans. The critical methodology is applied to categorize and evaluate the impact of the rhetoric upon Jewish-American people. Quantitative studies of the membership and leadership of groups in relationship to the strategies of the minority as a whole demonstrate trends in the direction of the Jewish movement.

Among the Jewish groups, the factioning found in the Black movement is atypical and the leadership tends to speak for larger groupings than those found in the Black rhetoric making identification easier.

To accomplish the study, I have isolated speakers from each major division, and have provided a critical analysis of their messages. The speakers themselves are not as important as the message they communicate. These are recognized leaders who speak for a broad representation of
Jewish viewpoints. These spokesmen have been chosen on the basis of their recognized leadership by virtue of positions held within the American-Jewish community; their identifiability as persons with credibility among the Jewish population; the impact of their rhetoric within the community; and the alignment of their position within recognized studies of American-Jewish populations such as the study by Simon N. Herman.¹⁰

As already stated, a reading survey of nearly four hundred speeches and thirty-five books on the American-Jewish community was undertaken to gain a familiarity with the topic of the study. This survey has given a selection of speakers whose names consistently reappear in scholarly studies as leaders of merit. This lent increased confidence to the ability to select speakers who are truly representative of major positions.

The concepts and strategies defined in the study are thus a result of the evolution of ideas generated by research and have not been an attempt to find isolated cases which prove a pre-drawn conclusion.

The methodology of the study is defensible in several respects. First of all, it has been applied with success to similar studies of other minority groups—it is the primary methodology for many rhetorical studies extant.¹¹

Secondly, critical analysis of any rhetorical system can be useful for developing paradigms which may in turn
be used to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of communication upon social groups.

The third consideration was the potential for new criteria being developed for identity rhetoric. If the methodology developed herein can be successfully applied to the Jewish rhetorician, it may open the way for the development of a new method of approaching similar rhetorical situations.

The study itself is defensible as a contributor to an increased body of knowledge about ethnic rhetoric. It can strengthen understandings concerning the purpose and effect of rhetoric upon audiences.

The Rhetorical Situation

There is then an emerging rhetorical situation. The exigency is a lack of defined identity. The lack is compounded by a triad of alternatives which are all readily accessible to the American-Jewish person. The audience for the speaker is the American Jew. It is an ethnic minority group that has existed, as we have already pointed out, under a number of different governments. It is one of the oldest of the ethnic groups. It is one of the most highly structured of the ethnic groupings and this audience, indeed, finds among its members large groupings of people who can act upon the rhetoric.
The rhetoric calls for an action. The action is either to assimilate into American society and not become involved very often with Israel as an entity other than as a political structure or, it calls for an action by an audience which is in terms of survival or separation into ethnic groupings. It is very similar to the concept of Jewish pride that would parallel the Black Power concept of the 1960's, or it can take the form of an audience that is being called upon to return to Israel to become highly involved in the Israeli-Arab conflict, or at least in the rebuilding of Israel as a nation. Any one of these three alternatives can be chosen in terms of taking direct action.

The constraints are likewise obvious. The constraints are in terms of the biases that the American tradition has placed upon the Jewish people; the changes in the manner of life that have come about as a result of being involved in a highly industrialized, Western culture; the stereotypes which have been developed in accord with such strategies as Zionism; the stigma that is sometimes attached to those who openly advocate such a return; the anti-Semitic feeling that comes about in relationship to the Jew who takes a position in the area of an identity; all of these things have created a situation whereby those who wish to assimilate are even more highly constrained than those who have chosen a Survivalist or Zionist position. Yet, in all three cases, there remains an inward-directed
rhetoric which is designed primarily to tell the person who he is and to preserve group identity.

The rhetorical situation then is constrained at the point at which the person refuses to accept that identity from the rhetorical action because of one of these characteristic results. The development of an identity is a crucial factor for ethnic peoples and minority groupings in the United States. The relationship that the United States has with its world neighbors has created a situation where people who have immigrated from those neighbors into the United States need to decide whether they are to be recognized as Americans or as immigrants, which is the singular issue at hand.

Problems of the Study

Limiting the study to a manageable body of material was the primary problem encountered. To branch off into a number of areas was enticing. Other research problems included the lack of recent empirical studies to test the hypotheses involving percentages of the population in each category. While some have been attempted, most are dated prior to 1967 and thus do not accurately represent present trends.

That there is an exigency is evident. Simon N. Herman in Israeli and Jews: The Continuity of Identity, recognizes that:
The problems that beset efforts to maintain a Jewish identity have become increasingly complex in recent decades. The cultures of the Western World, in which the greater part of the Jewish people now lives, exercise a powerful attraction, and Jews in many countries are either searching for ways to preserve distinct Jewish identity in these cultures, or where it is preserved, to give it meaningful content. The problems that beset efforts to maintain a Jewish identity have become increasingly complex in recent decades. The cultures of the Western World, in which the greater part of the Jewish people now lives, exercise a powerful attraction, and Jews in many countries are either searching for ways to preserve distinct Jewish identity in these cultures, or where it is preserved, to give it meaningful content. The problems that beset efforts to maintain a Jewish identity have become increasingly complex in recent decades. The cultures of the Western World, in which the greater part of the Jewish people now lives, exercise a powerful attraction, and Jews in many countries are either searching for ways to preserve distinct Jewish identity in these cultures, or where it is preserved, to give it meaningful content.

There are indications that while the third generation accepts the fact of Jewish affiliation, the content of Jewishness is considerably diluted for many of them. The problem of many third generation Jews is not one of identifying with the Jewish group, but rather of giving distinctiveness to that identity.

Rabbi Meir Kahane founded the Jewish Defense League in 1968 to meet the problem of a waning identity. He scathingly attacked the Jewish establishments in Scarsdale, Shaker Heights, Evanston, and other upper-middle to upper income areas for attempting to "melt" into American society and forgetting about the Jews in the ghettos of Bedford-Stuyvesant and Chicago's West Side. Kahane claims that the Jewish Defense League ... came into being to go out among Jews and instill within them a feeling of Jewish pride, to defend them from simply fading out. Our major goal is to come to Jews—particularly young Jews— and say, 'Jewish' is beautiful. Be proud that you are a Jew. Identify with it.

The one problem that was the most difficult to solve in the beginning of this study was the finding of American-Jewish people who see themselves as assimilationists. They
certainly exist and they have been attacked very strongly by Zionists like Meir Kahane. Abba Eban has spoken often of the American Jew who, he says, has thrown away his identity to become an American. These people with the Jewish ancestry and still holding some of the ethnic traits and some of the Jewish religion seem to be those who have most adequately become part of the American system—the American system being that which provides for them an identity that is separate from Israel and separate from a Jewish religious identity. It was at this point that it became very evident that a new category for assimilation was necessary, thus the division into two forms that was mentioned earlier.

We see in the New Left, for example, some Jewish Americans, Rubin and Hoffman being two who are predominantly involved in political action in the United States but not predominantly in relationship to ethnic position as Jews. Leadership also has come from those men who have gained large amounts of wealth or very high position who are of Jewish lineage, such as Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who again does not predominantly speak in terms of relationship to Israel, but instead speaks in terms of being an American who is interested from a position of wealth or a position of power or just from his own personal bent in being labeled as an American.

But these are not representative of the small core of Jewish-American people who are represented by the
American Council for Judaism. The goals of this group are to interpret Jewishness as a religious rather than ethnic category, and thus allow for freedom of movement as granted to Protestants, Catholics and other religious bodies in America. This group, then, became the object of the assimilationist viewpoint as redefined for the purpose of this study. This category is discussed earlier under "Focus of the Study," but bears repetition to demonstrate the resolution of what was at the outset a basic problem.

Inconsistencies also present problems for the study. Variables beyond the communications structure often blunt the impact of a message. Anti-semitism, for example, has not produced "survivalist" tendencies in the American-Jewish community to the same degree that it did among European Jews. Business success and social progress can explain a change in tendencies. It may be that oppression plus economic success, versus oppression plus impoverishment are stronger factors in the establishment of identity than the rhetoric of a recognized leadership, but there are variables operative here that are certainly open to careful study. No difficulties, however, seem to arise which cannot be overcome by careful research methodology.

Available Sources

Source materials for the study were readily available. The American Conference of Christians and Jews, B'nai
B'rith, and the American Jewish Committee have printed a number of pamphlets and periodicals in the last three decades. The American Jewish Committee publishes each year the speeches of the Annual American Jewish Conference, the American Jewish Congress publishes Congress Bi-Weekly which includes a vast number of rhetorical resources, and the Institute of Human Relations has published a number of secondary sources. Recently, the Xerox corporation has provided a list of available dissertations and studies about the Jewish movement with an excellent working bibliography.

The concept of the development of a Jewish identity is studied with accompanying bibliography in Theodor Reik's Curiosities of the Self and Jean Paul Sartre's Anti-Semite and Jew. Rabbi Leo Baeck in This People Israel and Erich Kahler in Jews Among the Nations, along with Morris Kertzer's Today's American Jew develop sources for the study of the identity concept. Other significant Jewish rhetoric comes from Moses Rischin, Soloman Simonson, Leonard Sussman, and Burnett Roth. Chaim Potok's fiction and several studies in the Quarterly Journal of Speech and Vital Speeches have provided materials for critical analysis.

In the field of rhetorical criticism little has been done in terms of a group or community study of the American-Jewish society. The sources that are available are
generally unpublished theses or dissertations dealing with specific men. James Dennison, for example, has completed a study of Rabbi Silver for a master's thesis at the Ohio State University. Likewise, Barbara Ann Harris did a doctoral dissertation at UCLA in 1967 on the Zionist Speeches of Louis D. Brandeis, and both have proven to be able to lend bibliography to this study for the purpose of gaining primary sources.

One work that has significant value for this study is a 1968 study by Stan Craig Johnson on the "Rhetorical Foundations of Political Zionism," a master's thesis also for the Ohio State University. This study has assisted significantly in the development of the concept of Israel as the focus of the American-Jewish identity. A specific study in Today's Speech of the Jewish Defense League by David M. Seibold has brought together some significant material on Meir Kahane.

A textbook on rhetoric, The Rhetorical Dialogue: Contemporary Concepts and Cases, by Dr. John Makay and Dr. William R. Brown, has generated ideas for the critical process especially in reference to the function of naming in the process of identity construction. Their criteria for "The Rhetorical Purpose" have likewise helped in the development of criteria for identity rhetoric. The guidelines established there are similarly applicable to inward-directed rhetoric as well as the outward rhetoric
Many of the studies which have generated ideas have come from the realm of social science. Orrin Klapp gives criteria for group identity in his *Collective Search for Identity* and Neil Smelser's *Theory of Collective Behavior* likewise has forwarded some principles which have been considered.

In fact, many academic disciplines have provided materials used in the study to this point. An anthology of ethnic literature edited by Theodore Gross entitled *A Nation of Nations* includes writings of American-Jewish authors which express in literary manner some of the objects of this study. Political scientist Lawrence Fuchs likewise has established a study of *The Political Behavior of American Jews* which gives insight into voting patterns and participation in the American governmental system.

David Rosenblatt of the Ohio Historical Society archives is presently working on a collection of materials about the Jewish Community in Columbus, Ohio. Presently, efforts are just beginning and they have been of no significant help, but the resource may become valuable to future studies.

A very important resource though, resides in the American-Jewish Archives at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. The library claims the largest collection of Jewish materials in North America and has already proven
to be helpful in the discovery of a number of the sources cited in this study.

Because there is a strong Biblical studies program at the college where I teach, the library has accumulated a number of significant holdings on the Jews both past and present, and there are large representative Jewish populations in Dayton, Canton, and Cleveland which have provided access to important interview materials. Thus, both primary and secondary sources have been readily available for study.

Some definitely helpful materials have come from unpublished dissertations that have been available from the American Jewish Studies Institute. One of those is by Moshe Amon, who did his work at Claremont Graduate School. It is called "Israel and the Jewish Identity Crisis." Another is by Itai Zak, "Jewish Background, Self-Esteem, Jewish-American Identity and Attitudes toward Israel," his work being done at New York University in 1972.

The most important help for the generation of the study has come from a work by Edmund Raas Hanauer in "An Analysis of Conflicting Jewish Positions Regarding The Nature and Political Role of the American Jews with Particular Emphasis on Political Zionism." This was a Ph.D. dissertation for American University in 1972. This particular work shows three conflicting roles for Jewish people and they are somewhat parallel to, although not the
same as, those that I wish to study from the rhetorical perspective. They do, however, give guidelines of the three alternative courses of action that can be taken by the Jewish audience as they listen to the rhetoric of the speakers. We note, then, that there are several things we must recognize at the outset. One is that the common denominator among the American Jewish people is the ethnic background that relates to their religious structure and its relationship to Israel. Beyond that there are other commonalities which include their geographical locations and their political tendencies. The rhetoric, though, does not spring specifically from geo-political structures but instead springs from organizations or people who have been brought together by the Judaic religious beliefs.

Chapter Divisions

The study is divided into seven sections: introduction and background, the analysis of the rhetorical situation, observations of three rhetorical strategies in the American Jewish community, development of a paradigm for identity rhetoric, and a summation suggesting areas for further study and application.

A significant body of material has been examined in preparation for this study. The problems have been the same as those encountered by any researcher, but none were insurmountable. The American-Jewish population offers an
interesting focus for rhetorical criticism and not much has been done with observing the rhetorical actions involved in the establishment of an identity for a minority.

The "rhetorical situation" construct is natural to identity rhetoric and it has not required being forced or stretched to make it apply. The exigency has been recognized by the Jewish people themselves; thus, the audience is open to study, and the constraints are discoverable. I am convinced that identity rhetoric is a significant factor in modern societies and therefore merits study.
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1 Theodor Reik, in his work, Curiosities of the Self, refers consistently to the term self in a collective sense in an assumption that he speaks for a majority of the people for whom he is writing. Simon N. Herman, however, uses the term as a plural in an attempt to make generalized observations rather than being restricted to speaking about only one person. This varies somewhat from the personality definition used singularly by many sociologists, but it legitimizes the usage of the term in a plural sense as it shall be used for this study.
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CHAPTER II
THE RHETORICAL SITUATION

Lloyd Bitzer in an article for Philosophy and Rhetoric, proposed that more than discourse is necessary to have a rhetorical situation. Three elements were forwarded as necessary: an exigence, an audience capable of acting upon the discourse, and constraints which either suppress or assist in attaining action. Whether or not full agreement can be found over Bitzer's categories and conclusions, the three elements lend themselves easily to structuring a rhetorical study. Using the components to organize the material assists the development of a perspective of American Jewish rhetoric and its purposes. That the discourse fits the characteristics of the "rhetorical situation" as defined by Bitzer is readily apparent even in beginning research.

A waning identity caused by interaction with other societies is immediately apparent as a focal point of discourse within the American Jewish community. Independent of the specific strategies chosen, all segments of the American Jewish population echo a call to identity throughout their speeches and literature. Casual reading discloses that regular contributions to Jewish periodicals include
discourse upon identity. Each year a full issue of Congress Bi-Weekly, the major house organ of the American Jewish Congress, devotes itself to the relationship of the American Jew to Israel in terms of the maintenance of identity.

Significant writings include the Simon N. Herman work, Israelis and Jews: the Continuity of Identity, and Theodor Reik's Curiosities of the Self. A leading Jewish historian, Rufus Learsi, similarly opened his volume with a preface recognizing the need to understand identity. Seldom in the research for this study has any publication of American Jewish origin been found which did not in a specific manner deal with concepts of identity and its maintenance.

Identity, though, is partially a historical function of character. Thus the establishment of the Jewish community in American society is essential to this study.

**Historical Background**

Jewish immigration into the United States has spanned the entire history of the country from Colonial times to the present. It has been generated by three major factors which varied in intensity in accordance with historic cycles. The three historic factors are: anti-Semitism in the European nations, the promise of a new land, and the lack of a homeland prior to 1949.

As noted in the introductory chapter, the Jewish people have been oppressed under nearly every form of
government that they have encountered. Max I. Dimont in *Jews, God, and History* concludes that it is, in fact, impossible to write a complete history of the Jewish people without compiling a history of all the nations with which they have been involved. ³ Their history covers at least four thousand years on four continents with no less than six major civilizations. They have, without homeland, survived the decline and fall of five empires into which they had integrated as an alien people, yet without a loss of cultural existence. In each form of government, including American society, there has been obvious anti-Semitism which resulted in oppression. The polar extremes seem to be the extermination attempts by the Romans under Titus, ⁴ the European Holocaust led by Hitler, and the tacit anti-Semitism of other minority groups within the United States.

Jewish community growth in American society dates primarily to the late 1800's and the rising technology in the United States. John Higham ⁵ and Morton Keller ⁶ in two separate articles conclude that the relative lack of organized anti-Semitism in the United States in comparison to the suppression of rights in Eastern and Western Europe was a prime factor in the centering of diaspora Jewry in America. ⁷

Keller points out that attitudes concerning Jews since 1930 have not had a very conspicuous place. Thus it might be better to refer to an asemitism or indifference, rather
than anti-semitism. He agrees with Charles H. Stember that attitudes in the United States have been shaped by specific events in history rather than an overall characterization of the Jewish populace.

Because anti-semitic expression is not organized and cultural pluralism is even encouraged in the United States, the nation has been attractive to those who have undergone focused persecution in Europe and Asia. The division of church and state as well as ethnic pluralism has resulted in a society which was and is conducive to the needs of those who embrace Judaism. The times when anti-semitism has been severe in America were when Jewishness was linked to an unpopular labor movement in the twenties and thirties and again when Nazi scapegoating had an impact during World War II. Beyond this, the tendency has not been national in scope. Where anti-semitism exists, it tends to be on a personal or local level and is commonly the result of stereotyping.

James Parkes in his work *Antisemitism* notes succinctly that "the attitude of a community to its laws depends upon the attitude of the law-makers to the community." Since the Western democracies have been established on a basis of the people making the laws themselves, Parkes concludes that they have been more adaptive to immigrants than those nations where the laws came from the rulers. This has resulted in immigration to the Western societies as an
avoidance of arbitrary rulers whose laws were often anti-semitic in nature.

Upon reaching America or other more democratic nations, the Jewish immigrants were often able to associate in voluntarily closed communities which gave them social support against anti-semitic actions. The precedent in non-Western societies has been the dispersion or direct supervision of such enclaves. Thus, the choice of individualism or community involvement within American society and the concomitant advantage of lessened anti-semitic actions created an atmosphere attractive to many Jewish immigrants.

This is not to say that anti-semitism was non-existent, nor that it has ceased to be a problem for the American Jew. Moses Rischin and Howard M. Sachar in recounting the history of immigration into the United States take note of the exploitation of Jewish workers in the "sweatshops" of New York and Baltimore, and the usage of anti-semitic expressions which surrounded labor problems at all levels in the urban areas.

The irony of the situation is that often the stereotypes were developed because of the exploitation of one group of Jewish immigrants by other Jewish immigrants. The garment industry in New York, for example, was owned primarily by German Jews who often took advantage of cheap immigrant labor provided by Eastern European Jews and Russian Jews. The significant income, linked with
expansion and multiple forms of ownership, led to the enhancement of stereotypes concerning the Jew. Into the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's, the stereotype of Jewish ownership of festering urban ghetto-like areas has fanned the antisemitic feelings expressed in terms reminiscent of Shakespeare's Shylock.

This exploitation of their own people has, however, given way to an opposite expression seen in the strongly liberal tendencies in the political stances of contemporary American Jewry. This seemingly unified position on human rights and civil liberties, which has spread across the full spectrum of minority civil rights legislation, has made the American Jew suspect in the eyes of strongly reactionary groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society. This reaction has similarly generated anti-semitism which is manifested in the writings and public pronouncements of these organizations, and the people that are influenced by them.

There are, then, areas in the United States where being Jewish may still bar one from effective social interaction, but there is relatively less threat from what is in fact an illegal anti-semitism than there is from nations whose governmental policies are overtly so. It is this relativity that has made the United States attractive to many diaspora Jews. The rhetorical strategies adopted to confront anti-semitism and the effects of anti-semitism in
the development of identity rhetoric are to be examined later in this study.

The second factor influencing diaspora Jewry toward immigration to the United States has been the "Great American Dream" or the "promise of a new land." The Jewish community has not been immune to the calls of democratic ideals of equality, human rights, justice, and personal success that have drawn many others into the American "melting pot" or "salad bowl." ¹⁷

Morris N. Kertzer, spiritual leader of Larchmont Temple in Larchmont, New York, summed up the feelings of many of the immigrants when he wrote in 1967:

Economically, the American picture is spectacularly bright. Although the poor Jew is by no means a phenomenon of the past—any Jewish social service agency in a large city can attest to thousands of such cases—the annual income of Jewish heads of households is $5,954 compared to $4,340 for the Catholics and $3,933 for the Protestants... What is even more remarkable, I would guess that if we examined the income of Jews who came to this country in the wake of the Hitler holocaust, the figures would probably match those of the long-time residents, even of third and fourth generations—a tribute both to the opportunities provided by the American economy and to the bootstrap-lifting quality of these people. ¹⁸

Beyond economic promise, the social promise of America is significant for the Jewish people. From birth to death, social indexes favor Jewish life in terms of longevity and lower mortality rates, lower crime rates, fewer broken homes, and remarkable old-age assistance programs. ¹⁹
Despite the historically negative problems of the urban ghettos, the massive migration of Jewish immigrants to the United States through the 1960's has resulted in America becoming a center for diaspora Jews seeking financial and social success. The achievement of this success is indicated by the present trends away from the city to suburban areas. The history of the Jews in America has been so prominently linked with urban areas that the movement to suburbia has resulted in a revival of an image of the United States as a diaspora "promised land."

Moses Rischin notes that even in early immigration (1870-1914) the Jewish people saw America in terms of promise and attainment of ideals. This "Great American Dream" is not at all unlike the viewpoints of other immigrant minorities except that the odds of achieving it were assisted considerably by the range of business abilities that the Jews brought with them from other countries.

By 1959, researchers were indicating that the majority of American Jews had already established themselves in the middle class of American society. Albert I. Gordon in Jews in Suburbia attributed this upward mobility to the realization that the Jewish people were "either professional men or self-employed, salaried employees in white collar jobs or skilled crafts." 21

A primary factor in the "American Dream" of the Jewish minority and the achievement of the goals linked with the
middle class has been the observation that historic "Jewish" values and non-Jewish "American" values have been remarkably similar. Robin M. Williams, Jr. in "Changes in Value Orientation" for Jews in the Mind of America recognized that:

In this country, Jews and Gentiles alike have prized personal achievement and success, active striving and ambition, religious freedom and cultural pluralism, humanitarianism, voluntarism, material prosperity, democracy, individual freedom and responsibility. Those similarities have not always been apparent; but if one looks at the historic stereotypes of the Yankee and the Jew and removes the labels, it is hard to know which is being talked about. When people are asked to describe "Americans" they often use almost the same adjectives as for the stereotype Jew: ambitious, active, industrious, aggressive and so on.22

Thus the first factor which has affected Jewish identity in the United States has been anti-semitism in other nations which was more prominent than anti-semitism here; and the second factor has been the involvement with the "American Dream" and values.

The third and most important factor is the lack of a homeland until 1949 coupled with Zionist pleas for an Aliyah (return). It has not been the establishment of Israel as a nation that generated the Zionist rhetoric, but the Zionist rhetoric precipitated the establishment of the nation instead. Zionist rhetoric has been a force in American Jewry since the 1880's and has produced the drive toward identity by linking the ethnic qualities of Jewishness with the political call to the Israeli.
Since the Old Testament call to conquer the "promised land," there has been an intrinsic link between the Jew and Eretz Yisrael. This link has been an almost magnetic attraction to return. In America, Zionists like Justice Louis Brandeis suggested that the Jew could not have identity without an established homeland. While some Zionists did not issue a call for return, they all issued a call for a land to which to be able to return.

Political Zionism, though, has been only symptomatic of the urge for a homeland among the Jews. American Jewry has linked itself to the nation of Israel in a manner which has preempted many other Jewish concerns. This is because many see Israel as the religious and spiritual center of Judaism despite the fact that the impetus for Judaism is primarily an American Judaic phenomenon. 23

It must be noted that the Jewish religion places the "land of Israel" in a central position in its ritual and liturgy. The Old Testament concepts of a "chosen people" and a "promised land" are intrinsic to the history of the people. Thus, while most American Jews do not propose to return themselves, the heritage of the land is significant to the rhetoric.

Israel's establishment as a recognized nation in 1949 gave a new meaning to the scattered enclaves of Jews throughout the world. For the first time in centuries, they had a link to their past which established themselves
as more than a migrant people. The nation became a symbol of one's own Jewish identity, and its support became concomitant with development of self-image.  

Thus, times of crisis in Israel, such as the Six-Day War of 1967, result in a general reaction among Jews everywhere. Where there is threat to the land and nation, there develops an assumed threat to the identity of its people. In the United States, this drive for a national identity derived from a homeland is heightened by an American majority sense of support for Israel. Whether this support comes from the Christian identification with Israel or from an American tendency to "support the underdog" is not as important as the fact that the climate is generally supportive of Israeli nationalism.

Eliahu Navi has made the point of centrality very clearly when he states:

...Israel exists not merely for itself, but for all Jews. Today Israel depends upon the help of the Jews all over the world, especially on American Jewry, not only for security, but in helping us to maintain our vision as Jews. We must all share this vision, nurture and sustain it.

There can likewise be no doubt that Simon Herman, who has done extensive sociological research on the American Jew, views Israel as a state as a requirement for identity. He says:

I would look upon Israel, America, and other communities as interdependent parts of one whole, of which Israel is the center. In such an analysis I think one would have to ask oneself what
part Israel can play in the eyes of the American Jewish community.  

This sentiment is echoed by Arthur J. Lelyveld, rabbi of Fairmount Temple in Cleveland and former president of the American Jewish Congress, when he makes the point that the American Jew's ambivalence with respect toward Israel is founded on the superficial levels of the search for identity. He postulates that Israeli nationalism is in effect a beginning level in the identity quest and is often mistaken for an authenticator of Jewishness. Thus, Israel for him has a central position for many American Jews, though he would maintain that the nation does not necessarily merit the status that it has developed.

Irving Horowitz, professor of sociology at Rutgers University, expresses that there is an "attitude that American Jews are all shareholders in Israel" and that Israel has a responsibility to all Jews, just as they have a responsibility to Israel.

Some, such as Carl Gershman, director of the Youth Committee for Peace in the Middle East, see the establishment of Israel as a nation in 1949 as an act of "normalizing" an integral part of Jewish life around the world.

Opposing viewpoints about Israel's centrality are likewise important to the identity concept and shall be dealt with in the subsequent chapter on identity rhetoric. The major point remains that whether there is an affirmation
or negation of Israel as central to an individual's identity, the emergence of Israel as a nation in 1949 has forced it to become a focal point of Jewish rhetoric around the world. This focus, along with its correlative historical factors, has made Jewish rhetoric an ideal study for identity rhetoric.

The historic factor of Israel as a homeland for Jews, culminating in 1949 with its recognition as a state, is best summarized by Ben Halpern in "Zion in the mind of American Jews," when he notes:

The peculiar relationship of Jews to Zion, the home of their ancestors, is familiar enough, but it never ceases to exert an extraordinary fascination. No other homeland, in spite of all the mythmaking, and sentimentality common to patriots everywhere, has been so intrinsically, profoundly, and sublimely involved in the whole cultural tradition of a people. The union in the idea of Zion of ethnic history and universal religious eschatology raises the concept to a higher power than any ordinary patriotic sentiment, however ardent.32

Thus anti-semitism, the promise of a new land, and the lack of a homeland (with Israel's centrality) until 1949 are relevant factors in the emergence of Jewish rhetoric in America. The first two brought the people here; the latter gave them a place to live until 1949 and has since been a dominating factor in their development of identity as a people.

Today, significant statistics indicate the impact of Jewry on American structures. Of the fourteen million Jews
in America a 1971 study indicated that 54 per cent had gone to college and that the median income in Jewish households was two thousand, two hundred dollars per year higher than the national average. Fourteen per cent of Jewish-American families made twenty-five thousand dollars a year or more while only ten per cent were at or below poverty levels. That the lack of overt anti-semitism and the promise of a new land has paid off for them is evident. A recent Time magazine article concluded with the telling statement that "...given the importance of Jews in American life and a 5,000 year devotion to creed and culture, there is no reason to predict a decline in their influence and contribution."

With the three historic factors in mind, it is important to recognize a significant new element in the American Jewish community. That is the development of third and fourth generation Jews who have not been driven here by the three previous factors, but were instead born here. For them, the relating of the stories of World War II, immigration problems, and Jewish identity prior to 1949 is concomitant to many of us studying American history. The events happened, but are not relevant to those who did not experience them. It is to this Jewish audience that identity rhetoric becomes most important in the minds of Jewish leaders.
The third and fourth generation ideals have sometimes developed independent of the viewpoints of the recognized leadership structure. Rabbi Morris Kertzer describes the developing division of ideas as he says:

A generation ago we spoke about the wide chasm between the immigrant Jew and his native-born children; but it was miniscule compared to the vast separation between today's Jewish youth and their elders. From the desolate depression days to the affluent Jewish society of the 1960's is a psychological and spiritual distance almost beyond measure.

John Slawson, past president of the American Jewish Congress, declares that:

We have to find ways of making known to this generation of young Jews the richness and vitality of Judaism, its moral and ethical force, its commitment to human compassion and social justice and its overriding concern with bettering the human condition here and now. For we are taught that 'the righteous of all nations have a share in the world to come.'

It is for this generation of American Jews that identity rhetoric has become most crucial. Oscar I. Janowsky concludes that in recent decades there has been new life stirring in American Jewry and that the "spiritual refugees yearn for a rootage and identification." It is this yearning that generates the identity rhetoric that is the focus of this study.

With this brief historical description in mind, it is possible to describe the rhetorical situation in which the American Jew presently finds himself. In terms of descriptive analysis the exigency, audience and constraints are
to be defined in accord with Bitzer's "Rhetorical Situation." Involved in this analysis necessarily is a study of the adopted strategies in relationship to the audience, and the effects of those strategies. It is necessary at this point to limit the identity rhetoric study to the last two decades for purposes of focusing on a manageable portion of material, but points arise where such focus must reflect the historical impact of rhetoric of earlier times.

**Exigency**

With the guidelines that Bitzer uses for the exigency, it is apparent that group identity loss will fit the categories. Bitzer requires that in order for a rhetorical situation to exist, the exigency must:

a. "be an imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing that is other than it should be."

b. be able to be modified. Things which are unalterable are not rhetorical situations.

c. be able to be modified by discourse. Things which can be modified by physical force are not rhetorical.

d. be capable of positive modification which requires discourse or can be assisted by discourse.

e. have at least one controlling exigence which functions as the organizing principle: it specifies the audience to be addressed and the change to be effected.39

The controlling exigency for the American Jewish rhetor is a gradual loss of those characteristics which mark him as being different from others. It equates with a lack of personal recognition. Before demonstrating that
there is significant rhetoric aimed at this exigency, though, it is necessary to define the concept of group identity.

Orrin Klapp, Neil Smelser, Theodor Reik and Simon Herman are all important theorists for this particular section of the study. Klapp and Smelser are social scientists dealing with collective behavior and Reik and Herman deal specifically with Jewishness in terms of identity maintenance.

Dr. John Makay and Dr. William Brown in *The Rhetorical Dialogue* give seed thought to the importance of identity which comes from a concept they call *self-naming*. They postulate that rhetorical reasoning comes from:

1. The statement of a name.
2. The statement of its appropriateness because of the criterial attribute which the phenomenon possesses.
3. A statement of the expected or appropriate response.
4. A listing of the reasons that the categorizing of reality is accurate.

If identity rhetoric and self-naming can be equated, and it is reasonable to assume that they can; the loss of the naming ability or right, or its improper usage by an outsider, can create a crisis in identity which requires rhetorical reason for its solution. This is why it becomes imperative in the eyes of many minority groups that they be allowed to define themselves.
This concept equates naturally with Klapp's hypothesis that identity is a symbolic matter which if disturbed, disturbs the man himself.\textsuperscript{42} The loss then, of symbols which make one's life meaningful and interesting result in the loss of identity.\textsuperscript{43} The return to symbols such as old traditions and rituals is an attempt to reach what Klapp refers to as symbolic balance.\textsuperscript{44} To lose the preferred symbols around oneself, then, becomes a threat to the maintenance of group identity as well. When the community is depended upon for definition, it must be able to provide meaningful symbols to its members.

This provision of definition is one of the functions of collective behavior. Its loss results in Smelser's "category of structural strain"\textsuperscript{45} which underlies group behavior. Identity becomes then, one of the value-oriented movements which has as an end result the establishment of an enduring collectivity.\textsuperscript{46}

Smelser's definition, though, is limited to movements which require some form of revolutionary outcomes.\textsuperscript{47} Such limitation is too artificial for identity movements whose goals are inwardly, rather than outwardly, directed. The structural strain that equates with identity loss may just as certainly be able to generate a movement that is value oriented, but the movement may remain general in nature rather than culminating in an historically-labeled "Revolution."
The questions to be answered, then, in terms of the existence of an exigency are:

1. Is the loss of identity recognized as a problem in the American Jewish community?
2. Is the situation capable of being modified by discourse in a positive manner?
3. Is there an attempt at "self-naming" which results in rhetorical reasoning?
4. Is there a loss of "symbolic balance" and/or is there a resultant "structural strain" that has generated a rhetorical movement which is value oriented?

If these four questions can be answered affirmatively, then the existence of a rhetorical exigency can be assumed.

A problem that each of the social scientists points out, though, is that none of these questions can be answered by empirical data with any degree of accuracy. They must be answered primarily by critical observation and analysis instead.

1. Is the loss of identity recognized as a problem in the American Jewish community? Theodor Reik suggests the search for identity in his statement that: "All seek meaning in that peculiar and special course evident in Jewish history. Is there such meaning at all, or is that strange fate merely the result of blind mechanical forces at work in world history?"

Simon Herman devotes his entire work to the concept of maintenance of ethnic identity. He sees the problem of the contemporary Jews as one of giving distinctiveness to their identity as Jews. Loss of identity for him becomes
a crucial problem for: "To be a Jew in any meaningful sense of the term means that one must establish and respect a certain boundary between Jews and Gentiles, an act of self-definition that is hardly as necessary for a Christian in America."^49

— The loss of identity is exemplified by, and contributes to, a lack of cohesiveness among ethnic groups whose continuity requires common efforts. That this tendency endangers the group is evidenced by the concern expressed about it. Several significant statements have already been quoted in Chapter I and the first part of this chapter concerning identity. The question arises though as to whether the concept of identity is as significant to the American Jewish community as it is proposed to be by this research.

Having already noted a lack of empirical evidence related to the subject, it becomes necessary to make a judgment based primarily upon the rhetoric which deals with identity.

Howard M. Sachar, professor of history at George Washington University, quotes James Joyce in Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man contemplating "going forward for the thousandth time to recreate in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race," and concludes that the Jewish people must "have a continually evolving concept of what Jewish civilization ought to be, and not use
stereotypes to close off our options for future creativity."51

Rufus Learsi observes that the search for identity is significant and multi-faceted among American Jews:

With all their distinctness and 'high visibility' the Jews in America are not, of course the compact body the anti-Semite professes to see in them. They are instead a highly diversified group, socially and ideologically and their character and destiny as a community are envisioned by them in a variety of ways.52

Similarly, a roundtable discussion by members of the American Jewish Committee in their annual meeting in 1959 led by Dr. Jack H. Kamholz released a four point call for identity studies as follows:

1) The American Jewish Committee must allocate increased resources and efforts to deal with the problem of Jewish identity; this should be a top priority for the agency.

2) The American Jewish Committee must clarify its own concepts and objectives and should mobilize whatever scholarly resources are necessary to achieve this clarification.

3) In general, however, the group felt that the time for study was past. Further major research on Jewish identity is not essential as a prelude to the development of action programs. We are already sufficiently aware of the dimensions of the problem. In fact, the difficulties we face are common to other religious and ethnic groups in American life.

4) Some practical suggestions for chapter activities centering on improvement of Jewish education and programming for youth were:
   a. American Jewish Committee members should explore, with local Jewish educators and boards of educational institutions, ways in which chapters can aid in improving the quality and content of Jewish education.
b. American Jewish Committee chapters should initiate intra-Jewish dialogues among Orthodox, Conservative and Reform elements in their communities, in order to exchange views and develop mutual understanding of our common concerns and approaches.

c. American Jewish Committee chapters should develop programming for youth and stimulate similar educational activities on the part of federations, community centers and other institutions, to foster an awareness of the relevance of Jewish traditions and culture to daily life.53

Although this study limits identity rhetoric to the American Jew, the exigency is seen as a worldwide Jewish phenomenon by some scholars. Herman states that:

The problems that beset efforts to maintain a Jewish Identity have become increasingly complex in recent decades. The cultures of the Western world, in which the greater part of the Jewish people now lives, exercise a powerful attraction, and Jews in many countries are either searching for ways to preserve a distinct Jewish identity in these cultures, or, where it is preserved, to give it meaningful content.54

Some Jewish leaders feel that this quest for identity is important, but until some see the need for maintenance of identity in terms of urgency, the solution will not be reached. S. Z. Abramov, a member of the Israeli Knesset, does not hold out much hope for the American Jew to ever find what he defines as authenticity:

If the Jewish community in America is to evolve an authentic Jewish community, . . . then I think a major, radical, painful reorientation is called for. The community must turn inward rather than seek out and act upon universalistic causes. I wonder whether the Jewish intelligentsia, the Jewish youth in America are ready for this. I think they are not.55
Sufficient evidence exists, then, to indicate that there is a recognized identity crisis in the American Jewish Community. The quest for identity pervades the writings, discussions and public speeches of the leadership continually.

2. Is the situation capable of being modified by discourse in a positive manner? The weight of materials dealing with identity from a rhetorical perspective would indicate that those involved in identity rhetoric see it as helpful not only to the Jews, but also to the cultures in which they reside. Dr. Morton Keller recognizes that:

If Jews turn their attention to this latest phase in their relationship to American society at large, they will not merely be serving themselves. For the problem is not peculiar to them alone. In the past, the American people have had to face the problem of maintaining their national identity in the face of growing cultural diversity. In the future they may have to cope increasingly with the no less difficult task of preserving their individuality from the oppressive weight of cultural sameness.56

To avoid this cultural loss of identity, Ben Halpern sees the development of new attitudes as needed among the Jewish population.57 He concludes that attitudes, more than experiences, shape the changes in society today. Thus, the indication is that there is a need for a rhetoric directed at attitude change. Edwin Wolf II, former president of the Federation of Jewish Agencies of Philadelphia and chairman of the Publication Society, advances the opinion that rhetorical leadership is needed to meet the
need of the potentiality that exists in the new generations. He claims that a shift toward loss of Jewish identity can be stopped by the application of proper leadership for the Jewish Community.58 This leadership has as its present task the "effecting of a creative interaction between the emerging values in democratic scientific, twentieth-century America and the historic insights and tested ideals of Judaism,"59 according to Louis L. Kaplan, president of Baltimore Hebrew College.

These people see rhetoric as a significantly beneficial force in American intellectual and cultural life as well. Healthy trends have been established especially among Jewish authors in terms of their rhetoric. Leslie A. Fiedler of Montana State University has noted that:

A Jew writing in America today is not doomed to be a parochial writer because he is Jewish and because his themes come from Jewish life. If he wants to reach a wider public, he does not have to turn his back on or deny his Jewish background. As a matter of fact, Jewish writers, insofar as they are Jewish, have at present wide appeal; the more Jewish they are the more universal their appeal seems to be. It is in this sense that Jewish writers are in the position of creating for all Americans--Jew and Gentile alike--the most useful, the most livable, the most viable images of what it means to be an American in the sixties.50

This ability to develop rhetorically a definition of identity without restriction to stereotypes is important to the structuring of change for the community. This is seen as a positive function of rhetoric.
The fact that the American Jewish Congress gives time annually to speeches and discussion of American Jewish identity indicates the belief that discourse can produce an affirmative modification in the exigency as well.

The conclusion, then, for question two is that the American Jewish community not only sees the situation as capable of being modified by discourse, but in fact demands its leadership to develop such discourse, defines the goals of it, and is encouraged by the openness of the American society to it.

3. Is there an attempt at self-naming which results in rhetorical reasoning? Beyond the rhetoric already noted, the attempts at naming are demonstrations that the exigency is indeed one upon which the audience can act. Arthur Lelyveld recognizes the application of symbols (with which he personally disagrees) to be an attempt at self-naming. He says:

Now what is the ethnicity that we see expressing itself today among American Jews in their joyful identification or search for identification within Israel? Hosts of upper middle-class Jews in my community are suddenly studying Hebrew— but studying Hebrew on the level of the Diaspora ulpan, so that when they come to Israel, they can engage in colloquial speech or ask for directions or read a menu or give an address to a taxi driver. They do not sit down to learn some of the value terms that are imbedded in the Hebrew of our literature, of our prayerbook, of our total value-heritage. They are much more interested in identification with Israelis on a simple, prosaic, colloquial, secular level. I would describe that kind of ethnicity as inauthentic ethnicity.
Even though Lelyveld sees the attempts as inauthentic, it is evident that the naming process is taking place in the actions of those he describes. It is also important to note that the deeper study that he suggests would contribute to an authentic ethnicity is similarly a symbol applying process.

Janowsky sees in this action the rise and consolidation of the local community and an attempt to bring unity to Jews everywhere which corresponds to a feeling of kinship. For him, "a new Jew is emerging here on American soil." It is this "New Jew" name that is found recurring throughout American Jewish rhetoric. It becomes a centering or "marking off" concept for those who are seeking a recognized identity.

The outcome of the "New Jew" viewpoint is to discard the stereotypes commonly ascribed to the Jewish people and to replace them with positive confirmations of identity. The movement is shaking to the foundations much of the Conservative, Orthodox, and even modern Reform Jewish thought in areas from politics to religion.

The religious trends are outlined well by Eugene Borowitz, former National Director of Education, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, when he expresses the movement in A New Jewish Theology in the Making and How Can a Jew Speak of Faith Today? Each of the works is an attempt at the self-naming process through the affirmation
of those articles of faith which still pertain, and the re-definition of those which seem to be losing relevance. He seeks an integration of Judaic principles and daily life of the modern Jew that will make the two totally indivisible. The end purpose is to produce a sense of pride within the person which makes him content with his confirmed identity.

In politics, this "New Jew" is fiercely independent, and not necessarily a Democrat, though liberal. He is suburban, rather than urban, and philanthropic rather than miserly. His pursuit of education is avid, but a new awareness of leisure is replacing a former disdain for recreation. In literature, he is cosmopolitan rather than having a singular topic. His approach is one of unification rather than division. All of these new characteristics are developed to reinforce a positive identification with Jewishness.

Thus the writers are casting the modern Jewish characters in new roles for purposes of changing the names. Leslie Fielder notes that:

Today, however, images of the Jew are created by Jews—by Malamud, Saul Bellow and Philip Roth. It is hard to say whether we are better served by our own in terms of status in the community, but at least the creating of our literary images has passed into our own hands. We do not have to worry about coming to terms with somebody else's images of ourselves.
The naming impact of those who write about the Jews must not be underestimated in an identity rhetoric study. Literature has generated the development of many of the stereotypes which shape images of ethnic groups. Early Jewish writing in America was acutely self-conscious and the writers seemed to have a need to explain themselves to the world. This has given way to a confident development of characters which are not designed to fulfill stereotypes, but to act as portrayers of life. The Jewish writers have ceased to be public relations people for gentile onlookers. They are applying new symbols to the Jewish community.

This action fulfills the Makay and Brown requirements for rhetorical reasoning cited earlier. (1.) The statement of a name ("New Jew"); (2.) the statement of its appropriateness because of the criterial attribute which the phenomenon possesses ("the New Jew is cosmopolitan, suburban, philanthropic, etc."); (3.) a statement of the expected or appropriate response (he can now be accepted into the mainstream of American society"); or (4.) a listing of the reasons that the categorizing of reality is accurate (the New Jew is third or fourth generation stock and is firmly American, ...).

Both the attempt at self naming, and the resultant rhetorical reasoning are found, then, in reference to an exigency, in American Jewish rhetoric. The first three
questions used to establish the fact of a recognized exigency have affirmative answers.

4. Is there a loss of symbolic balance and/or is there a resultant structural strain that has generated a rhetorical movement that is value oriented?

__ John Slawson in a speech to the American Jewish Committee referred to the "need to make our religio-cultural treasures intellectually attractive, emotionally satisfying and aesthetically enjoyable." Without such symbols, Slawson feels that the strain of a "homogenized society" creates a loneliness or lack of identity in the lives of the Jewish young people. This observation fits well into Smelser's concept of structural strain.

Janowsky sees the outcome as a specific strain for the American Jew that comes from a loss of individuality. He sees the person as one living in two cultures. The American culture draws him apart from the Jews of the rest of the world, while his Jewishness creates needs which are apart from fellow American citizens. This results in a strain between the class position that the American Jew feels he should occupy and the status he actually holds in reference to social prestige. The loss of revered Judaic symbols, coupled with the inability to be seen totally as an American with full American symbols, has caused the imbalance.
Published surveys which deal with attitudes of Jews toward their identity in this country and interviews with local Jewish leaders and businessmen have led to the conclusion that many still regard themselves as an ethnic grouping, but maintain their individuality primarily through the application of the religious symbols of Judaism. The outcome of such action is a resultant identity crisis when the religious symbols are ignored or referred to as irrelevant by the younger Jews.

Because of this, the state of Israel has gained political centrality for many. It provides the symbols lost to them when they disregard the Judaic religion. Earl Raab refers to this idea when he states that: "For the American Jew the existence of Israel could be expressed as a necessary, but not sufficient, part of authentic American existence." It becomes a "symbol balancer" by granting historic ties with the genealogical rather than religious heritage of the Jewish people. This heritage is exemplified by a renewed interest in the Hebrew language and travel to Israel by Jewish youth.

Those who have not cast off the religious identity, though, continue to seek balance by updating the religious observances and modernizing the symbols for application to today's people. The Reform movement is indicative of this reaction among American Jews.
The second part of the question remains as to whether or not a movement is developing which is value-oriented as Smelser defines it. His definition encompasses all attempts to "restore, protect, modify, or create values in the name of a generalized belief." The following chapters on—observations of the rhetorical strategies will indicate that such is the case with American Jewish rhetoric. Attempts are made throughout the rhetoric to establish the values inherent in Judaic custom and tradition. Even those who reject Judaism for assimilation make an attempt to establish the values of their particular position in terms of their relevance to identity.

With all four questions answered affirmatively, it is reasonable to assume that a rhetorical exigency does exist in accord with Bitzer's guideline. This indicates that the first requisite of a rhetorical situation is observable in the American Jewish community. It is thoroughly impossible for any research to be done into the American Jew without quickly coming upon the question of identity. A massive amount of rhetoric exists on this subject alone.

**Audience**

The second constituent of Bitzer's concept of the rhetorical situation is an audience consisting of those people who are capable of being influenced by the discourse
and who can assist in bringing about the changes called for. The discourse must require an audience in order to produce its end and the audience must be capable of the change which the discourse serves to produce.\textsuperscript{72}

For the American Jewish rhetor, the audience is an exceedingly significant facet of his rhetorical situation. With the loss or waning of identity as his exigency, he seeks to rebuild the characteristics of Jewishness in the terms that he sees as necessary to his individuality. Thus the selection of rhetorical strategies depends almost totally upon his own viewpoint of what being a Jew means. The selected strategies are the subject of the following chapter. It is necessary here to examine the audiences.

Unlike a majority of ethnic rhetoric in America which consists of attacks upon the white majority, Jewish rhetoric has been found to be peculiarly inward in nature. With the exception of only a few reactionary groups such as the Jewish Defense League, very little aggressive rhetoric was found in the course of this study. The primary function of the American Jewish rhetor has been found to be one of positioning or as Simon Herman puts it, "marking off" of the Jewish identity for Jewish people.

This Jewish audience fits the requirements of the rhetorical situation in that they are capable of making the changes necessary to achieve the goals of the rhetoric. The Jew himself is the one being called upon to maintain
identity in spite of his American citizenship.

An informal study by Charles Liebman has indicated three broad categories of Jewishness in America: the affiliated, the associated, and the non-associated. These categories are found to generate the rhetorical strategies used by the identity rhetoricians.

Liebman found that about seventy per cent of American Jewry was in the "affiliated" category. This means that they are members of a synagogue or belong to one or more Jewish organizations. They are consciously Jewish and seek to have Judaism survive the assimilationist tendencies.

The associated Jew is unaffiliated with a synagogue, but claims his ethnic identity as a Jew and typically belongs to one or more nominally Jewish organizations. This group is disproportionately composed of third and fourth generation Jews for whom secular identification is more important than religious identity.

The non-associated Jew is most likely to maintain only his ethnic characteristics. While he may associate with other Jews, he does so for reasons other than Jewishness. He is most likely to be assimilated into the American community without worrying about it being viewed as compromising his identity.

A fourth category exists as well, made up of those who have returned to Israel in the Aliyah. This accounted
for approximately thirty-three thousand between 1967 and 1971. This audience has been influenced primarily by the Zionist rhetoric that links identity directly with citizenship in the State of Israel.77

A major problem in the study, and one that has been unresolvable, has been the almost complete disagreement of all sources on the number of Jewish people in the United States and their patterns of affiliation. No sources of seemingly unbiased nature have been found in reference to the number of people in each category. It was very plain that the size of the estimates of affiliation increase proportionately with the expressed affiliation of the writers.

Even in terms of total estimates from seemingly objective sources the numbers vary greatly in accordance with definitions. Time magazine, evidently using synagogue affiliation as a criterion, has listed just under six million Jews in America presently.78 The World Almanac for 1975, however, credits the U. S. with 6.3 million, evidently using ethnicity as a criteria.79 Such diverging estimates make quantitative evidence nearly impossible. The majority of authors do, however, agree that American Jewry constitutes about forty-five per cent of world Jewry and thus is the most important identity audience outside of Israel.
The study has shown that it is a significant error, though, to attempt to place all Jews under any one specific category. Even the four audience categories previously expressed must of necessity remain broadly descriptive. No major agreement exists in reference to what constitutes Jewish identity to the point where the Israeli Knesset was called upon to define "When is a Jew, not a Jew?" for purposes of immigration into Israel. The identity problem is not solely an American Jewish phenomenon.

Daniel Elazar in an article for Congress Bi-Weekly suggested a different manner of division for American Jewry in 1972. His study breaks the population into six, rather than four, categories thereby leaving room for the variability of numbers. His designation includes:

1. Hard core (Jews living full Jewish lives or intensively active in Jewish affairs) 300 thousand.
2. Participants (Jews involved in Jewish life more than casually) 600 thousand.
3. Members (Jews affiliated in some concrete way) 2.4 million.
4. Contributors and consumers (Jews who give money and/or utilize the services of Jewish institutions from time to time) 1.8 million.
5. Peripherals (Jews who are recognizably Jewish in some way, but completely uninvolved in Jewish life) 610 thousand.
6. Quasi-Jews (Jews whose very Jewish status is unclear as a result of intermarriage or assimilation in some other form) unknown.

This final unknown category is estimated by Elazar as comprising between five and ten per cent of American Jewry and may account for much of the discrepancies of numbers.
The entire study indicates that the audience that the American Jewish speaker addresses is a highly fluid one which tends to shift identity in terms of urgency and that there is a high degree of self-selection in the identity chosen. This would indicate the presence of an audience capable of change with a potential for participation in the development of identity.

Milton Doroshkin sees the Jewish people as open to identity definition despite the difficulties. He notes that "even when all possibilities seem to have been exhausted--race, people, national religion, cultural entity, historic group, linguistic unit--we find students casting about for other, more precise, more comprehensive designations."\(^{82}\)

A major target of the rhetoric is the young people. In 1970 the American Jewish Congress centered its entire American-Israel dialogue around "Transmitting the Jewish Heritage in Israel and the United States."\(^{83}\) An obvious area of concern for the older Jews, especially the Orthodox, is the apparent ambivalence of the third or fourth generation Jew toward his cultural heritage. The emphasis in Jewish education upon ethnic background and language is indicative of the attempt to reach this audience.

The lack of identity sent ten to fifteen per cent of the Jewish youth into counter culture movements in 1970,\(^{84}\)
but this tendency has changed to a seeking out of Jewish identity in 1975. The indication is that this target audience is amenable to change in response to the discourse that they choose to accept.

As with the youth of many groups, the Jewish young people fill the ranks of the more aggressive movements. The overwhelming majority of Jewish Defense League members, for example, have been between fifteen and twenty-five years of age. This radicalism may be overestimated. M. J. Rosenberg in "The New Jews: Myth and Reality," suggests that the counterculture youth movements are exceedingly small and do not represent a trend of any sort among the youth.

As an audience, however, the young people engaged in counterculture movements are still seemingly open to mainstream identity rhetoric. Mortimer Ostow relates that his experience has found third and fourth generation American Jews actively engaged in Jewish organizations in order to maintain their identity. He senses that the advantage of Jewish audiences is a "loyal and creative nucleus which continually produces a community of Jews. Despite those who drift away, the nucleus remains." Janowsky characterizes this nucleus as being bound together by expansive media usage which provides unification. The audiences for Jewish rhetoric have more information sources available to them which carry
predominantly Jewish views. Though they have differences of rhetorical strategies, this commonality assists the creation of a community sentiment.

Because of this Doroshkin notes that

. . . Jewish cohesiveness, Jewish sympathies, the feeling of intra-Jewish kinship—these are stronger today than they have ever been . . . the Jews of today cluster together around their Jewish institutions. To promote their survival as Jews, they are fashioning a rather compact form of Jewish settlement . . . with a full complement of Jewish institutions . . . all held together by a Jewish community council. This development of an ethno-religious enclave has characterized the direction of Jewish life in America since the 1930's. 89

Despite this togetherness, the evidence indicates that there is an appreciable number of Jews in the rhetorical audience who have no clear definition of what it means to be Jewish. Extensive studies by Simon Herman suggest that to many the measurement is more a statement of what it means to be a "non-Jew." 90 The sole judgment of identity then may be the establishment of a boundary between Jews and Gentiles. The action of self-definition is recognized as more important by Jewish audiences than Gentile audiences and the Jewish community is often amenable to change in the direction of the suggestions of recognized leaders.

Over three hundred national organizations serve the various needs and interests of American Jewry and these are made up of the same people that compose the rhetorical
audience that the identity rhetoricians must move. This means that an exceptional number of messages are bombarding this audience continually. This makes unified action very difficult. Local Jewish businessmen indicated that it is most unusual to complete a week without several appeals for assistance from groups with widely divergent goals.

Another factor influencing the audience significantly is the existence of three distinctive forms of religious thought: the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. Each claims to speak for the Jewish community. Their strategies are so much a part of identity rhetoric that they shall be covered in the following chapter. It is necessary to note here that the religious and/or non-religious presuppositions of the audience influence their acceptance of self-definition or identity in a profound way.

The fact that a significant portion of the audience has rejected religious affiliation altogether adds a different dimension to the potential effects of rhetoric to produce change. It requires new rhetorical sources to reach those who are decidedly non-affiliated.

The identity key for this total audience is to decide which part of their hyphenated name Jewish-American applies to them. This process of this study has shown that a distinctive difference exists between those who call themselves "Jewish-Americans" as opposed to those who refer to
themselves as "American Jews," and these both differ from those who wish to drop one part of the hyphenation altogether.

In reference to this audience, Lelyveld proposes that identity rhetoric overused may

lead to an over-preoccupation with self and an excess measure of introspection. The very need to define identity—and perhaps this entire discussion—is an exhibition of this tendency.

Having lived precariously and having frequently been disappointed, he has learned to distrust his neighbors. "Respect him and suspect him," he is likely to advise. But the other side of this coin is that he has learned from this insecurity to rely upon himself and sometimes to overcompensate in that aggressiveness that anti-Semites call "pushy."

Labeled "pushy" and "clannish" and "materialistic," he comes to despise any evidence of rejected qualities in himself and in his fellow Jews and we have the familiar response of what Lessing called "jüdischer Selbst-Hass." He comes to have doubts about the worthwhileness of Jewish survival and frequently seeks to dissociate himself from other Jews and to pass into the majority culture.92

Because of this, the audience is amenable to change and thus fits the requirement of the rhetorical audience. The indication is that unless the change is guided, the tendency is to adopt the characteristics of the host culture. Shlomo Shoham fears this reaction as he states:

Then, there is the problem of identity and, if you will, of a certain self-hatred and self-deprecation that results from confusion and uneasiness about their belongingness. This is one of the most severe penalties paid for uprootedness and failure at new cultural integration.
Now we know also that the focus of all these problems is the second generation immigrants. The new generation boy or girl seeks ardently to discard the inherited bizarre language, mannerisms and patterns of culture, and to emulate the patterns of culture of the receiving communities. Of course, it doesn't happen quickly and the integration process is full of conflicts, and often marked by the shallow absorption of the values of the receiving community. Nevertheless, — it is not unrealistic to observe that the integration process has not been a total failure.93

This openness to change was disturbing to Arthur A. Cohen in Negro and Jew: An Encounter in America when he described the tendency to change in the following terms.

Surely one of the defects of the Jewish personality is that it collects itself (like a derelict rummaging in a junkyard for usable bits and pieces) from its environment, picking and gnawing at the social structures of others for reliable self-images, sources of confirmation and approval. It is a neurotic posture, but it should alarm no one that the Jewish personality, however assimilated (or, more fashionably, acculturated), is still resolutely neurotic. The neurosis—however variously it may be described—is transmitted from generation to generation and disappears only when the historical experience with which it must cope ceases to be either enthusiastically Jewish or explicitly anti-Jewish.94

This is the audience that the identity rhetorician must face in the Jewish community. It is individual and homogenous, traditional and changing, religious and non-religious, but capable of change in accord with the requirements of the rhetorical situation.
Constraints

The third constituent of the rhetorical situation is a set of constraints composed of persons, events, objects and relations which have power to constrain decision and modify action needed to modify the exigency. These may be instrumental in either aiding or hindering changes proposed by the discourse. The orator's purpose is to control the constraints and to add his own where necessary. Those that he adds equate well with Aristotle's definition of artistic and inartistic proofs. 95 Constraints normally include values, attitudes, beliefs, facts, traditions, interests, motives, documents, etc.

In the American Jewish identity rhetoric the constraints are multiple and somewhat simple to define in relation to the other characteristics of the rhetorical situation. The rhetoric is steeped in a historic tradition bound by the heritage of the people. Rabbi Meir Kahane, for example, has been able to move masses of the Jews in diaspora lands with the simple phrase "Never Again" which quickly reminds the people of the persecution under Hitler. The Zionist uses this remembrance plus the historic centrality of Israel to cause some to seek identity by returning to Israel.

The taboos inherent in Judaism likewise have provided significant constraints. The injunctions against intermarriage have held in check the integration of some
and have reaffirmed the "chosen people" symbols to many American Jews. The rigid resistance to integration to the point of disowning the religious convert despite his ethnic identity is still used by the survivalist and Orthodox groups to modify action.

— The messianic unification commitment of liberal Jewry has likewise acted as a shaper of identity. Their persistent belief that the Jew is to be a unifying force in the host nations for all minorities has predicated an identity tie with social service organizations and philanthropic endeavors.

Fear of anti-semitism has also worked to constrain individual action for some Jewish groups and has held the people in community enclaves for the protection of their Jewish identity. It is from this fear that organizations such as Kahane's Jewish Defense League have sprung.96 This fear has similarly left the American Jew as a staunch advocate of church-state separation for his own protection.

Herman notes that the social pressures of who one is with will affect his "marking off" in terms of whether he wishes to be seen as a Jew or non-Jew. Herman suggests that marginal Jews, (those who are uncertain which group they wish to be in), are more apt to waver in reference to identity in relation to how they think others are viewing them.97
Janowsky recounts a series of constraints when he says that: "Welding American Jewry together is inevitably a slow and often painful process, for Jewish life abounds with negative factors which are almost as important as—if not more important than—positive factors ensuring unity."98

Outside pressures have always been as important as inner factors for American Jews. The 1940's found a number of identity groups coming together to fight anti-Semitism, religious bigotry, and to provide defense against organizations which wished to deny human and civil rights. These reactions were often in response to constraints evolving from Gentile majorities and requiring redefinition by the Jewish speakers.

These are, of course, generalizations about the total American Jewish Community which demonstrate some of the many constraints in this particular rhetorical situation. The specific constraints develop into or generate the strategies which are observed in the following chapter. The operant constraints are as many and as varied as the speakers and the situations in which they find themselves.

Other Considerations in the Rhetorical Situation

Bitzer requires that the discourse be called into existence by the situation, that the response is fitting, and that the response is prescribed by the situation.
Beyond this, the exigency must be objective and observable, as must all of the constituents of the situation, in order for the critic to study it with an assurance of accuracy. These requirements all are met within the realm of Jewish identity rhetoric and may produce a paradigm for rhetorical situations as well as for identity rhetoric. The multiple sources investigated for this study indicate that the situation certainly merits the critical observations. The strategies demonstrated reveal a unique and important body of information from which to develop a model for minority identity rhetoric.
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CHAPTER III

DEFINITIONS AND ZIONIST IDENTITY RHETORIC

Observations of Rhetorical Strategies in American Jewish Rhetoric

The realization that identity rhetoric is a response to a rhetorical situation leads to an analysis of the forms of response used by specific speakers in the American Jewish community. Extensive study has led to the conclusion that a series of generalizations is possible about these identity rhetoricians and their audiences and that these generalizations are pertinent to the development of a model.

Previous chapters have attempted to show that identity rhetoric is a recognized interest of the majority of Jewish speakers despite the strategy that they ultimately choose. The selection of strategy will depend, however, on whether they view the political, ethnic, traditional aspects of their heritage, or a combination of them as most relevant.

The personal viewpoint of the identity rhetorician is exceedingly important. It is quickly recognized that there is very little divergence between the identity that they select for themselves, and that which they advocate.
publicly. Behavioral ambiguities are uncommon among the American Jewish rhetors, thereby simplifying the study significantly.

As noted in Chapter I, however, inconsistencies do arise in the positions taken because of overlapping identities which occur. This sometimes makes individual speeches difficult to categorize in terms of overall strategies. For example, an early American Zionist, Dr. Louis Brandeis, spoke often of responsibilities to American citizenship in terms which, if removed from context, could have been attributed to the assimilationists. Yet he remained steadfast in his Zionist pleas for a State in Israel to which he also held allegiance. As a United States Supreme Court Justice, however, he was recognized for his contributions to the American judicial system.

The fact that personal identity and selection of strategy have such a correspondence for the American Jewish rhetor assists in the development of a critical analysis. It also allows Jewish audiences to select leadership for their own "marking off" process without difficulties which arise from speakers changing total positions as have some in the Black American society. The critical analysts, though, must be careful not to categorize a speaker's position solely upon one piece of rhetoric. The emphasis upon a point of common concern with other strategies can
easily lead to improper designation of the speaker's total position.

Another generalization which can be made with assurance is that all of the strategies of identity rhetoric in the American Jewish community are universalistic in nature, and thus develop into political liberalism where social action is involved. This Jewish universalism may well be symptomatic of the inward direction of the rhetoric. The tendency that they display is a faith in social movements rather than overt reaction to solve their identity problems. The concept is expressed clearly in relationship to the Black minority by former MIT professor, Leonard Fein, now the editor of a new Jewish monthly called Moment. He feels that Jews have a special responsibility to human rights solely because of a common purpose of maintaining identity in America.

Milton R. Konvitz, though, sums up the concept most directly when he says:

The Jewish community in the United States does not stand alone when it defends the rights and liberties of American Jews. In fighting for these rights and liberties, it speaks for all Americans who value freedom and equality; so that vindication of the rights of Jews is, in fact, vindication of the ideals of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights of each of the state constitutions. The Jewish community and its agencies thus have behind them the strength of principles, the power that comes from striving for ends that are universal, the interests which, as Emerson would say, "the divinities honor and promote—justice, love, freedom, knowledge, utility."
This dependence upon social action assists the researcher in predicting the strategy that an individual speaker will espouse by noting the organizational memberships the speaker claims. There are over three hundred social action groups among American Jewish communities with four major groups acting as umbrellas for the rest. These groups are the American Zionist Council (AZC), the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, and the American Council for Judaism (ACJ). Other well-known groups include B'naï B'rith and the Jewish Defense League (JDL). The strategies of these groups are discussed in the observations in this chapter.

Similarly, all of the rhetorical strategies must deal with four major religious positions: the Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and non-religious. The theological position espoused by the speaker is shown to be directly linked to the identity position which he accepts.

As noted in Chapters I and II, however, the key factor in the rhetorical strategies of the American Jewish rhetor is his viewpoint of the position of the nation of Israel to his own identity. Some affirm a direct tie with Israel while others define themselves by a negation of Israeli-ness, but all of the strategies will deal with it. This tends to lend a political cast to all of the identity positions. It is readily apparent that heritage, religion, and traditional culture in the Jewish community all have
reference to the "nation of Israel" and the defining of this "nationality" is unavoidable for identity.

A generalization which comes from observation of American Jewish rhetoric is that it is uniquely inward in direction. It is intensely bound up with defining self rather than attacking other societies and cultures. A distinct tendency exists for each person to sound as though he is speaking for all Jews and to all Jews as a result of this. This bent is one to which the American Council for Judaism has reacted with a published caution that each organization "speaks only for itself and its members." 4

These generalizations characterize the majority of the rhetoric studied and are useful in understanding how the model for identity rhetoric in Chapter VI was developed. It is necessary to visualize this rhetoric now with definition of strategies and development of specific illustrations from representative speakers.

Definition of the Three Major Strategies

As noted in Chapter I, there are three major strategies adopted by American Jewish identity rhetors. They are Zionism, Survivalism, and Near Assimilation. Within this construct, the latter must be recognized as being divided into two basic sub-divisions: the affiliated and the non-affiliated. While, as recognized previously, these
divisions resemble the strategies defined by Drs. Golden and Rieke in *The Rhetoric of Black Americans*, the categories are not identical and there are indeed significant differences.

The thrust of these chapters, and in reality the entire study, is to use representative rhetoric to demonstrate each of these strategies. From that, conclusions can be reached concerning the identity rhetoric in general.

**Zionist Strategy**

The Zionist rhetoric is the easiest to define in terms of critical analysis because it is the most radically different from assimilation and is easily identifiable. The basic premise of the Zionist is that Jewish identity is now and always has been linked directly to the "promised land," the nation of Israel. A Roper poll in 1945 gave indication of the impact of Zionist sentiment as it controlled thought in America. At that time 80.1 per cent of American citizens were of the opinion that every effort should be made to establish Palestine as a Jewish state. The prevailing Jewish rhetoric was a reaction to the persecution that the Jews had just undergone in Europe and was well accepted in the United States. Identity became linked intrinsically with nationalism even though this had always been the thrust of Zionism.
Early Zionism was represented in the United States by the rhetoric of Theodor Herzl, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, and Justice Louis Brandeis. Of the three, Silver was perhaps the most eloquent. For him Jewish identity was based upon historicity and the capacity to re-establish a Homeland. A representative statement of Silver's beliefs is found in his passage:

"... We have attended many vineyards, but we have neglected our own vineyard. We have removed the stones and planted the vines and cared for it and watched over it, and then the wine has become gall and bitterness in our mouth. The time has come to begin planting and attending the vineyard of our own people... so that Zionism as it is most truly conceived, a spiritual renewal of the Soul of Israel, may send forth currents of vitality into every member of Jewry the world over."

Recognizing the claims of many that the American Jew had responsibility to the United States, Silver discounted such loyalties as a debt which had already been paid. In an address at Carnegie Hall he replied:

"We do not look upon our prerogative of citizenship as a gift bestowed upon us. We have purchased it with our blood, with our toils, with our sacrifice."

Thus, identity in America is a transient element to the Zionist. It must be authenticated by the return to Eretz Yisrael (The land of Israel). Dan Leon, a contemporary Zionist leader, reiterates this pattern of identification with the pessimistic comment that identity will disintegrate outside of the land. He quotes one of the
great religious Zionists when he says:

"Apart from the nourishment it receives from the life-giving dew of the holiness of Eretz Yisrael, Jewry in the Diaspora has no real foundation and lives only by the power of a vision and by the memory of our glory--by the past and the future; but there is a limit to the power of such a vision to carry the burden of life and to give direction to a people, and this limit seems already to have been reached. Diaspora Jewry is, therefore, disintegrating at an alarming rate and there is no hope for it unless it replants itself in Eretz Yisrael."10

There is irony in that the Zionist identity is embraced by two different, and somewhat opposite, groups. The Zionist may be extremely Orthodox religiously, or may be thoroughly non-religious, or in between these extremes. The designation "religious" Zionist and "political" Zionist are thus applicable. As such, the naming process is significant to them. The religious Zionist names himself in terms of the Biblical return to Palestine, whereas the political Zionist is one who seeks "Israeli" identity to avoid what he sees as ethnic persecution as a Jew.

The culmination of Zionist appeals came into fruition with the establishment of the nation in 1949. Upon completion of that goal, its tie upon diaspora Jews waned until it became a minority Jewish sentiment in the 1950's and early 1960's. The Zionist sees any threat to Israel as a personal identity crisis, though, and the Six-Day War in 1967 began a revival of Zionist appeals. Rather than just a passing sentiment, it has reached many American Jewish
young people not because of religious threat, but because of a perceived ethnic threat which has in actuality provided a cause with which to unite. This hastens the identity process by providing reference organizations to produce new symbols to apply to oneself.

Dan Leon sees this as a genuine identity structuring movement:

I believe that the revival of a search for Jewish identification is something genuine. I contend that this process represents a victory of the Zionist idea. I believe that the Zionist idea has now been validated and we now have to work out where we go from here. But wherever we go, I think we must proceed on the basis of two concepts. We must accept the idea that the only people who can genuinely know where they are going to are people who know where they came from. Secondly, we must recognize that there is such a thing as an authentic Jewishness, whether it be defined in religious or secular terms.\textsuperscript{11}

A wide range of reaction exists in the Zionist movement and the revival seems to be influencing about 20 percent of the American Jewish population in terms of involvement and the emphasis is strongest among young people. David Seibold in an article for \textit{Western Speech} on the rhetoric of Meir Kahane found the movement significant because:

"First, Jews are offered a strong sense of identity through membership in the League. For example, Kahane has found that Jewish students in the many schools at which he speaks each year 'want to change, . . . want to do something. And the Jewish kids would like it to be within a Jewish context.'"

. . . the need to provide a sense of identity for followers.\textsuperscript{12}
An identity conflict is also presented by the Zionist development, however. In essence, identification with Israel is a "forced choice" concept which in the minds of some becomes an "either-or" conflict between American citizenship and Jewish identity. This conflict was predicted long before Israel gained statehood by Justice Brandeis. It was for this reason he backed and espoused the formation of an American Jewish Congress as early as 1906 which was to bring unity to American Jewry by bringing his ideals of Americanism to them as though American democracy and Jewish identity were the same thing. It was, in effect, a redefinition of American citizenship to make it acceptable to the Jew who felt he was giving up his heritage by being a citizen of a diaspora nation. Brandeis' claim exemplified Zionist rhetoric by asserting that All Jewry was one no matter where they were dispersed in the world, and until Israel was a nation again in terms of recognition, he advocated citizenship where democracies were conducive to Jewish growth. The inherent assumption was that the Jews would return to Palestine if it were ever open to re-entrance by the Jew.13

The existence now of Israel as a state has revived the dichotomy of loyalties. Edmund Raas Hanauer in a Ph.D. dissertation for American University discovered that most American Zionists feel that they live a sufficiently full Jewish life in America so as to justify their refusal to
migrate to Israel. As a justification some reason that a strong Jewish community in the United States is necessary to the maintenance of Israel as a nation.14

The common beginning point of the Zionist identity is the Aliyah (return to Israel). It is seen as a self-fulfilling step in the ultimate realization of one's commitment to Jewish identity. It is, in effect, the rhetorical "action step" of the Zionist speaker. Meir Kahane refers to the concept by saying that:

"We want to encourage the belief that the Jew is not safe here. If there is just a slight fear in some Jews, we can play upon it. The solution is that Jews can only be secure in Israel."15

A constant reminder is made to American Jews that their identity lacks authenticity outside of the land of Palestine. The "unity of world Jewry" is a persistent reminder to return. Eliahu Navi demonstrated the strategy well when he said:

We are speaking here about American Jewry as if it stands by itself. I don't think it should be conceived in such terms, because American Jewry is a part of the world Jewry. We should bear in mind that any Jewish community in any place in the world did not come there freely and voluntarily. The Jewish people, in a sense, never had the opportunity to select where they wanted to live. The Jews who came to America came out of compulsion and because it was open and available. In fact, the only place in the world where the Jews exercise volition is Israel.16

Depending on whether the claims are religious or political, Zionists consistently attempt to supply symbols
of Jewishness which they feel are lacking in America. If "religious" the symbols are a call for a return to Orthodox Judaism in the land. If "political" the symbols are Israeli and nationalistic.

The three main goals of the Zionist movement are:

1. The preservation and unity of the Jewish people.
2. The protection and development of the State of Israel.
3. The creation and furtherance of close cultural, spiritual and personal ties between diaspora Jewry and both the State of Israel and Israeli Jewry.

To reach these goals, five basic principles are espoused by the American Zionist Council.

1. There is a World Jewish Nation--Jews are One people.
2. Judaism is the religious expression of Jewish nationalism.
3. Zionism is the solution of the Jewish problem and the guarantee of Jewish survival.
4. Palestine (Israel) is the historic, spiritual, and cultural homeland of Judaism and the Jewish people.
5. Jews have political rights in and obligations to Israel.

The research indicates, too, that Zionism is a natural reaction to anti-semitism in many cases. This would indicate why Zionism declined sharply in the United States as cultural pluralism became encouraged by civil rights actions. Hanauer discovered that if a "forced" choice between Zionism and American citizenship were to happen at present, many would renounce the Zionism rather than the citizenship because there is no major anti-semitic pressure to make them uncomfortable here.
One of the specific speakers chosen as a representative of the Zionist strategy for this study is Emmanuel Neumann. Born in 1893, he has been recognized as a key figure in the Zionist movement. He has been in the executive levels of the American Zionist movement from 1918 to the present. He is presently the chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency. He has served as president of the Jewish National Fund and the Zionist Organization of America. A prolific author, his works have been regularly found in the *American Zionist*. As a speaker, he has represented Zionism before Congressional committees, the United Nations General Assembly, and the World Zionist Congress. Rather than the Orthodox stand of many Zionists, he espouses Conservative Judaism.

While Neumann escapes much of the allegiance dichotomy by claiming that the American Jew "owes political allegiance to the United States and spiritual allegiance to his Jewish heritage," his speeches typify the Zionist focus on Israel.

A Neumann speech, "Israel Has One Ally," was presented to a mass report rally of the Zionist Organizations of America in Manhattan, New York, June 26, 1967. The address was presented to several thousand fellow Zionists who were gathered to hear discussion of the Six-Day War which had just happened several months earlier. The outward purpose of the speech was to report the results of
the war, but the identity building attempts of the rhetoric are clearly present.

With Israel as victor in the brief encounter, the speech was a reiteration of the diaspora Jew's dependence upon Israel. Neumann went immediately to the importance of maintaining tradition in the gaining of victory:

Is there any limit to the gratitude that we owe to this small but heroic people of Israel. It was not for themselves that they fought but for the future of the Jewish people as a whole. This may be the secret of this great miracle unfolded before our eyes. We have learned what is Israel's real potential. It is not Israel's planes or tanks or other weaponry that wrought this victory and this miracle. It is the people of Israel and the great traditions of the past. . . . whereas the world long viewed the Jewish people as worthy objects of compassion, of pity, . . . nations have begun to understand that this is a people with dignity and self-respect, with honor and heroism.  

Thus Neumann establishes an identity based upon a traditional heritage and dependence upon God. This concept is important if the speaker is going to call upon the audience to maintain the traditional symbols as Neumann does:

Even though at the beginning, we Zionists had to go it alone, as later Israel has done, we proceeded on this assumption that the Jews are one people throughout the world, devoted to its traditions, illuminated by the light of its Torah--this people is one people . . .  

Added to this are constant appeals to the universal laws of freedom, independence, and self reliance. He praises the young people, who he admits he doubted, for
their immediate response to Israel's needs thus linking them directly to the Zionist identity by the repetition of including them in the plural pronoun "we." It is important to the address that Neumann established all Jews outside of Israel as "One people" because later he imposed upon them the identity of being the only ally that Israel as a nation has upon which to depend. An important ramification is the repetition that none except the world's Jews can be depended upon for action, thereby making those in attendance the guardians of Israel's statehood. He quickly discounts the United Nations, the United States, Britain, France, and other political allies in the light of recent history.

Because of this position the American Jew is encouraged to maintain his self-esteem by continued victory in Israel. This gives distinctive status to the Jew as a universal defender of freedom. Neumann throughout the speech attempts to persuade his audience to adopt a system of values which centers around the maintenance of Israel as an authenticator of Jewishness. It is apparent that successes in Israel were seen as an indicator of the righteousness of the cause.

Such success, then, gave renewed meaning to the need to identify with a winning side. Thus the Jew who had been looked down upon by the majority of the host nations can point with renewed pride to the Jews who have won against seemingly insurmountable odds.
Sol Linowitz, former board chairman of Xerox Corporation and United States ambassador to the Organization of American States, noted that the new symbols used to define Jewry after the Six-Day War caused "the end to the image of the Jew as a loser. He became a man who resembles David more than Shylock."[23]

This is the point which Neumann wished to emphasize in his speech. His praise, though, for renewed identification with Israel's cause ends in a direct appeal for all Jewish families to unite by sending their young people to Israel to "take part in the high adventure of nation building."[24]

Neumann closes with an appeal that:

Surely Israel has a right to expect, not a huge inundation of American aliya, but in the next three or four years, a hundred thousand young American Jews who will want to help shoulder the responsibility of this small but heroic people.

That is the challenge that lies ahead of us. Let us resolve to stand by the sacred cause of Israel, and to strengthen the ranks of Zionism. We have been the vanguard and we shall continue to fight the good fight and make sure that Israel not only shall survive but be a beacon to the nations of the world.[25]

To a degree Neumann's strategy failed in that only about seventeen thousand have immigrated to Israel since that time, but the point is that the Zionist strategy has caused some to assume identity with Israel to the point of returning.
Other Zionist rhetoric fits the same pattern. Rabbi Charles E. Shulman of Riverdale Temple in New York City noted the significance of focus in a reply to an article written by James Warburg of the American Council for Judaism. Shulman argues that the nation of Israel is the centerpoint for the majority of all Jews and that American Jewry's share in this venture is so great and so personal that the social and economic status of the new immigrants to Israel can hardly be separated from the philanthropy of the Jews in the United States.

There is recognition that the American conditions may be unique but that there are "... great numbers wishing to leave their miseries behind them. The only available home for them is Israel whose 'Law of Return' grants all newcomers automatic citizenship."

Likewise apparent is the same assumption of universality of the Zionist opinion that was found in Neumann's rhetoric. This assumption is that all Jews are of one mind concerning the centrality of Israel as a nation and that all alternative viewpoints are held by exceedingly small groups. The rhetoric, in fact, is very strong in reply:

Apart from the absurdity of his unsubstantiated charges is the refusal of Mr. Warburg and like minded individuals associated with the American Council for Judaism to recognize that the United Jewish Appeal expresses the sentiment and will of the overwhelming majority of American Jews, that American Jews gladly share with Israeli Jews the task of absorbing immigrants into Israeli life.
The establishment of the Zionist position in history is noted with three lengthy paragraphs reminding the audience of Zionist appeals which pre-dated World War II and which he claims might have saved many Jews had they heeded the warnings. To Shulman, those Jews who reject the call to return "... reveal an abysmal ignorance of the Jewish conditions they deplore. Above all, they do not understand the feelings of the Jewish masses in America."\(^2^9\)

The strong appeal to history and a definition of Jewishness couched in terms of what may happen if the history is repeated is a futuristic form of defining self. In other words, the speaker feels that the American Jew must define himself into or out of the Jewish future in respect to his viewpoint concerning Israel. If he defines the nation as other than central, he loses true Jewish identity as the Zionist defines it.

As Neumann did, Shulman recognizes the importance of success in the generation of identity as well. He suggests that:

The tremendous popularity of Leon Uris's "Exodus" has shown that world-wide interest in and amelioration of the Jewish problem abroad not only has the complete support of the masses of American Jews, but also the sympathy and support of millions of American Christians who, for the first time, have become aware of the tragedy of Jewish homelessness and the need of a Jewish homeland for those Jews deprived of their elementary rights.\(^3^0\)
This dependence upon success is not new however to the Zionist identity. In 1954, Dr. Nachum Goldmann, then chairman of the Zionist Executive Agency, in an address on the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Theodore Herzl, referred to the establishment of the State of Israel as a Zionist success which had both "grandeur and positiveness" in the search for meaning for Jewish people. For him:

The Zionist idea has, as I said, convinced the majority of the Jewish people, and it is not decisive whether all those who accept the idea or the reality of the Jewish state, had been or are members of the World Zionist Organization. But it does mean that the majority of the people are Zionists in a more thorough and searching interpretation.

In other words, the success of Zionism in achieving the statehood of Israel produced a new awareness of identity. Such emphasis upon significant gains has marked the rhetoric continuously to the present.

The dependence upon history to mark successes is important to the identity challenge. Goldmann, having recounted the successes, proceeded in the address to redefine the future. He recognized that

Those successes entail the risk that the beginning achievement is mistaken for the final object; that the great revolutionary fervour is lost by assuming the goal has already been attained; that the people glory in their own performance and take life easy by resting on their laurels. Most historic movements have collapsed in such a crisis . . . . This is the present danger of the Zionist movement, seen from a historic perspective . . . . Contentment
with the scope of a success is justified only
if it generates the courage to embark with equal
fervour on what has not yet been achieved.33

Herein lies the challenge to maintenance of the Zionist
identity. For Goldmann it involved the continued renewal
of goals and the redefinition of purpose. He never missed
the emphasis upon the state as central and the Jewish
people as one. Without those overriding principles the
force of Zionist identity is lost.

In recent rhetoric, Marie Syrkin, associate chairman
of editorial board of Midstream, "How Israel Affects
American Jews," recounts that the successes of Zionism
have produced new names for the Jewish identity:

A striking instance of the effect of
Israel's emergence on popular attitudes is that
for the first time in generations a code word
for Jew is no longer the mediaeval (sic) "wander­
ing Jew" or "rootless cosmopolitan" but "Zionist,"
the individual fiercely rooted in his soil—the
exact opposite of the former stigma . . . .

In this sense, the existence of Israel
compels Jewish identification, whether through
acknowledgement or rejection, for rejection,
too, is an admission of a bond even though the
individual may demonstratively decline to honor
the connection.34

So the factors become integrally linked, focus, goals,
successes, symbols all become a significant part of the
Zionist identity appeals. To remove them would be to
destroy the framework for defining self and would retract
from community view the standards necessary to position
both self and others in relationship to identity.
Zionism, then, serves to provide a sharpened sense of Jewishness as well as an alternative to assimilation and the Zionist redefines the character from that of the cringing victim of anti-semitism to an image of vigorous independence. Syrkin notes that:

In addition to changing gentile stereotypes, the comparatively few decades of Jewish independence have given new symbols to the national imagination.35

These new symbols become the function of the identity rhetorician. The Zionist uses them to renew the emphasis upon Israel as the Promised Land, requiring the allegiance of the Jewish Community. To attain this allegiance, though, the rhetoric must make the audience uncomfortable with its present state even if it requires hyperbole in its emphasis that all commonly accept the definitions. The Zionist must demonstrate that assimilation is not working by reminding others that peace in America for the Jew is, at best, tenuous. Syrkin is no exception. She claims:

... even comfortable American Jewry, despite its affluence, is visibly troubled by increasing challenges to the democratic consensus. Jews in the United States are no longer confident that the democratic doctrine by which an individual could prosper according to his accomplishments and ability are unassailable ... . American Jewry shows signs of unease in American Zion. And instinctively many turn to the actual Zion for an answer.36

The implicit assumption is that assimilation has not, nor will it ever, solve the identity problems of the Jew in the Diaspora. The strategy varies directly with
observable failures in assimilation and becomes more important at times significant numbers of the group do indeed feel uneasy about their present situation. These ebbs and flows result in concomitant shifts toward and away from Zionism. Two periodicals, both Zionist, Midstream and The American Zionist chronicle the changes in rhetoric.

Thus, the rhetoric of Herzl, Silver, Brandeis, Dan Leon, Meir Kahane, Eliahu Navi, Emmanuel Neumann, Charles Shulman, and Nachum Goldmann, though delivered across a long span of history still is held together by the similarities in the Zionist identity which they each supported. The examples used here serve to demonstrate the results of the research into this area of identity rhetoric with emphasis upon the fact that, though some of the goals have changed in accordance with successes and failures, the call to identity has remained intact. Beyond this, the methods used to make the people aware of the need to maintain identity are virtually the same despite the changes brought on by time.

A major problem with the rhetorical strategy affecting the masses, however, is that the popular press fails to understand that there is not "one" American Jewish position. Thus when they report on the topic of American Jewry, the tendency is to combine all of the strategies together, thereby weakening the symbol applications.
This affects the Jewish audiences in that messages intended for them are distorted and misunderstood when they are disseminated to outside groups. The call to Zionism, then, is often seen as radical separationism by gentile American reporters. This increases the pressures upon the young Jews to shun the Zionist cause in order to avoid the disdain of those especially among the Jews of the New Left who see Israel as an aggressor nation. The media filter distortion and the encouragement of cultural pluralism may explain why many more Jews have not adopted the Zionist identity even though they have strong sympathy with Israel.

Zionist ideals vary from the scholarly eloquence of the Silvers, Brandeis's, Weizmanns, and Herzls, to the more radical street levels of Meir Kahane, but the basic commonalities exist. Whether one accepts identity for political or religious reasons, his focus is upon Israel and his allegiances to it. Zionism has ebbed and flowed in popularity in the Jewish community, but has maintained enough of an influence to keep Israel in focus as an identification symbol. It must be remembered that Zionism had a direct causal relationship to the recognition of Israel as a nation in 1949.
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CHAPTER IV
SURVIVALIST STRATEGIES

Among strategies in the American Jewish community, survivalist rhetoric is the most common approach of the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform theologies. Survivalism likewise views the Jewish people as one audience and recognizes Palestine as the Jewish homeland. These rhetoricians will, however, reject Israeli citizenship as an authenticator of identity and will turn to application of religious and cultural traditions for symbolic balance. This strategy decries the assimilationist tendencies of the American culture and calls upon the Jew to retain his identity by remaining together in Jewish enclaves, attending Jewish schools, observing Jewish holidays, eating Jewish foods, and avoiding intermarriage.

Such strategy is exceedingly value-oriented. It is suggested that the maintenance of Judaic culture is superior to all other systems and thus the "true Jew" is authenticated by his differences from gentile society.

For the survivalist, it is not uncommon to depend upon outward manifestations of his heritage for "marking-off." The plight of his people is not really oppression but the loss of distinctiveness and self-esteem. These
rhetoricians encourage the young people to return to the Hebrew languages and studies and to regain the symbolic balance of being a "chosen people."

The strategy is not anti-Zionist, but does see Jewishness in a unifying rather than nationalistic sense. It is reinforced by affiliation with the synagogue as the center of life.

The Orthodox survivalist ranges from the Hasidim who are recognized by strict dietary laws and dress codes to the less noticeable Orthodox position which maintains the traditions and laws as a centering function but whose outward appearances do not mark him as different from the rest of his community. The Conservative survivalist likewise maintains the traditions and customs but uses them more in the symbolic sense than as regulators of everyday life style. Survivalist leaders are typically Rabbis or professional educators rather than politicians and the strategy is much less political in nature than Zionism.

The survivalist rhetor will maintain allegiance to World Jewry, but his citizenship and political structure is American. He recognizes himself as a Jew and marks that distinctiveness as important. His religion is Judaism with a strong emphasis in his rhetoric upon history. Like the Zionist, many speeches demonstrate a
mutual mistrust of other people and cultures and call for self-esteem and development.

That survivalism is gaining acceptance among Jewish young people is apparent. Simon Herman found that:

The students desire Jewish identity in the Diaspora to be preserved even though they are pessimistic about the capacity of the Jewish communities to maintain their identity. They do not hold the view that the alternative to aliyah to Israel should be assimilation. When asked what a youth abroad who is not prepared to immigrate to Israel should do—maintain his Jewishness or assimilate—not only the religious students (99%) but also the great majority (82%) of the non-religious students state that he should maintain his Jewishness abroad. A minority of non-religious students (18%), however favor assimilation.

"Assimilation" was a much-derided word among the students and they spoke with contempt of "assimilationist" Jews. 1

It is likewise apparent that there is a direct attempt to reach the younger generations and bridge the gaps. An advertisement in Congress Bi-Weekly for information packets called "The American-Jewish Care Package" included such titles as "A Guide to Jewish Student Groups," "Jewish Survival and the College Campus," "Report on Jewish Campus Youth," "Jewing it in '32," and "Keep the Faith." 2 The materials in the packet echo the call to establish the ethnic and religious symbols of Judaism as part of daily existence.

A consistent repetition of the dangers of assimilation is found throughout survivalist strategies. An apparent assumption is that All American Jewish communities
are prone to assimilation. This makes introspection by the individual all the more urgent lest he be caught up by the trend of his environment. David Landes has emphasized this problem in an American Jewish Congress dialogue.

I am prepared to believe that the Jewish population in the United States has, in fact, not grown, and I think the reason for this is simply the steady erosion of the Jewish population. Although we bear children, not all of them remain Jews. There is a process of assimilation that bleeds the Jewish population at a steady pace from year to year. If this is the case, it simply reinforces what I have been saying, namely, that the secularized Jewish community of the United States with its special concerns will drift ever farther, in terms of life-style, from Israeli Jewry, and that communication is going to become increasingly difficult. I am told that even now communication is difficult. Many Israelis have told me, and many American Jews have complained to me, that when American young people come here they don't find it easy to talk with and become friends with Israelis. 3

The survivalist sees a relationship between diaspora Jews and the State of Israel because of values inherent in the Jewish past. 4 This is why the indoctrination of this value system is regarded as a maintenance of identity. The assumption is that the loss of these values equates with a loss of identity.

At this point community organization becomes an important survivalist strategy. A measure of assurance of keeping one's identity is linked with affiliation with other Jews. Howard M. Sachar notes that:

The determination of Jews to maintain their ethnic identity has impelled them to establish
and finance a communal structure of unprecedented scope and vitality, a skein of associations and activities fulfilling an extraordinary variety of social and secular, as well as purely religious, functions. Contrary to popular impression, most Jews, not excluding the Jewish majority among whom religiosity has been diluted to the minimal observance of two or three festival dates, still tend to prefer as the symbol of their peoplehood the synagogue, rather than the all-purpose Jewish community center. Apparently there is a bedrock of religio-culturalism that even the most educated and "assimilated" Jews are reluctant to abandon. By the same token, there has been a growing preoccupation in the postwar decades with the quality of Jewish education . . . Accordingly, by 1966 not less than 60,000 Jewish youngsters were enrolled in Jewish "day" schools, exposed to a somewhat ill-coordinated program of general and Jewish studies. The growth of interest in Jewish education arises partly from an intensification of survivalist values after the Holocaust, . . . 5

Ruth Gay, in her well recognized work on Jewish America, emphasizes this trend.

American Jews are not so eager as they were a generation ago to shake off their past, to become "just" Americans. Like other third generations, they are beginning to discover the pleasures of their Jewish identity, and for many Jews their entire social world is made up of fellow-members of their synagogue or temple. Just as their parents' days were regulated by religious ritual, the calendar of the modern Jew is dominated by the calendar of his synagogue. The education of his children, his philanthropic interests, his own education, his social life, and, finally, his religion, are all bound up with his membership in his synagogue. 6

By this participation the survivalist generates his identity symbols by reviving and preserving "agreed upon" portions of his ancient Jewish heritage. This differs from the secularist whose strategy follows in that he generates his symbols from present universalisms of
"freedom and dignity" and "individual worth." When the emphasis is placed upon symbolic identity, the symbols become doctrinal means of identification. To refuse the symbols is to lose identity.

If the American Jew seeks and uses these symbols:

He will also have some conception of his historic relationship to the Jewish people of the past. It is a fact that even today the average Jewish religious school student, who has read one or two of the many textbooks on the subject, can boast a better and more systematic knowledge of Jewish origins and history than his parents and grandparents ever could—even though he is no Hebraist and is not likely to be one. And because he knows more, he is more sympathetic; with knowledge have come loyalty and devotion, not in parochial but in broad universal terms, to the ideals of his people and to the welfare of even the most distant of Jewries. This growing sense of kinship and the "style" of American life in general will bring the majority of Jews back into the synagogue. Some will come only to associate with their fellows. Others will seek education for their children and for themselves. Some will remain to pray, and in a world where science reaches out to embrace the infinite, they will reverently identify themselves once again with the spiritual ideals of their fathers.

At times, survivalist rhetoric has been very strongly worded and forceful in its attack upon those Jews who were becoming acculturated to American society. Rabbi Kertzer recounts that:

Half a century ago, the English writer, Israel Zangwill, wrote a popular play, The Melting Pot, describing a social process which he observed taking place in the United States. Under the benevolent skies of a free society, Zangwill prophesied, Jews were in danger of losing their identity. Old World habits and manners—and even values—ran the risk of being
submerged in a new culture, a homogenized, uniform Americanism embracing all of its citizens, whatever their background, tradition, or ancestry. For Jewish survivalists, "the melting pot" boomed as a fearful threat, an invitation to cultural and religious suicide. Those who welcomed the notion of the Jews melting into America were branded as assimilationists, escapists—and worst of all, self-haters. They were excoriated from the pulpit and in the Jewish press for their lack of dignity and self-respect.

The correction of this naming problem is inward though, and must be sought beyond the stereotypes of the gentile cultures. Survivalist Rufus Learsi recognized this factor when he said:

... the ability to survive is neither a virtue nor even a boon, unless the life it brings is wholesome and dignified. And while the hostility to which Jews have been peculiarly exposed cannot be ignored as a survival factor, it alone will certainly not engender a dignified and creative communal life. Other survival factors must be found, and they must be sought where, in the unique experience of the Jewish people across continents and millennia, they have always been found: in the realm of mind and spirit.

His strategy is to conclude that identity must not rest solely upon reaction to anti-semitism or it is lost where anti-semitism is not present. Authentic Jewishness for the survivalist, then, exists in and of itself in the person who embraces the religious and cultural symbols of traditional Judaism.

Specific examples of survivalist rhetoric will indicate the importance of these strategies. Possibly the most interesting factor in the survivalist rhetoric is a pronounced tendency to assume that secularism and
assimilation are carrying away the majority of diaspora Jews despite quantitative evidence to the contrary. This arises from an earnest intent to press the urgency of the message strongly upon the audience. The tendency is strongly similar to many ministers who generalize their messages to reach those in the audience who are guilty despite the fact that many in the audience aren't.

The survivalists present a common research problem. There are many who could be cited as examples and who are worthy of note. It is helpful that with very few exceptions the strategies emerge clearly and do not require a great amount of interpretation to be recognized.

Excerpts from representative speakers have been chosen herein for the purpose of demonstrating the strategies which have been observed. A good starting point is a speech by Dr. Irving Greenberg entitled "Adventure in Freedom—Or Escape from Freedom?" Dr. Greenberg is an Associate Professor of History at Yeshiva University and regular speaker for the annual conferences of the American Jewish Committee. His basic theme is the danger of secularism and assimilation.

Greenberg's speech begins in accord with many survivalists with a recitation of the growing problem of a loss of identity which he feels comes directly from a failure to maintain Jewish values. The threat of increasing intermarriage coupled with a declining birth rate is
of particular concern. To counter this trend, Greenberg reminds the audience that it is maintenance of identity that has brought the Jew to the point where Jewish literature has been on best-seller lists, visibility is high in the mass media, institutional life is at an all time high and anti-semitism is declining.\textsuperscript{11} The strategy, then, is to demonstrate that success in these areas should encourage the continuance of the Jewish traditions.

In another speech, Greenberg uses this analysis to emphasize the distinctive nature of Jewishness and the "choseness" of the Jew. A historian, the time perspective of identity is very important to him. He reminds his audience of the failures of earlier attempts at assimilation as a reason for remaining distinctive.

First and foremost, I think, we do so by confronting the implications of the holocaust—that it challenges the claims of all the progress, that it smashes as empty illusion the thought that modern moral man will solve his own problems or that science will cure all of men's needs, that it smashes the dream of a world where there will be only one group and all men will live in equality so that the Jew no longer has any need to see himself as a Jew or to be concerned for Jewish self-interest. To the extent that we have assimilated for 150 years, it has been under this vivid dream—which tragically turns out to be an illusion—.... This is the kind of illusion which is illuminated by the light of the crematoria.\textsuperscript{12}

This analysis is important to the survivalist strategy because it leads to the necessary conclusion that there must be an alternative course of action to assimilation...
and more than simply being available, it is mandatory. Greenberg continues:

We have to recognize and confront the fact that to be a Jew is to be singled out, that we have no choice. And throughout Jewish history, those who have been Jews and those who have remained Jews have been those who did not need to apologize for this Jewishness but who understood that it was a calling and were not afraid to accept it in that spirit.¹³

Beyond this, the speaker must understand the overlapping identities of the Jewish-American and either discount or re-define one portion of the identity. Greenberg chooses the latter strategy as do most of the survivalists studied. Few condemn Americanism, rather they re-define it thus:

A main reason our children deny their Jewishness, I believe, is that they feel that if Judaism is nothing more than Americanism, they might as well be Americans, lock, stock, and barrel. Only when we have the courage to admit to them that we act as Jews will their experience of Americanism be an experience of Jewishness and not a flight from Jewishness.¹⁴

This experience of Jewishness is the subject of Dr. Charles S. Liebman in his "Personal Observation on Jewish Survival." He is an author for the Jewish Publication Society of America and chairman of the Department of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University.

Dr. Liebman fears the trends of American life which undermine what he considers to be the essentials of Judaism. His strategy emphasizes that the values of integration and survival are contradictory. He lists three
criteria that he sees as necessary for a community to call itself Jewish. First, there must be a sense of unity and peoplehood which transcends all national, regional, racial and cultural boundaries. This sense brings a feeling of unity with and responsibility for Jews everywhere. This criterion is not singular to the survivalist as already shown.

The second criterion, though, narrows the strategy to a representative form of survivalism. This is a requirement that a further definition of Judaism is the Torah. This he defines as a set of laws and practices which exist objectively or in a reality which are not of the person's own construction. The Torah is outside of the person and abiding by it demonstrates affirmation of belief and thus identity.

To this is added the third criterion that the community require Jewish education which includes the study of the Torah and sacred texts. It is here that outward actions become doctrinal. Those who do not abide by the criteria lose their Jewish identity for this form of survivalism though they may fulfill the ethnic requirements.

Because the study of Torah and sacred texts as well as the maintenance of tradition seems irrelevant to some segments, particularly the youth, a common survivalist strategy is a re-affirmation, and even re-definition of their importance for contemporary Judaism. This is the
approach of Eugene Borowitz in his two previously cited volumes *A New Jewish Theology in the Making* and *How Can a Jew Speak of Faith Today?* Borowitz is Professor of Education and Jewish Thought at Hebrew Union College in New York. He is the former National Director of Education, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Borowitz says of his own methodology:

Thus in Jewish theology I object to using a Neo-Kantian or naturalist or existentialist approach because the resulting interpretations of Judaism seem to me to have distorted my continuing Jewish faith in the people of Israel, the God of Israel, and the Torah of Israel respectively. So in seeking a proper methodology by which to do Jewish theology today I have felt I had to work not only on methodological inquisitive question, that is to see how my emerging stance would affect the various substantive aspects of Jewish faith.\(^{18}\)

His strategy is similar to the political conservative strategy of re-defining the present in terms of the past. He calls for a renewed application of Judaic symbols to the end that he concludes that modern Zionist and secularist interpretations of those symbols are incorrect.

This conclusion predicates the survivalist interpretation that the nation of Israel is an entity of people wherever they are, who are united to their relationship to God and has no political connotations to a geographic state whatever.\(^{19}\) The concomitant result is to recognize the people of Israel as a people of the Mosaic Covenant wherever they are. This promises the eternal nature of
Clearly, Israel cannot even largely be identified with a particular state. Israel must rather be understood as the community of the Covenant wherever it is and under whatever circumstances, though it becomes most clearly visible when it is living a self-determining existence on its homeland . . . How extraordinary a prospect would open up if American Jews, now groping for a sense and style of Jewish living, accepted as basic to their life the premise that they are indeed the inheritors of this ancient promise! 20

Through the application of Judaism in its historic and traditional form the survivalist defines new hope for the Jews of the present. Without this application of religious symbol, Jewishness becomes sterile and unnecessary to the present.

A fourth representative of survivalist rhetoric is Louis L. Kaplan, President of Baltimore Hebrew College and chairman of the Editorial Committee of Jewish Heritage. His synopsis, "Needed: Dynamics of Judaism," provides the action step for the American Jew that is required for identity. His strategy is to define clearly the concepts of Judaism as they are to be applied today. Examples of this rhetorical application of principles are as follows:

The synagogue needs to be saved from its current success. It must again become the powerhouse where Jewish idealism is energized so that Jews and society can move forward . . . .

Worship experience must be a means of bringing to its full potential the divine spark in each person . . . .

. . . Above all, this Torah was given to be embodied in the history and life of our people . . . .
Judaism is nothing less than a view of the universe, of man's place in this universe in all his interrelationships with God, nature, his fellow men and with the animal kingdom. It is a philosophy of life and history, tested and tried in the experience of a particular people.

This emphasizes that applying the ancient symbols of Judaism is necessary to the daily life of one who would call himself Jewish. Thus they gain a new relevance for today because they re-define the present.

Kaplan recognizes well his task as a speaker and writer in response to his position. That task is to create an "interaction between the emerging values in democratic scientific, twentieth-century America and the historic insights and tested ideals of Judaism." He seeks a return to "spirituality." This requires that physical action be raised to the dimension of the spiritual by sanctifying and hallowing it. This makes clear why the symbols of the past are so important to the survivalist.

A particularly significant aspect of Kaplan's strategy, which is found in many of the survivalists, is to define Israel as a Messiah for the world, thus fulfilling Judaic prophecy. To see Israel as a unifying force because the Jews are found in all nations and because they teach love and provision for the stranger in contrast to many other societies, is to attempt to grant a mystically distinctive quality to Jewish existence.
Perhaps the best summary of the survivalist identity rhetoric comes from a rather lengthy statement by Rabbi Seymour Siegel, assistant Dean of the Herbert H. Lehman Institute of Ethics and member of the editorial board of the Jewish Publication Society. Siegel attempts to define the implications of true Judaism thereby authenticating identity for those who follow these precepts:

1. Judaism seeks to preserve personal liberty but limits this liberty in the interest of public order and welfare. Traditional Judaism did not tolerate public lawlessness, public displays of immorality or sexual permissiveness. Jewish teaching is suspicious of strong concentrations of power, since man's nature tends to turn all power into vehicles for self-interest. Traditional Judaism affirms individual responsibility and expects man to master his conditions and not to be overwhelmed by them. Judaism is passionate for justice, but realizes that in a human society there will always be inequalities which have to be mitigated by the rule of law. Traditional Judaism views the particular traits of nations and groups as important. Traditional Judaism does not relegate religion to a sphere of private activity. Rather, it expects religious principles and institutions to be visible in the corporate life of a community. Judaism is among the most tradition-oriented of world views, but it does not eschew novelty. It assimilates it within the tradition. Judaism is realistically aware of the limitations of human nature, the ubiquity of the evil yezer and the imperfections of human societies. And, above all, Judaism is antiutopian. It affirms messianism over against utopianism. Messianism means the redemption of human society and the cosmos by a Power beyond history--while utopianism affirms the possibility of redemption within history by history-making men.\(^3\)

Such survivalist rhetoric has gained a positive response in the Jewish community...\(^4\)...A renewed interest in...
the study of Torah and sacred texts has arisen among Jewish students and a return to Hebrew and Yiddish has developed along with participation in traditional ceremonies. Unlike Zionist ideology which may be reactive to anti-Semitism, survivalist identity makes an attempt to exist of and for itself. The survivalists in fact see as their greatest danger the lack of anti-Semitism which encourages assimilation and loss of cultural identity.

The survivalist rhetoric also well expressed in its totality by Rabbi Arthur A. Cohen in a brief speech, "Why I Choose to Be a Jew," as well as in the literature of Chaim Potok in such works as The Chosen and My Name is Asher Lev. Indeed there is no paucity of application of the survivalist strategy and there is a high degree of uniformity of both style and goal in it.
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CHAPTER V
ANTI-ZIONIST—SECULARIST STRATEGIES

As noted in the exposition in Chapter I, there is no truly assimilationist rhetorical strategy in American Jewish identity rhetoric. Certainly some seek assimilation and discard Jewish identity altogether in order to function in American society. The changing of names and alteration of physical characteristics are procedures commented upon by many authors in the Jewish Community. Often there is no "protective coloration" as in the Black community, to keep one mandatorily in the Jewish community. These people fit into the "quasi-Jew" designation developed by Dan Elazar.¹

Because intermarriage, conversion, and total assimilation are so strongly reacted against in Jewish circles, such action has not developed a rhetorical strategy which is identifiable. Persons choosing this course typically do so on an individual basis by simply "dropping out" of the Jewish community structures. They will choose "American" identity as their "marking off" structure and cease to maintain the traditional symbols of Judaism as authenticators of identity. Some of the rhetoric of the New Left which attacks Israel as an aggressor nation and
characterizes the Israeli government as barbaric might come from some of these people, but it is neither identity rhetoric nor representative of assimilationists, and thus must be disregarded for purposes of this study.

The remaining representative strategy to be examined in terms of identity rhetoric, then, is the near assimilationist. This position is inimical to the survivalist and often results in part from Classical Reform theology. The position resembles the political liberal in that it defines the past in terms of the present and seeks its identity symbols in the universal concepts of freedom, equality, civil and human rights.

In the Jewish community the person will maintain that he is an American who happens to be either of the Jewish faith or Jewish genealogy, but these do not exclude him from full participation in American life. For him, the Jewish faith is often equitable to the denominational structure of protestantism and does not require dual allegiances.

He must deal with the nation of Israel in reference to identity as do the other strategies. But for him a sympathy for Israel is engendered by a belief in assisting a young, democratic nation, rather than in Palestine as the symbol of his future. He often is strongly anti-Zionist and dislikes the call of the Aliyah echoed by many in the Zionist community.
He may maintain alliances with Jewish organizations and people and even live in a recognized Jewish community, but does so for sake of convenience rather than requirement.

Varying degrees of adaptation are evident ranging from that which is simply anti-Zionist to that which completely divorces the religious aspects of Judaism from acculturation into American society. Those who are anti-Zionist will be viewed as secularists by both the Zionists and the survivalists because of their lack of centering on the State of Israel and the traditional elements of Israel. The near assimilationists do, however, accommodate the old religious symbols to the present and discard those symbols that they deem to be irrelevant.

In each strategy there are those who would be labeled by others in their community as secularists. Typically, this labeling comes as a result of the lack of outward manifestations of the symbols of Jewishness: failure to attend the local synagogue, lack of support to Jewish philanthropies or agencies, political conservatism, failure to observe Shabbat or Jewish holidays. Each of these things mark the person in relationship to the community and have become identity traits.

The near assimilationist is more readily identified by other Jews than by outside communities and often finds himself in a middle ground between cultures, not fully
accepted by either group. Where full assimilation fails to take place, he often will fall back on the survivalist or Zionist strategy for identity. If full assimilation does take place, the reference points for identity are changed to those of the new culture and the rhetoric may lose its ethnic identification altogether to be replaced by new standards. Thus the success at assimilation often directly affects the amount and form of identity rhetoric.

Some Zionists and survivalists exist who give vocal assent to the Jewish symbols, but do not conform in terms of behavior.

It is readily apparent that where the Zionists and survivalists are predominantly speaking of religion and culture in their identity, the near assimilationists develop a strongly political rhetoric which espouses the liberal traditions and symbols. The position arises, as Rabbi Bertram Gold points out, because it "is a striking characteristic of American society that it enabled so many immigrant groups of diverse religious, ethnic, and cultural origins to become an intrinsic part of American life while simultaneously permitting these groups to assert their unique characteristics within a pluralistic framework." From the beginning Jews have sought integration with identity into American society because there was little conflict between Judaic goals and the goals of democracy.
Despite the dire warnings of the survivalists, the near assimilationists do not adopt a philosophy of doing away with their Jewish distinctiveness. Their rhetoric instead indicates a wish to mold the best of Jewishness and the best of Americanism together.

Seldom do those who are labeled secularists by the survivalists or Zionists admit to being such. In fact the anti-Zionist American Council of Judaism declares that the Zionists are the true secularists because they hold political allegiance to Israel. The Council accuses the Zionist movement of subversion in that step by step it has taken essentially religious concepts, customs, ceremonies, institutions and appeals and changed their meaning to a secular and national one.³

The significant factor is that each of the strategies alludes with disfavor to the other strategies and defines them as the culprit in the identity problem. Yet the rhetoric is projected inward to the entire Jewish community for the purpose of initiating individual choice.

The specific rhetoric representative of this anti-Zionist—near assimilationist position comes primarily from pamphlets, articles and speeches of members of the American Council for Judaism (ACJ). The Council has produced a prolific amount of information concerning its position and it is an attempt to define the separateness of being a Jew and being an American to show that the latter does not
preclude being a member of any minority. The identity that they wish to project is one that is fully integrated and operative in American society.

In a General Introduction Paper pre-dating the annual conference of the Council in 1959, a six-point definition of "What Do We Mean By Integration?" clearly outlines the identity symbols which the ACJ wishes to apply:

Before departmentalizing the process of "integration," we should come to some agreement as to the meaning of the term itself as applied to Americans of Jewish faith.

A more precise and generally understood phrase, expressing what the Council means, would be "secular assimilation." But the term "assimilation" has such unfortunate — even if inaccurate — emotional overtones among Jews that its use would present an insurmountable public relations problem. By "integration," nevertheless, we mean:

1. The affirmation that Judaism is a religion; a set of spiritual and ethical values.

2. That in the United States (and "integration" for United States citizens means something different from what it would mean for people in any other country) the collective actions of Jews, as Jews, should be limited to expressing, developing and further evolving these spiritual and ethical values.

3. That in the United States, the basic socio-political principles of our country are all predicated upon the assumption that our rights — and obligations — are individual. This is not a nation of minorities or cultural blocs or fragmentizing group rights.

4. A special prohibition, implicit and explicit, against bloc rights or obligations is involved whenever there appears to be a merger of church and state. That is to say, while other departures are tolerated in American life, where blocs or minorities operate as special pleading
groups, the degree of tolerance for such blocs operating on the basis of a merger of church and state is materially lower.

5. Further, that there is no — or little — validity to ambiguous and general terms like "Jewish culture," "Jewish nationality," "Jewish community" in any religious sense. Either these concepts are all reconcilable with a purely spiritual approach to Judaism (depending on anyone's denominational preference in Judaism) or they are secular accretions picked up by fractions of the Jews of America from the "assimilation" of culture which took place, at various times and in various countries, in the disparate history of Jews who are now Americans.

It follows, therefore, that there is nothing "disloyal" or "un-Jewish" about a total social, political and cultural assimilation for Jews in the United States.

6. That in the United States, granted these basic assumptions, there are still some areas of our national life where social services are supported — and (less often) used — on a sectarian religious basis. Hospitals and many forms of philanthropy, though varying from city to city, are fairly widely recognized as normally American if they are identified with some religious group.

Some American Jews may choose to lead in secularizing and de-sectarianizing such institutions. But for an effort to establish a norm of American conduct, it should be clearly understood that Jews are not expected, as Jews, to be less sectarianized than Americans of other faiths.

With these refinements we may venture a definition of "integration." We mean: The affirmation, observance and dedication to Judaism in accordance with each individual's religious preference and requirements. We mean the support, where conscience dictates, or public institutions of worship, as Jews. But we mean, in all other aspects of American life, that as individuals Jews will participate fully and completely in the system of rights and obligations shared by all other Americans. This system of rights and obligations is broader than mere legalities. It involves the nation's cultural, social and political patterns.
In these facets of our common country's life, Jews, as all other Americans, may join voluntary agencies to advance advertised and discernible objectives. But as Dr. Robert MacIver cautioned some years ago, in his study of the NCRAC agencies, Jews should be careful not to create "Jewish" agencies to carry on functions in American life which are -- or can be -- carried on by non-sectarian agencies. And, by integration, in a negative sense therefore, we mean -- above all -- that no institutions or agencies (except such as are within the acknowledged sectarianism of American life mentioned in §6 above) should be created to reflect, or appear to reflect, the "responsibilities" of a so-called "Jewish community." Quite apart from all else, this concept -- or the "peoplehood" concept -- deprives American Jews of the quality of voluntary association. As such, it follows inexorably, in an America dedicated to the principle of voluntary association, Judaism cannot be regarded as a high religion and Jews cannot be regarded as capable of full integration.

This application of the concept of "voluntary association" is very important to the development of this strategy. It allows the person to maintain his Jewish distinctiveness in those areas that he wishes and to keep the values of Judaism without depending upon the community or "one-people" symbol for his identity. An ACJ pamphlet recognizes that "In this pattern, Jews can live a fully integrated secular life and yet hold fast, as a matter of private and personal preference, to the Jewish faith, observing whatever interpretation of Judaism appeals to them." Integration with identity is sought on three levels, the personal, local, and national. This strategy is to allow the person to re-define his Jewishness in terms of
present values that are applicable to his own needs and wants.

On the personal level, the ACJ emphasizes the right of choice in the making of decisions as to what elements of the Jewish religious and cultural heritage are essential to his identity. The implication is that the Zionists and survivalists in speaking for a collective Jewry are denying the individual his distinctiveness. Repetition is commonly used to remind the Jewish audience the collectivist strategies forbid some personal choices. The ACJ paper notes: "At the more formal levels, there have been created quasi-governments of 'Jews' in the form of Community Councils; and, at even more intimate levels, efforts to intervene in personal affairs such as marriage, social contacts and the education of children."^6

The local level involves the application of organizational symbols, and the reminder is that there is a specific danger of being stereotyped by one's membership in specific groups. The near assimilationist feels that there is a threat to the individual in the application of "community of Jews" concepts. Therefore, the rhetoric calls for the personal right to live outside of a recognized grouping and to have association with groups other than Jewish agencies. That all actions of "Jewish" organizations might reflect upon the individual in a negative manner is an expressed fear.
The tendency for Zionists and survivalists to speak for all Jews is the expressed concern of the anti-Zionists on the national level. They see an attempt to provide an "internationalism" or "trans-nationalism" for diaspora Jewry. The ACJ feels that these cooperative agencies tend to digress into "defense" or "social justice" agencies rather than fulfilling their stated purposes of assisting Jews. There is a caution that "most Americans today believe that when the Israeli government whistles, the local synagogue's pulpit, the local welfare federation, the local Community Relations Council dance" because of national affiliations.

Ironically, it is at this point that near assimilationist and anti-Zionist rhetoric becomes very political in direct contradiction of their stated positions. A significant amount of time and energy is spent trying to convince political parties that there is no "Jewish Bloc Vote" and reminding them that no one group or agency speaks for all of America's Jews. This is exemplified by the pamphleteering efforts of the 1972 election year.

A speech representative of the strategy was delivered by Dr. Leonard Sussman, then Executive Director of the American Council for Judaism for a symposium at Brandeis University. The speech, "The Dilemma of American Jewry," expresses the intent to adopt an identity which separates Jewish faith and American citizenship into
two separate, but mutually acceptable, categories.

Sussman begins with a recognition of the importance of the State of Israel to all of the strategies:

The dilemmas persist because Israel is projected as the center of Jewish religion, culture, and nationalism. This claimed "centrality" assumes the creation of a unified Jewish peoplehood embracing common religious, secular, and nationalistic characteristics. Never before has this concept been less attuned to the societies in which most Jews live.¹⁰

In short the symbols of the Zionists and survivalists which center around Israel are not applicable to Jewishness today. It is therefore necessary to re-define these terms.

He begins by re-applying several very significant concepts in response to the "dilemmas" that he feels the survivalists have created for the American Jews. These dilemmas stem from two functions that he sees as creating separate value systems; these are segregated socio-political structures of Jewish enclaves and the second national interests aroused by allegiance to Israel.¹¹

In response to this duality, Sussman re-defines the past in terms of the present. First, in reference to the centrality of the Land of Palestine he reminds his audience that the Mosaic Covenant was made in the deserts of the Sinai rather than in present land of Israel and concludes that there is therefore no sacred significance to the land. He refers to "Malachi's cry, 'God is great beyond the borders of Israel'."¹² This leads to an analysis that
the call to return (Aliyah) is a spiritual call to unity of faith, not a physical call to a geographic center. Sussman's contention that "Even before the exile, Jews were dispersing voluntarily," gives an entirely new meaning to the diaspora relationship of Jews to other nations.

He likewise re-defines assimilation in a positive sense through a reminder that the Talmud itself represents a "thorough assimilation of ideas, mores, and legal systems of the Romans, Greeks, and Russians. Even modes of Eastern European Jews determine what is "Jewish" for Americans, but are really only assimilations of German and Slavic cultures.

Thus he refers to history to show that assimilation into other societies has been the traditional pattern rather than the exception for Jewish identity.

Sussman continues by defining the "Jewish people" not as those united by political commitments to Zion, but instead as those who hold the Judaic faith. Beyond this though, he does not want specific elements of Judaism to be the identifying doctrines either. This would lead to another form of "Jewish nationalism" which would impose secular Hebrew and Israelism upon the American Jew. He concludes:

The major problem, then, is to keep ethnic separation in communal life from being so pronounced in itself that it threatens ethnic harmony, good group relationships, and the spirit of basic good will which a democratic pluralistic
society requires, to keep it from spilling over into the civic arena of secondary relations to impinge on housing, jobs, politics, education and other areas of functional activity where universalistic criteria of judgment and assignment are necessary and where the operation of ethnic considerations can only be disruptive and even disastrous.

The values that must be emphasized, then, are those which equate with the dignity and worth of the individual. Therefore the symbols of Judaism are adhered to not as a link to Israel or survivalism, but as a means of balance for day to day existence. The ethnic identity which must survive for Sussman is the cultural-religious, not the ethnic-political.

Because there is no room for political allegiances, all traditional elements which make such ties must be re-named for the near assimilationist and he must not depend upon others to do the re-naming for him. The developing doctrine is that a manifestation of the concepts of independence, worth, justice, and other universalisms in the American system are also a mark of Jewishness.

A significant example of this identity is displayed in the response of Jewish author Saul Bellow:

I wouldn't say that I'm religious, although I have some religious feeling, but the last really Orthodox religious thing I did was have my bar mitzva. In myself, I don't feel there's any division; I'm both a Jew and an American. You must appreciate that the American experience is unique; in my opinion it is a tremendous event in world history. As an American, I think it would be very bad to leave my native city (Chicago) in this time of crisis (Watergate).
Obviously, Bellow feels comfortable with a total assimilation into the American society. He recognizes Israel as "a democratic society. The only modern democratic society in the region. Freedom loving writers have to care what happens to it."\(^{17}\) The emphasis is that Israel is to be dealt with as a democratic nation, not as a center of identification for Bellow. It is necessary, though, that he deal with the subject in terms of explanation.

The need to produce one's own name is also evident with Bellow. He is concerned about being classified as a Jewish novelist.

I don't like it. First of all, I'm suspicious of all labels. This one in particular has the flavor of the ghetto about it. I think when American Jews began to write in English, people were so astonished that they could do so that they quickly gave them a tag. Malamud, Roth and I are all tied together in this way, and it's rather unfortunate.\(^{18}\)

This independence from other Jews for identification characterizes the strategy. Bellow in further remarks indicates success at integration into the American culture. This, then, becomes his identity standard.

Such rhetoric is not new to the near assimilationists and anti-Zionists. It has existed parallel to the Zionist and survivalist strategies through American history, producing a significant counter-point. As Zionism grew in favor in the 1940's, near assimilationist rhetoric was relegated to a minor role. As Zionism and nationalism declined in the
1960's, the strategy increased. The decisive factor seems to be the acceptance of the minority group by the majority culture.

The speeches of the Conference of Non-Zionist Rabbis in Atlantic City, in June of 1942, express the concerns related earlier in this chapter and seek to define the relationship of the American Jew to his position in the United States. It is a clear attempt to sever identity from dependence upon Palestine as the Jewish center. A statement from that conference attempts to redefine the Jewish position as universal rather than nationalistic.

Thus the homeland of the Jews is a "spiritual" Israel rather than a geo-political entity. The passage reads:

Reform Judaism, as we conceive it, is the contemporary manifestation of the eternal prophetic Israel, through which alone Judaism and the Jew live to witness the universal God.

There remains a call to maintain the religious symbols of Judaism, but to cast them in the light of a universal lifestyle rather than one centered on Palestine. The American identity is enforced by Jewish faith rather than dependent upon it.

The concluding conference speaker affirmed:

We declare our unwavering faith in the humane and righteous principles first envisaged by the Prophets of Israel and embodied in the American Bill of Rights. In keeping with these principles we hold that the Jewish people have the same right to live securely anywhere in the world and to enjoy the fruit of their labor as have men of every other faith and historic background.
This final sentence was crucial to identity even at that point in history. That is, there must be division between political allegiances and Judaism as a faith in the same sense that other faiths exist simultaneously with government.

In the keynote address of the Forty-first Conference of the American Jewish Committee in 1950, the speaker, Dr. John Proskauer, using the topic "Our Duty as Americans --Our Responsibility as Jews," states:

... We have not, we cannot have and we will not have any political fealty except to our own America.

Clear thinking requires that we begin with this axiom; and its first corollary is to say to the anti-Semite that the Jews of America suffer from no political schizophrenia, that politically we are not split personalities, and that in faith and in conduct we shall continue to demonstrate what the death-rolls of our army on many a battlefield have attested, that we are bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of America. 22

The attempt is to maintain Jewish identity ethnically and religiously while assimilating into America socially, economically, and politically. The anti-Zionist position is summed up in the conclusion:

In short, what we strive for in our relation with our fellow Jews is based upon the same fundamental that we hold should guide our conduct in relation to all men. That fundamental is respect for the dignity of the individual, adherence by each man to the principles he holds sacred, complete respect for the varying views of others. This we ask of all mankind. We ask it alike of our fellow Jews and our brethren of other faiths. 23
Proskauer did not require all Jews to conform to the same concepts of Jewishness. Thus he opened the door to redefinition of the Jew's relationship to other Jews and to his gentile neighbors. This action aids assimilation and may be referred to as adaptive. It is the redefinition of terms, however, that is significant to the analysis of the rhetorical strategy.

A public presentation made for the Secretary of State by the American Council for Judaism in 1953 is a representative attempt at definition of Jewishness as a religious rather than ethnic structure. The response was to the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 which distinguished Jewishness as a nationality for immigration purposes. The Council noted:

"such a distinction is contrary to the basic American principle that a human being's religious faith is, in no way, to be a consideration in his acquisition or retention of the rights, privileges and responsibilities of United States citizenship. For Judaism is not an ethnic classification any more than it is a national classification. Neither language, nor culture, nor common origin of people who are Jews qualify them--or their religion--for either of these classifications.

To legislate that "Jew" is an ethnic group, we submit, would therefore result in discrimination against people of a religious group. It would also deprive Jews of their American right of voluntary association as Jews. Such action is manifestly contrary to the spirit of American democracy."

This message has not changed significantly over the intervening twenty years from the 1953 statement to the present. The anti-Zionists continue to express the
distinction between ethnic and religious identity and are often recognized as secularists by others in the Jewish community.

It is necessary to recognize a near assimilationist position beyond the anti-Zionist. It is held by those for whom the traditional Jewish symbols espoused by the Zionist and survivalist do not apply. For this person the recognition as a Jew may be painful to the point of rejecting the majority of those symbols.

Rafael Scharf defends "those who feel themselves to be Jews to the very nerve ends--yet remain indifferent or hostile to religion, and also, as the case may be, happen not to support the Jewish state, in concept or conduct."  

He defines what he calls the secular Jew as one who:

... shares with his non-Jewish contemporary the attitudes and the worldview which define secularity: a belief in the process and results of free inquiry, wherever they lead; the emphasis on the human, historical, temporal at the expense of the divine, eternal supernatual and the ordained. ... However, when from behind these logically secure and philosophically defensible borders he proclaims and affirms his Jewish identity and allegiance. ... (but) the self-confessed Jew must remain in dialogue with his own past, the past which in the main has a religious dimension.  

There is no easy escape from the time perspective of the identity rhetoric even for this "secularist." He must deal with a definition of Jewishness which explains the historic link between Jewishness and Judaism.
To apply this redefinition, Scharf explains that:

When the secular man contends that he would (as in a way he does) stake his life on the thesis that there is no transcendent order of reality it only means that, on available evidence, this thesis appears to him infinitely more probable than the opposite. The other side, on which properly rests the onus of proof, is seen as having failed to convince, and not for lack of trying. . . . The conviction that there is no divine intervention in man's transient and finite earthly existence seems to him inescapable, but he will not insist that in this sober recognition lies the sole and exclusive truth and that whosoever refuses to see it in the same light is a self-deluding fool.  

Thus the near assimilationist is defined as more tolerant and accepting of others' viewpoints than they are of his. This definition provides an affirmative counterpoint to the negative stereotypes often ascribed to him by other Jewish strategies.

At the risk of an over-reliance upon Scharf's statements to explain the position rather than my own words, I must submit that his rhetoric epitomizes the concepts of the identity very clearly and is quite self-explanatory. Excerpts from the address serve to give a feel of the calculated choice of words used by the speaker to present what to much of his audience is a distasteful position.

Scharf establishes the precedents for Jewish adaptation by analog to the trends in modern radical theology exemplified by Tillich, Bultmann, Bonhoeffer, and Van Buren and then gives credence to the modern trends by
making them again a positive rather than negative action.

He says:

. . . The attack on the mythology of religious form and contents, the attempts at secularisation (sic), have made it possible—for those who are persuaded by such an approach—to feel that religious beliefs, in these new modernised (sic) garments are compatible with intellectual integrity.26

An important form of redefinition of symbols takes place with such a statement. The older symbols of Liberal, Conservative, Orthodox, and Reform Judaism, give way to radical theological positions labeled with the description of having intellectual integrity. The assumption is that the older forms lack this characteristic. Thus the near assimilationist behavior of rejecting traditional symbols becomes a positive way of naming oneself.

This Jew must note that it is a mark of "the open-minded, honest, and non-evasive secular attitude that it recognizes its own limitations, acknowledges value where it is found and grants everybody his freedom; specifically, it sees merit in the multiplicity of beliefs and is tolerant of them; . . . "29

This leads to Scharf's definition of "Jewishness" where religion is left aside as the defining point.

At the outset there is the pervading conviction that the "Jewishness" has to do with ethics and signifies a moral involvement; that, through history, the Jewish ethical message, experience and modes of thinking have produced a specific amalgam which is worth preserving and perpetuating and the disappearance of which
would make mankind the poorer.

There is in this conviction an ingredient of pride on account of being a part of a worthy enterprise. . . . The biblical and post-biblical experience of the Jew is unique, . . . The contribution both in the past and in the present to the store of human heritage by the many individuals with whom one can claim common ancestry and a bond of kinship gives a sense of distinction. . . .

Despite the ethnic diversity caused by dispersion and exposure to different cultural influences there is a sense of wholeness, of unity, of solidarity with all who connect with that same tradition. This bond makes a Jew feel that he is indeed his brother's keeper: sensitive to his misfortune, proud of his success, ashamed of his transgression. He has a sixth sense which will recognize another Jew under any guise, through the exchange of some barely conscious signals.30

This condensed, but lengthy example of Scharf's speech epitomizes the identity strategy. "Jewishness" is redefined without dependence upon religious symbols, yet with the preservation of the moral behavioral attributes which are affirmative characteristics. The Jew is placed in a significant position in history and recognized as unique. Thus the identity retains the qualities of chosenness, but does not remove the adherent from the society into which he may culturally assimilate. There remains the tacit agreement that "all Jewry is one" but the concept differs in application from its meaning for the Zionist and survivalist in that it is not a defining factor which requires some sort of active participation in the traditions of Judaism.
The speaker is perceptive of the inwardness of the rhetorical strategies when he notes that:

There is a persistent strain of self-criticism, a sensitivity to one's own faults, an ability to see them clearly and abhor them heartily. But it is a "family quarrel" syndrome, with the cutting edge towards the inside and a fierce resentment of criticism from the outside.

Deeply imbedded in the common psyche is the taboo against abandoning the group, a feeling that it is immoral and unworthy to relinquish a position of good repute, for which, through history, millions have suffered and died. . . . The secular Jew, a composite figure, is in any one of its guises a creature of daunting complexity. But there are many who may see in this simplified version a reflection of their own innermost landscape.31

Scharf's insight into the identity strategy of the secular approach is remarkable and embraces the characteristics of other such defenses. The purpose is to cast the position in such a manner that it becomes acceptable to those who have previously rejected it. Of the strategies, the near assimilationist position requires the greatest caution in its presentation because it is often seen as a negation of Jewishness rather than as an alternative means of maintaining the identity.

As was stated earlier, not many defenses of adaptation are to be found because in some cases it results in the acceptance of a new identity, (i.e., American) or because it is a disdained position for the Zionists and surviv- alists who retain the traditional symbols and maintain Israel as a center of focus.
Be that as it may, the position still involves an identity rhetoric which is characteristic of the other strategies as well. Though the goals and manifestations differ, the methods are similar. Each requires a definition of identity which is acceptable to its audience and each provides a method of "marking off" in accordance with standards by which to measure the success of one's self-identification.

Responses to the Strategies

Recent studies by Simon Herman, Earl Raab, et al., indicate that the Zionist strategy remains a minority position primarily because it requires dual loyalties and the American system, while tolerant of such trends, is not such that it forces people back to Israel by persecuting them here. The apparent lack of anti-semitism here coupled with the problems of the Middle East seems to be more conducive of a supportive rather than active role in the Aliyah.

Survivalism, on the other hand, is growing among the youth in relationship to the national trend of encouraging ethnic identity. The application of traditional Judaic symbolism serves as an anchoring point for many in the maintenance of individual identity as a Jew. The outward manifestation of Jewishness is most readily accepted and reinforced by remaining in Jewish communities and
organizations. As noted earlier, the majority of the identity rhetoric comes from this strategy because for them the loss of identity poses the greatest threat.

The near assimilationist identity is prominent in terms of rhetoric because it adapts best to the American society. Seeing Judaism as a faith rather than a goal and re-defining the symbols to meet contemporary issues has made the position attractive to many of the younger Jews as well as those who have been successful in American society and do not wish to be alienated from it. It generates the least rhetoric, however, primarily because the rhetoric is less necessary to the American identity.

That each strategy has been successful is evident for each continues to generate new followers who develop its rhetoric. All three strategies are methods of meeting one singular exigency, "Who is A Jew?"
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CHAPTER VI

TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF AN IDENTITY RHETORIC PARADIGM

To this point the study has been historically-descriptive in nature. The development of the rhetorical situation in Chapter II and the observations of the strategies used to respond to that situation in Chapter III indicate that identity rhetoric is a significant element in minority communications studies and that it has specific and definable characteristics which may be common to other identity searches. The American Jewish community has lent itself easily to the study because its speakers and writers openly state that the maintenance of identity is their purpose. Interviews with Jewish educators, businessmen, and Rabbis have developed confidence that the observations of strategies and methods are both accurate and useful and that the results have not been skewed by major errors in judgment. This gives confidence that hypotheses about identity rhetoric may be useful.

A number of characteristics of identity rhetoric have been observed which I have chosen to break into four major categories for definitional purposes. These categories are: 1. situations, 2. directions, 3. elements, and
variables. The caution must be made that while the purpose is to develop a paradigm for identity rhetoric, the observations are solely of Jewish rhetoric, thus extrapolations to other minorities must be done with caution.

**Situations**

That identity rhetoric has been a response to a rhetorical situation and fits the elements required by Bitzer's analysis has already been established in Chapter II. Three overriding requirements develop from this observation worthy of emphasis. 1. Identity rhetoric is generated by a perceived exigency; 2. The amount of rhetoric varies directly with the ability of the audience to act, and 3. The expressed goals of the rhetoric are often indefinite and immeasurable. These three characteristics are important to the analysis because they explain the ebb and flow of identity rhetoric.

1. **The rhetoric is generated by a perceived exigency.** In each of the Jewish strategies observed this perception is necessary for the generation of rhetoric. The reason for the lack of total assimilationist rhetoric, for example, is two-fold. There are of course the constraints which make it unpopular to assimilate, but there is also the factor that for these people there is no perceived need to maintain the ethnic identity and thus there remains no reason for rhetoric. Because they do not see
such a change as an actual "loss" of identity, there is no reason to attempt to convince others.

The Zionists and Survivalists, on the other hand, perceive a threat both to ethnic identity here and to Israel. Thus, they generate great amounts of rhetoric for the purpose of convincing others or at least causing them also to perceive a problem in identity loss. The anti-Zionist, though, sees a threat in the Zionist and survivalist identity symbols and therefore strives to re-define rhetorically Jewishness so that he can avoid the political elements of Zionism while maintaining the religio-cultural elements of Judaism and Jewishness. The amount and urgency of the rhetoric, then, varies directly with the perception of the significance of the exigency.

2. The rhetoric varies with the ability of the audience to act. The observation applies to both the amount and strategy of the rhetoric. The majority of identity rhetoric takes place in areas where change can be affected. The survivalist strategy, for example, has recently been directed strongly toward younger Jews and those in the marginal reference groups. There is little need for it in the strongly Orthodox enclaves and the Zionist groups because they have already adopted the symbols and characteristics. In these areas the goal is primarily one of maintenance rather than assumption of identity. The near assimilationist position is most often directed into
those areas where the people are socially and economically capable of making a choice. There is, for example, little use for near assimilationist appeals in the garment district of New York where the Jewish people do not have the opportunity of disassociating in the same sense that the Jews do in Shaker Heights or Scarsdale.

Thus, two forms of identity rhetoric characteristically develop: Maintenance rhetoric and transition rhetoric. The first is used to encourage the followers who have already made a choice, the second is to generate reasons to make a new choice. The first provides symbolic balance for a present position, the second seeks to provide "imbalance" or "dissonance"\(^2\) which leads to choosing a new position. These forms are used no matter which strategy is adopted. Thus, identity rhetoric may or may not be part of a social "movement" depending upon its function in the community.

3. The expressed goals of identity rhetoric are often indefinite and immeasurable. The characteristic human trait of seeking individuality in conformity is not to be missed in identity rhetoric. Several possible reasons surface immediately. First the rhetorician seeks agreement rather than alienation from his audience. Thus a certain amount of "autistic perception"\(^3\) is desirable. For this reason speakers of each strategy leave the designation "Jewish" partially open to the definitions of the
audience and seek instead a commonality of agreement on central symbols, i.e. Israel, faith, Judaic customs, etc. By leaving such goals indefinite, the identity rhetorician is thus able to attempt to speak for "world Jewry" or "American Jews" as if his strategy was synonymous with the total community. Even the anti-Zionist who espouses individuality and acculturation into American society readily notes that they speak for all groups in saying that each group "speaks only for itself." If that seems circular, it is. They assume that each group is in agreement with their position of having a right to one's own viewpoint.

This leaves the significant manifestations of identity in those nebulous areas of affiliation and association. Each strategist is thus able to claim a following from indefinite numbers of people depending upon his designation of his audience. This allows each strategy to inflate or deflate population numbers by re-defining the characteristics of membership. These immeasurable factors may then be used to draw others into the identity grouping by showing "how many" have already joined. A significant instance of this was applied in Neumann's speech where he referred to the "thousands" of young American Jews who were signing up to assist the Zionist cause.
If the goals are too definite and the characteristics of the identity too measurable, the speaker risks the potential of "defining out" many of the people who he wishes to have choose his strategy. Both the survivalists and the near assimilationists can presently claim a number of Jews who have American citizenship and embrace the Judaic faith. This nebulousness of goals somewhat equates with Leland Griffin's description of the incipient stages of a social movement. If so, a beginning hypothesis could be that identity rhetoric is a social movement in itself. It certainly has some of the characteristics of a rhetorical campaign.

Directions

By the term directions in identity rhetoric I mean to define the unique quality of Jewish rhetoric of being inwardly directed. This concept was referred to briefly in Chapter I and has been significant focus of attention throughout the research. Unlike the Woman's lib movement which currently blames men for their identity crises, the Indian and Black movements which tend to blame the Caucasian, and the Gay liberation movement which blames society; the Jewish rhetoric, no matter which strategy is selected, assigns the responsibility for identity maintenance to the Jewish people. Originally the tendency for this study was for me to think in terms of assignment of
guilt, but that designation seems inappropriate to what is happening in Jewish rhetoric. While each strategy responds to the others (sometimes even aggressively), the call to identity is predominantly an affirmation of the positive characteristics of Jewish tradition and symbols rather than a placing of blame or guilt upon the majority society for its influence upon the Jewish people.

The survivalists, for example, descry the tendency toward acculturation, but recognize that the Jewish communities have, in fact, sought integration into the American system. Thus the regaining of identity entails the responsibility of the Jews themselves to retain the heritage and culture in spite of the social influences around them.

The anti-Zionists feel that the survivalists and Zionists have hurt Jewish identity by forcing dual loyalties and thus they call upon the Jews to retain identity by maintaining the relevant symbols of Judaism as a faith while holding their loyalties to American citizenship.

The failure to maintain Jewish identity, then, is assigned as an inward problem rather than one which requires rhetoric to be directed outward to the majority culture. It is at this point that organizations like the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith come into play. They serve to correct errors in the majority viewpoint of the Jewish minority. Their function is to act as a social
buffer from outside attack and anti-semitic appeals. They are not really identity rhetoricians, nor do they act as such within the Jewish community.

The inward direction of the identity rhetoric assumes that if the Jewish people can develop a positive attitude about themselves, they can maintain their identity despite changes in the majority cultures in which they find themselves. There are eight significant factors involved in the inwardness of the rhetoric: 1. It shuns dependence upon others, 2. there is an inward assignment of guilt where identity is lost, 3. the emphasis varies with the overlap of identities and reference groups, 4. it encourages self-esteem, 5. it may be acutely self-conscious, 6. it has its own jargon, 7. it is used for personal adjustment, and 8. it is an attempt at self-naming. These factors are all characteristic without regard to the strategy chosen by the speaker.

1. The rhetoric shuns dependence upon others. Each strategist from his own perspective recognizes that identity maintenance is a Jewish problem and that host cultures and societies are not to be depended upon to assist the Jew for differing reasons.

The Zionists, for example, whose identity is tied to the Nation of Israel, demonstrate the inability to count on the major powers for help by citing examples where Israel has not been upheld in national assemblies. Kahane
ventures so far as to remind of the European Holocaust and venture the reminder that it might happen again. This leaves Israel, and hence the Jew who is tied to Israel, vulnerable to attacks upon his identity. The diaspora Jew, then, remains as "Israel's One Ally" for Neumann and thus the Jew has the responsibility to maintain his identity for the sake of world Jewry and Israel.

The survivalists, on the other hand, note that the tendency of the host cultures is to remove the distinctive character of Jewishness and thus homogenize the society. Thus the Jew must depend upon the traditions and heritage of Judaic structure to maintain identity. If they are to survive, they must not depend upon others to define themselves, they must instead seek definition from within their own community.

The near assimilationists and anti-Zionists shun dependence upon others because they feel it necessary to demonstrate individuality and responsibility from within their own ranks so that they may be accepted in the society and yet maintain the religious and cultural richness of Judaic faith.

In each case the responsibility rests upon the Jewish people to adopt themselves the symbols of identity rather than having them imposed upon them because they have not developed themselves.
2. **There is an inward assignment of guilt where identity is lost.** This factor is concomitant with the first. That is, in those instances where identity has been lost, the rhetor often assigns guilt upon one of the other strategies. The Zionist will claim that identity is lost because Jews have ceased to identify with Israeliness. The survivalists will say that it is because the majority has lost interest in authentic Judaism and have assimilated into American homogeneity. The anti-Zionists offer that it is because the Zionists and survivalists force irrelevant traditions and restrictions upon the Jewish people and thus have caused them to give up both religious and cultural identity to operate in contemporary society.

Such observations appear, simplistic and general, but do, in fact, accurately represent the rhetoric observed in the study.

3. **The rhetoric varies with the overlap of identities and reference groups.** The tendency for a speaker to develop identity rhetoric intensifies in direct correspondence to the strength of his ties to the groups he uses as referents. The rhetoric becomes more predictable and precise as the speaker becomes recognized as a spokesman for the group, particularly if elected to high office. As his own identity stabilizes in respect to associations, the identity rhetorician is more likely to assume a dogmatic position on the rhetorical strategy and the definition of
identity. In several instances, the position of the speaker changed slightly in force in regard to whether he was giving a specific address or participating in a discussion. Arthur A. Cohen is a good example of this tendency. His survivalist position is much more explicit in his speech-essay "Why I Choose to Be a Jew" than in his discussion comments in the Congress Bi-Weekly dialogues.

With the near assimilationists, the more they identify with being Americans, the less emphasis that is put upon maintaining an outward "Jewish" appearance. Judaism becomes a faith practiced regularly as are Protestant denominations. It ceases to be a goal upon which survival is dependent. As the person sees himself moving into another culture, he may react rhetorically to change his reference points in relation to those around him.

4. The rhetoric encourages self-esteem. From Kahane's "Jewish is Beautiful," to Sussman's closing statement that "We are here! Those who stress 'survivalism' for the group's sake are, in the words of Jacob Agus, forgetting 'that only sick people think of life itself as a goal while healthy people think of the good things of life'," there is a consistent call to self-esteem in the identity rhetoric. The survivalists refer to "authentic Jewishness" the Zionists to "Israeliness" and the anti-Zionists to "Americanism," but all seek to raise the image of Jewry from the "wandering nation" to the "chosen
people." Each of the strategies seeks to discard the stereotypes of the "Shylocks" and "Jew-boys" and emphasize the positive characteristics of Jewishness. This includes emphasis upon the philanthropies and educational developments for which American Jewish organizations are noted. The rhetoric also emphasizes the commonalities rather than differences among the Jewish people. It is an obvious attempt to discard the persecution identity developed in Europe and carried to the United States by early immigrants.

A call is sounded to return to the Judaic traditions and Hebrew and Yiddish languages in order to demonstrate pride in the ethnic heritage of Jewishness. Especially toward the college students is this appeal directed.

5. **The rhetoric may be acutely self-conscious.**

Because the rhetoric is inwardly directed and requires introspection, a negative aspect of identity rhetoric is discernible. It sometimes develops so many categories of definition and symbol application that it becomes defeating to those who attempt to follow. Earl Raab notes:

> Many American Jews may still commonly suffer from something called self-hatred, but these days they more commonly hate themselves not because they are Jews, but because they consider themselves inferior Jews. This is a relatively new phenomenon, post-Israel, and has developed during the same period that American Jews have become increasingly uneasy about their status as Americans. American Jews are becoming twice marginal: marginal to America and marginal to Israel. These are different burdens of marginality, but they are burdens nonetheless. Beneath the surface of unity engendered by a common concern with Israel,
American Jews are in an uncommon state of disarray and confusion—or to put a better light on it, in an uncommon state of ferment. Among the ways in which this ferment is being expressed is an organized quest for "Jewish identity." Commissions on Jewish Identity are multiplying on the American landscape. One of the reasons why these organized quests are often less useful than they could be, is that they are too rigidly bounded by considerations of what Jews "should be" rather than of what they are or might become.

In response to this introspection the Jew whose status is marginal by definition often becomes extremely concerned about how others classify him. This provides additional stress for the one who is uncertain whether or not he can measure up to the norms of the group with which he identifies. Those who are very confident with their identity are not imbalanced severely by the rhetoric, but those whose confidence is already weak may over-react to the rhetoric and produce somewhat of a backlash effect by actively avoiding the identity which makes them uncomfortable.

The self-conscious rhetoric may also work to establish artificial boundaries between the Jew and the "non-Jew" by over emphasizing the minority status. This consistent rhetoric with emphasis upon self may make it difficult for the person to react to the majority culture. In fact, it can result in increased alienation on the part of the minority member.

For the Zionist, this is desirable because it increases the drive to return to the homeland. For the
survivalist and anti-Zionist, though, it is regressive because it produces stereotypes and obstructions which make effective progress in America difficult.

Properly used, though, the self-consciousness of the rhetoric helps it develop categories by which the individual can note his own achievements in reference to the community. It allows the person to say "those are positive symbols of Jewishness and since I have adopted them, I may have pride in my being a Jew." Herman says that "to be a Jew in any meaningful sense of the term means that one must establish and respect a certain boundary between Jews and Gentiles, an act of self-definition that is hardly as necessary for a Christian in America."¹²

6. **The rhetoric has its own jargon.** A peculiar pattern developed during the study for which I initially could not account. That was, that without many exceptions, all of the speakers used a similar vocabulary which had nothing to do with languages such as English, Hebrew or Yiddish but which had common understanding and definitions which they did not feel it necessary to explain. A characteristic of jargon is that it provides a shortening process for communication and it establishes an "in" group. This appears to be essential to identity rhetoric.

The four terms for the basic strategies, for example, are good examples of jargon. "Zionist," "Survivalist," "Assimilationist," and "Anti-Zionist" all have common
meanings which serve to describe either the person or the group without defining all of the beliefs and differences each time. There exists a remarkable unanimity of usage no matter which strategy the speaker represents.

In the Jewish rhetoric a number of Hebrew and Yiddish terms are likewise interspersed in the speeches which are understood by the Jewish community. The nuances of these terms are never fully understood by outsiders. This factor gives distinctiveness to one's position as an "insider" and thus a pride in belonging. A number of Jewish ceremonies and traditions gain significance beyond themselves when they become symbols of membership through jargon.

The ability to have a language that others do not understand, but is fully expressive of self may be the uniting factor of identity rhetoric. It serves to give uniqueness to one's existence in relationship to his social environment.

7. The rhetoric is used for personal adjustment. One of the primary purposes of the introspective process is to give the individual a measuring point to compare himself to the other members of the group with which he chooses to identify. For minority groups, such measurements are a function of the identity rhetoric. It serves to apply boundaries by which the individual can decide which elements are "more Jewish" or "less Jewish" than others. This too involves symbol application.
For the survivalist, for example, the application of the Judaic laws, customs, and traditions to the daily life mark him as an "authentic Jew" in relationship to the secularist or assimilationist who does not maintain those elements. The identity speaker, then, will seek to define the necessary characteristics to which the person must adjust if he wishes to be a recognized member of that group.

The rhetoric may also serve as an adjustment aid when it explains away a failure on the part of the individual or group by re-defining it. For example, Sussman's analysis that there was no mandatory relationship to Palestine because the Covenant was struck in the Wilderness, serves to reinforce the choice of those who have already rejected Israel as a centering point.

The rhetor may, then, offer symbols to which to adjust or reinforce present positions and still fulfill the personal adjustment function of identity messages.

8. The rhetoric is an attempt at self-naming. The exposition in Chapter II indicates the importance of the self-naming process. For some time now the majority cultures have named the minority groups by means of stereotyping. Often this has produced a self-fulfilling prophecy and the people have adopted the stereotype. That is not to say that there is no "criterial attribute" which produced the stereotype, but it is to say that the attribute
may become entrenched by constant repetition. This makes the naming process crucial for identity rhetoric as exemplified by Sol Linowitz's remark about making Davids out of Shylocks and the modern epithet of the "New Jew."

This form of rhetoric must attempt to get the person and community to see what they can become rather than what they are. It implies new and affirmative attributes which equate with the earlier concept of self-esteem.

Identity rhetoric must similarly reject attempts by outsiders to name the group, and significant emphasis must be put upon the nuances of the names applied.

Elements

Nine identifying elements have surfaced from the study which are characteristic of the rhetoric. They are: 1. a time orientation, 2. a focal point, 3. a symbol orientation, 4. generalizations, 5. a perceived struggle, 6. an appeal to higher law, 7. seeking of distinctive status, 8. repetition, and 9. values which become doctrinal. The majority of these elements are found to be present in all of the speeches studied despite the individual strategy and goals. This leads to the assumption that these elements may help define identity rhetoric in other groups as well.

1. The rhetoric has a time orientation. History is extremely significant to identity rhetoric in that it
develops the traditions and heritage which ultimately compose the identity culture. The past and present, sometimes the future, must be dealt with in terms of definition and relevance. Such an observation is marked by the fact that most of the Jewish leaders referred to in this study are professional historians or political and social scientists. It is they who provide the connecting link between the past and the present and suggest how the people are to react to the defining of terms pertinent to each.

Lion Feuchtwanger underscores this concept when he says:

What is it that has distinguished Jews from all other peoples since time immemorial and up to this day? I believe that their most distinctive characteristic is an enduring vital awareness of common history. More than four thousand years ago, this consciousness served to unite a few small nomadic tribes to such a degree that they were able to establish first one state and then another. This same awareness held the Jews together during the dispersion of an almost two-thousand year exile and has enabled them to establish, in our day, a third commonwealth.15

No matter which strategy is selected, an emphasis upon time pervades the rhetoric. Many of the speakers use historical illustration to demonstrate to the Jewish community the importance of tradition and heritage.

As noted earlier, the Zionist tends to speak of the present and future in terms of Aliyah, the survivalists use terms from the past to define the present, and the near assimilationist uses the present to redefine the past. The
characteristics are present even where definition is necessary. Herman notes that the "Israeli and the American Jew will each tend to interpret the Jewish historic past from the vantage point of his own present."¹⁶

The Jew specifically relies upon history for development of identity because until 1949 he did not have a geo-political structure with which to relate. The establishment of Israel, though, has not lessened the dependences upon tradition and heritage for diaspora Jews.

All three strategies also have a future orientation, which centers around the Messianic promise of Judaism. While each group defines the messianic pledge differently, they all hold out a promise for future distinction for the Jews. A sense of historical mission for the Jews prevails to control the purpose of their identity.

2. The rhetoric has a focal point. Throughout the study the central factor of Jewish identity has unmistakably been the relationship to Israel. The concept has been explained at length in preceding chapters, but at this point it is necessary to note that such a factor upon which to agree or disagree is necessary to the development of identity. The identity, then, is measured by each group in relationship to how the other groups react to the focus.

Herman's studies indicate that:

No Jew can escape the necessity of defining
his Jewish identity in relationship to Israel, particularly after the Six Day War when Israel as a geo-political entity achieved increased prominence in the affairs of nations and in the minds of men the world over. There is evidence that the compelling impact of these events has brought about a renewal of identification with the Jewish group on the part of many marginal Jews who had been on their way outward. 17

Without the focus there would remain no way to gauge significantly one’s position in the community.

Acceptance or rejection of the focal point as crucial to one’s identity becomes the relative key to which rhetorical strategy one will accept as well. It gives the rhetor a goal to be attained which he will call upon others to accept.

3. The rhetoric has a symbol orientation. As Smelser points out, one of the necessities of identity is the collection of symbols around oneself which will balance him with his environment. The strategies of identity rhetoric each call upon the individual to adopt the symbols important to them.

For the survivalist those symbols include a return to Judaic tradition and heritage for stability. The commonly known holidays and observance of the Sabbath as well as dietary laws are outward manifestations which identify one to his neighbors as Jewish. From the very orthodox Hasidim to the secularist there are religious symbols by which the individual can identify with the community. It is the speaker’s purpose to reinforce the symbols as necessary to
the community. It may be that Jewish cultural identity has survived so many civilizations because it is so closely linked with religious identity which is naturally symbol generating.

4. The rhetoric is characterized by generalizations. Identity rhetoric must be able to include all those to whom it is addressed; therefore it must at points ignore differences and speak in general terms. The plural pronoun "we" is an element that characterizes the approach. The Zionist and survivalist insistence upon the existence of a "world Jewry" and the common agreement upon the symbols of Jewishness are indicative of this factor. The early parts of Chapter III demonstrate the generalizations common to the rhetorical strategies in the Jewish community.

Each strategist will generalize both the numbers of people joining and defecting from the identity. The survivalists, for example, often despair at the number of people assimilating, but also point with pride to the "renewed interest" in Jewishness among the youth. Neither is usually demonstrated by specific quantitative study.

Beyond this generalizations will be used to identify the outsiders, in this case the goyim (gentiles). Stereotypes will be developed against which the "in" group can be compared. As with symbols, the generalizations demonstrate belongingness.
5. **The rhetoric refers to a perceived struggle.** Again a significant element, the perception of a struggle to maintain identity is evident in all of the rhetoric. Identity becomes something that the individual must strive for and it does not come without effort.

For some, the mark of the struggle is persecution which comes upon the individual or community because of differences in identity. The Zionist often refers to the Holocaust and its results as a manifestation of Jewish identity and reminds that it could happen in America.

The survivalist alludes to a struggle against acculturation and loss of character. The near assimilationist refers to the struggle to be accepted in terms of Judaism being a faith like Protestant denominations rather than a divisive characteristic which separates them from American society. Lack of struggle is a characteristic of majority identity, the minority community has to work for recognition and balance.

In the Jewish community the struggle reflects the problems of stereotype and anti-semitism which has kept them from full participation in some segments of society. This element is recognizable in the rhetoric of many minorities in America and certainly may be one of the factors common to all identity rhetoric.

6. **The rhetoric appeals to a higher law.** The link between Yahweh and Israel in covenant is inescapable
in the identity rhetoric. Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg phrases it in reference to Jewish people as the only group whose basic law requires them to reach out to the aid of all strangers.

Judaism constructs its present out of a memory reaching back to Abraham and looking forward to the Messianic age for humanity as a whole. It is the way which began with the breaking of the idols and with risking all for the sake of God. To lead is often to suffer, and throughout all the centuries Judaism has found in the tragedy which is so much of Jewish history, in its role as the "suffering servant" of God, the surest sign of its ordained task. ¹⁸

This higher law and task is in a sense expressed in the liberalism and universalism common to the Jewish community.

The philanthropy of Jewish organizations is similarly an element of the appeal to higher law in the identity. The selection of organizations as reference groups is a response to the appeal and challenges the individual to attainments beyond the "normal."

Beyond this, the element allows the Zionist to balance dual allegiances by recognizing the religious and spiritual ties to the nation of Israel as a mark of his Jewishness.

Norman E. Frimer clarifies the process when he says:

The scholar and sage must in every question refer back to the Torah, the source of the tradition, and with the skill and perseverance of a deep-sea diver plumb the depths of Biblical and rabbinic thought in order to see the original precept representing the will of God, as it has meandered its way through life. Then only can one apply the Law to the particular experiences of one's generation. ¹⁹
Where civil law and moral law are contradictory, the maintenance of Jewish identity requires that moral law and tradition be the determining factor.

7. The rhetoric seeks a distinctive status for its identity group. With the Judaic religious structure the element of distinction is unavoidable. The "chosen people" identity refers to God's election of Israel as an instrument by which He makes His will known to the world. Alfred Jospe recognizes that:

The concept of the "chosen people" permeates much of Jewish literature, folklore, prayers and liturgy. When a Jewish man is called to the Torah, he recites the traditional blessing, "Asher bahar banu mi'kol ha-amim," praising God who has chosen us from all other nations. When we recite our daily morning prayer, we say the benediction, "She'lo assani goy," thanking God he has not made us gentiles. When we pronounce the benediction over the Sabbath wine, we declare that God has chosen and sanctified us from among all other peoples, in the same way in which he has distinguished between Sabbath and weekday. When we make Havdalah on Saturday nights, we recite the traditional Hamavdil, glorifying God for setting us apart from all other peoples just as he has set apart the sacred from the profane and light from darkness.20

This concept of being set apart from all other people and nations grants a meaning to existence and gives purpose to maintaining the symbols of identity.

For the Jew, the "chosen people" status does not relegate others to inferiority, but rather comes about by the demonstration of commitment to the Torah and a conviction to obey the law that other nations do not have. The
Jewish identity, then, depends for its "chosenness" upon the strength of conviction within the individual. It denotes obligation. The call to an identity which defines one as being different from those around him also gives a measuring point to see if identity is being maintained. Each strategy emphasizes a different manifestation of chosenness, but it is inherent in each as a major component.

8. The rhetoric is characterized by repetition. In each strategy the repetition of definitions is necessary to inculcating them into community identity. At this point jargon and slogans are a helpful means of repeating the message in a brief and memorable fashion. The constant repetition of the traditional prayers and rituals of Judaism is similarly useful as a means of maintaining identity. Many of the repetitive elements remind the individual of his distinctiveness. The speaker need only refer to these traditions by title to produce the same response. It is as though the rhetor documents his message by a repetition of the symbols of identification.

The maintenance of ritual, then, is crucial to identity rhetoric since it serves both to reaffirm belief and indoctrinate.

9. The rhetoric establishes values which become doctrinal at the point where outward manifestations are
required for identity. Whether it is a return to Israel, membership in B'na'i B'rith, giving to the United Jewish Appeal, attendance at the synagogue, or putting the American flag in the front yard, identity rhetoric requires the establishment of values which result in observable behavior. Thus certain value-related actions become necessary to the maintenance of identity and hence are doctrinal.

For the Zionist that value is Eretz Yisrael and a commitment to the nation. Giving allegiance and financial aid to it has become an identifying characteristic. Continuance in Judaic custom and a supportive role in Israeli struggles are prerequisites for authentication. The rhetor must establish values which the audience can adopt.

For the survivalist, those values include philanthropy, maintenance of the Torah, membership in the synagogue, and attendance to religious and cultural Judaic customs. It may include remaining in a recognized "Jewish" community and "bloc voting" as well. The values are all symbols of unity which must be maintained.

The near assimilationist establishes values in accord with American ideals of progress. These are manifested in continuance in the relevant aspects of Judaism as a faith, involvement in civil rights and community organizations, active individual political lives and a commitment to assist each other.
The doctrinal manifestations should result in identity being maintained in respect to others in the group. The doctrine establishes the boundaries of the "in" and "out" groups through emphasis upon similar values.

All of the preceding elements are interdependent in identity rhetoric and the speaker must balance those in accordance with his audience. Pre-analysis is necessary. Where the audience already assumes distinctiveness, for example, the speaker is required to give greater emphasis to other elements of identity.

Variables

Four important variables about identity rhetoric stand out in Jewish American rhetoric. They act primarily as regulators of the amount of emphasis a specific strategy or message element may receive at a particular time. In effect they are similar to the "constraints" of the rhetorical situation. The variables, like the elements, are interrelated. They are: 1. the rhetoric is success generated, 2. it varies in intensity with success at integration, 3. the values are relative to majority/minority reactions, and 4. the rhetoric changes as the culture changes. All of the authors indicate that the reaction to the identity structures by the host cultures will influence the popularity and acceptance of the messages. America, where cultural pluralism has been
encouraged in recent years, is a good climate for identity rhetoric.

1. The rhetoric is success generated. Increases in the amount of rhetoric and its followers is observable where successes have developed. The victory in the Six-Day War in 1967 resulted in a surge of renewed identification with Jewishness in America as has already been shown. New ways of defining self as victor rather than vanquished are necessary to identity movements thus the path of development is often marked by a listing of successful relevant campaigns.

The establishment of Israel as a nation in 1949 resulted in a parallel revival of Zionist rhetoric here since there was now a land to which to return. The wish to mark oneself in reference to a winning cause is integral to the concept. Success then comes to demonstrate worthiness.

Civil rights actions which open new doors for all minorities are the successes of the secularists and generate a rhetoric with emphasis upon Judeo-American ideals.

This helps explain why seemingly unrelated campaigns are important to minority identity. Successful fund-raising, for example, can be used to illustrate success and act as a defining mark for identity. These successes are not viewed as insignificant in identity rhetoric.
Concomitantly the rhetoric will tend to wane where the campaign is not successful. Where anti-semitism increases rather than decreases, or where followers are not attracted, the amount and type of rhetoric will change. Meir Kahane, for example, upon meeting with little success here withdrew to Israel where his form of message had greater popularity.

2. The rhetoric varies in intensity with success at integration. A spin-off of point one, this observation indicates that one of the best things that can happen to identity rhetoric is for it to meet some resistance from the outside community. Where the identity is readily integrated into the non-Jewish society there is a lessened acceptance of rhetoric which emphasizes differences. Hence the lack of total assimilationist rhetoric. Where the individual is comfortable with his acceptance into other cultural groups, or where his distinctive identity is completely acceptable, there is no need for rhetoric.

3. The values forwarded are relative to majority/ minority reactions. In America the similarities of values between Judaic guidelines and American universals have allowed the development of Jewish identity in an atmosphere where the differences are not viewed as subversive. Because of this the identity rhetorician has been able to work within his particular strategy freely and the distinctiveness that he advocates will be seen as a positive
maintenance of cultural pluralism. Russian Jews are unable to have such freedom of identity expression because the values are contradictory to the majority culture. A similar reaction was seen in Germany under Hitler. There were many who maintained Jewish identity, but the rhetoric was not open and the values were definitely contrary to those of the government of the country.

4. Identity rhetoric changes as the culture changes. Where the Zionist ideals influenced the majority of the Jewish Americans in the 1940's, the 1970's find survivalism and secularism more prominent. The pattern relates closely to the acceptance of the Jewish community into the mainstream of American society. As the studies previously cited indicate, the majority of American Jews would be very reticent to give up their American citizenship today despite the drawbacks of being a minority people. They can point with pride to the many who are successful in American society.

Even the Zionist strategy has moderated from an aggressive Aliyah rhetoric to a supportive role for Israeli nationalism. It can be predicted that a renewed anti-semitism in American culture would result in a strengthening of Zionist rhetorical identity.
Paradigm

Thus described are four categories which have characterized the rhetoric studied. It is projected that the application of these categories to the rhetoric of other minority groups would result in similar observations. Rhetoric which fulfills these requirements, then, may be assumed to be identity rhetoric for the purpose of defining self.
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3Autistic perception is the tendency for us to view the position of another as similar to our own position because we want to see him that way. That is to say that if I am Jewish and he is Jewish and his ethos is good, I may see his suggestions as salient to me even if his strategy is in reality opposed to mine.


6Neumann, p. 8.
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16 Herman, p. 25.
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CHAPTER VII
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Observations

The research which has culminated in this dissertation has proven to be a fascinating rhetorical study into minority rhetoric. I have often been asked how, as a gentile Christian, I could expect to examine Jewish rhetoric and develop a paradigm for identity rhetoric when the Jewish people themselves have not been able to come to agreement on their identity in American society. The answer is not difficult. The paper does not define the identity of Jewishness but rather examines the attempts of those who have sought to define it. The actual definition still remains to be done by the Jewish American himself.

Some were skeptical that as a gentile, I would encounter significant resistance among the Jewish community to such a study, but such was not the case. Jewish students, faculty and library staff at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati were helpful to the point of going far out of their way to be of assistance. The cooperation is characterized by the command of an elderly Rabbi as I sat pondering some materials in the Archives with a puzzled look on my face. Bending down to catch my attention he said, "Ask
me! Ask me!"

From local Jewish community leaders in Dayton to some to whom I wrote in New York, I found no reluctance to lend materials of information. That shattered many stereotypes.

The Jewish community as other minorities in the United States is collectively seeking the meaning of its existence in a majority culture. The amount of written materials on the topic of identity attests to the importance of the search.

Jewish rhetoric seems to be unique for its inwardness and lack of assignment of blame or guilt to others where failures have happened. A rhetoric of self-help and cultural pride is a part of the Jewish heritage. Those who espouse radical movements tend not to represent Jewishness, but alternative identities and thus do not typify the rhetorical strategies found in this study.

That the Jewish community recognizes the strategies is obvious, for the terms applied to them are not original to this study, but come from the community itself. The application of those terms as a means of description indicates that they are also cognizant of the differences of appeals in the strategies.

A spin-off of the study is the demonstration that Bitzer's paradigm for the rhetorical situation can be applied as a structure for such a study. In fact, its framework is most helpful to the critical analysis of the
rhetoric because it provides an outline for study.

Another observation is that identity rhetoric may appeal to an entire minority community despite the differences in the strategies. The strategies act as guidelines for the self-naming process which is ultimately open to individual and community acceptance. The rhetoric then, functions to assist and hasten the "marking off" process in terms of reference groups.

Self-naming, and the breaking down of negative stereotypes is a prominent goal in the minority communities. Thus the process functions as a collective behavior which may fit the categories of a social movement. If this is so, a new paradigm equating social movements and identity rhetoric may need constructing.

It seems that other rhetorical situations fit some of the categories for identity rhetoric in Chapter VI. It may be then that the definitions define rhetorical strategies beyond identity as well. If so, each can be examined in more detail by succeeding studies to discern how it may be applied most effectively in answer to an exigency.

Concerns

The Old Testament writer in Ecclesiastes 12:12 adequately notes that "Of the making of books there is no end." There is the constant nagging concern that despite
several years of research and the reading of many books, papers, speeches, etc., some may exist which would serve to clarify further or modify, even discount the observations of the study. That is the nemesis of every researcher, but a major concern.

Some questions arise which merit answer from further research. First, does the paradigm apply to other minority rhetoric in a way that will make it useful to rhetorical criticism? Are there such wide differences that make it useful only with the rhetoric of the Jewish community?

A separate question remains as to whether or not the identity rhetoric is a social movement in itself, or is merely part of a social movement. Must all of the characteristics be there to make it effective and why is it sometimes ineffective when all of the characteristics are present? These questions will require the application of the paradigm to significant situations to test its accuracy.

In the Jewish community three factors were found in the identity rhetoric which may be crucial to the model's usage with other minority groups. It was noticed that the Jewish rhetoric was uniquely inward. Will, then, the entire model break down when applied to a rhetoric which is focused outward, especially in terms of guilt assignment or blame for the minority status? If so, is there an alternative direction which can be applied to assist the
critic in analysis?

Secondly, all of the strategies in the Jewish rhetoric were found to deal with one central focus, Israel. Can, then, identity rhetoric function without the existence of a concrete entity with which to relate either by acceptance or rejection as a symbol? Must identity rhetoric have such a measuring point simply because it does in the Jewish community?

Thirdly, will the identity model fit the study of diaspora Jews in other lands, or is it in reality unique to the American cultural plurality system? In other words, do Jewish identity rhetoric strategies have commonalities around the world, or are American Jews really representing a new form of Jewishness as indicated by the "New Jew" designation?

Conclusion

The concerns almost totally deal with the further investigation of the model which has developed from the research. The key will be its application to the rhetoric of other minority groups to see if it defines their identity rhetoric as well. I have confidence from some casual attempts at applying it to Black rhetoric that it does indeed describe it as well. Even the central focus of relationship is found, except the Black society must deal with its relationship to American citizenship rather than
a foreign land. The situations, directions, elements, and variables, likewise, are operative.

The study has been worthwhile for me personally in that it has broken down many of the stereotypes about Jewish identity that I had never questioned. If nothing else is to come of it, there remains that significant worth.

Beyond this, an increased awareness of what happens in the act of communicating and developing identity can assist in further rhetorical analysis of those messages which are most important to the lives of the people involved. The understanding of a rhetorical situation can assist the proper reaction to it.

A strong relationship exists between the study and the generation of theory about identity rhetoric. The broad category called rhetoric is in the process of being broken down into its component parts and described by the uniquenesses of those parts of which identity rhetoric is one. Recent theory has been developed concerning minority, revolutionary, radical, interpersonal and mass media rhetoric. These new areas require observations which may differ from classical theory merely because the events described are taking place in a different time and with the availability of different media.

Such is the case with present attempts to define and maintain identity. Introspection beyond that required by
older theories of persuasion is necessary where the audiences must live daily with the choices that they make. The need to define oneself and to destroy the negative stereotypes generated by other social groups, while it may resemble the ancient concept of vindication, goes beyond to require that the speaker not only must convince himself of the identity first, he must then adopt the identity and demonstrate its importance for himself.

This study generates the hypothesis that identity rhetoric has definable characteristics which are both predictable and necessary. The repetition of these characteristics in several variant strategies aimed at definition of self, indicates that the observations are at least reasonable.

Identity definition has increased in importance with the encouragement of cultural pluralism. It may be that identity rhetoric and the study of it reflects the concerns of the age. The theory is in reality post fact analysis, however. It springs from the rhetoric rather than the rhetoric from it. It is unlikely that those dealing with identity ever set down a comprehensive campaign or strategy for its attainment. The positions that they espouse and the method used come instead from positions and methods already inculcated in them.

The paradigm, then, serves not to establish an identity campaign, but to mark where one has begun by examining
the characteristic rhetoric. If we can understand the true purpose of such rhetoric, we may as a result deal with it in a more accurate manner.

As the study began with the innate feeling that more was being done to establish identity positions than just empty calls for allegiance, it reaches this point by discovering that the calls and symbols which may be empty and meaningless to the outside observer are crucial elements in the identity process. It is this rhetoric which ultimately produces doctrine for the minority. And this doctrine is crucial to the marking off process which a person uses to establish his reference groups.

The study generates the theory that there are identifiable commonalities in identity rhetoric strategies which must be understood in terms of their utility to the message purpose. It postulates that purpose does not always mean persuasion or physical action, but sometimes connotes merely the mental addition of a new characteristic to one's personality as a minority member. Where enough people give assent to the community definition of self, a recognizable enclave is developed. Where people do not adopt the distinctive characteristics suggested, amalgamation results and ethnic characteristics are lost to a new composite identity. Rhetoric is a necessary part of this defining function when it becomes a means of hastening the definitional process.
The rhetorical movement may be massive as in the Jewish, Black, and Women's Liberation movements, or it may be limited as in the adopting of the distinctive elements of a fraternity or similar social group, but all cases require the discussion of the defining elements. That outsiders do not understand the rhetoric is not important unless the group depends upon those outsiders for its existence.

The paradigm suggests also that some of the symbols generated in the process of identity rhetoric will seem radical or unwarranted to outside societies, but that these need not be objects of great concern to majority cultures since they are often more a function of the identity process than an attack upon the majority culture.

Where the adopting of these symbols are not directly detrimental to the majority society, the rhetoric about them and the usage of them need not be perceived as a threat. For example, the Hasidic Jew's continuance of dietary laws and observable differences in dress customs need not mark him as an alien in the American society. It should instead be viewed in terms of allowing him areas of self-definition which are functional to his personality.

This generates the theory that identity rhetoric has personality function and is requisite to the maintenance of ethnic or cultural differences. It is, in fact, an aid to the social development of communities, rather than a
divisive element.

A definite need exists, then, for the refinement and further understanding of identity rhetoric theory, especially in those areas where concern was noted earlier. The concept is vital to an understanding of the function of rhetoric for minority groups.
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