

RABBI ENGAGEMENT WITH THE PEACE PROCESS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Anand Edward Sokhey
Department of Political Science
The Ohio State University
Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
614-260-1021
sokhey.2@osu.edu

Paul A. Djupe
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Department of Political Science
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023
P. 740-587-6310
F. 740-587-6601
djupe@denison.edu

ABSTRACT

Support for Israel has been a hallmark issue of the Jewish lobby in American politics. But what do Jewish religious leaders think about U.S. policy toward Israel and the peace process, and how often do they address these issues? Do the opinions of American rabbis on Israel fall in line with their views on American international involvement, or are they distinctive? Using a sample of over 400 rabbis drawn from the four major movements of American Judaism in the fall of 2000, we investigate rabbi views of and speech about international affairs and American foreign policy; we focus specifically on the Middle East and Israel. Contrary to conventional wisdom, we find considerable diversity in opinion among rabbis (if not public speech patterns), particularly on issues concerning the internal governance of Israel and the direction of the peace process. We conclude that the religiously observant Jewish community is hearing a diversity of opinions about the peace process from these important opinion leaders.

Note: A previous version of this paper was prepared for the 2003 annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. The research was supported by a small grant from the Denison University Research Foundation – any opinions, findings, or conclusions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of Denison University.

Version: July 1, 2005

Speaking before an antiwar forum in Washington, D.C. in March 2003, Representative James Moran, Jr. (D-VA) commented: “If it were not for the strong support of the Jewish community for this war with Iraq, we would not be doing this...The leaders of the Jewish community are influential enough that they could change the direction of where this is going...” (Hsu, 2003). Moran later claimed that he was attempting to make a general point about the potential power of religious organizations in anti-war efforts. However, the Congressman’s comments generated immediate response and outrage. Jewish organizations called Moran’s remarks “Anti-Semitic,” and leaders from both sides of the aisle quickly condemned the statement (Anderson 2003; Hsu 2003). Moran’s words even prompted Secretary of State Colin Powell to testify before a House Appropriations subcommittee that policies towards Iraq have not been “driven by any small cabal” of pro-Israel American Jews (Sands 2003).

Support for Israel and the concern for its security needs have been hallmarks of many American Jewish Advocacy Organizations (JAOs). And, as the statements by Moran and Powell intimate, some extreme anti-war groups have taken this history as evidence, charging American Jews with eagerly and effectively lobbying for war. However, opinion polls conducted before the beginning of the current campaign indicated that support for a war in Iraq among American Jews was either equal to or lower than that for voters on the whole (e.g., Sands 2003).

What could help to explain some of the differences in opinion on security issues between these advocacy organizations and their constituencies? One possible answer is the focus of this paper: rabbis. By virtue of their position, rabbis hold a special place and authority within the Jewish community, and their beliefs and agendas can inform and influence others; rabbis may mediate the information flows from JAOs. Accordingly, we ask several questions about American rabbis: what beliefs about international affairs do they hold, what structures those beliefs, and how often do they talk about these issues and why?

DATA: THE 2000 AMERICAN RABBI STUDY

The data result from a mail survey of rabbis conducted in the fall and winter of 2000 in the four major movements of American Judaism – Conservative, Orthodox, Reconstructionist, and Reform. After obtaining the membership directories of the rabbinical associations of each movement, randomly selected rabbis were sent surveys, amounting to roughly half of all rabbis in these movements (about 1,600 of the 3,200 rabbis). From that initial mailing and two follow-up waves, 517 surveys were returned, though not all were usable. The overall response rate, therefore, was right about one-third (32.3 percent) and the usable rate was just below one quarter (23.6 percent). The rates vary by movement and decline with increasing orthodoxy of the movement – the overall response rate for Orthodox rabbis is 22 percent, 30 percent for the Conservatives, 32 percent for the Reform, and 29 percent for the Reconstructionists. Rabbis from the Reform movement form a slim majority of the sample – roughly their proportion of the rabbinical population. In our analyses, we weight the data so that each movement is represented in accordance with its proportion of the population of American rabbis.¹

RELIGION AND FOREIGN POLICY

There is good reason to examine the opinions and behavior of religious interests when it comes to international affairs. While there was once a consensus that public opinion did not factor in to foreign policy formulation and implementation, that consensus no longer exists (e.g., Holsti 1992). Research has found public foreign policy opinion to be “real, stable, differentiated, consistent, coherent; reflective of basic values and beliefs; and responsive (in predictable and reasonable ways) to new information and changing circumstances” (Page and Shapiro (with Gillroy)

¹ We determined the proportion of rabbis for each movement from the membership lists obtained from the four movements. In 2000, there were 1,620 rabbis in the Reform movement (50.5 percent of the total number of 3,209), 781 Orthodox rabbis (24.3 percent), 630 Conservative rabbis (19.6 percent), and 178 Reconstructionist rabbis (5.5 percent).

1992: 172). Scholars have also documented the impact that particular religious interest groups can have upon foreign policy (e.g., Hertzke 2001). While religion has *not* often factored into investigations of foreign policy attitudes among the public (but, see Green et al. 1996), it has been more commonly seen in studies of group influence, working in tandem with ethnicity. Groups often become influential in the policy process when they have a tie to the country for/with which the policy is being created (Huntington 1999); these individuals and their opinions can be mobilized by their social ties and links to organized interests.

Religious interest groups have been involved in foreign policy making from the beginning of the United States— notably, of course, in the decision over whether or not to form an independent country (Ribuffo 2001). Whether debating and supporting American intervention in the World Wars or protesting the Vietnam War, faith-based groups have long maintained a presence in foreign policy matters (Noll 1990; Ribuffo 2001; Wald 1997).

A canonical example is the American Jewish community (Goldberg 1990; Hertzke 2001); American Jews have strong, salient opinions about American foreign policy toward Israel and countries with Jewish populations under pressure or threat (e.g., Russia). And, of course, the Jewish community is represented by a range of high profile, resourceful, savvy groups—the most well known of which is AIPAC (Bennis and Mansour 1998).

However, the nature of the presence and influence of ethnic religious groups appears sometimes to be misunderstood by scholars. Ribuffo (2001) is quick to point out that the impact of religion on foreign policy makers has been indirect, and that major historical diplomatic decisions have not been swayed solely by religious concerns. Nevertheless, scholars have reported causal relationships between the efforts of ethnic interest groups—specifically the pro-Israel efforts of the American Jewish community—and American foreign policy efforts (e.g., Trice 1977; Watanabe 1984).

INFLUENCES ON THE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS

A large literature has documented the myriad ways in which clergy involve themselves in social and political issues (e.g., Beatty and Walter 1989; Djupe and Gilbert 2003; Jelen 2001; Morris 1984; Olson 2000). And, though the mix of forces affecting the political behavior of clergy has long been understood (e.g., Campbell and Pettigrew 1959), the weight that particular factors may carry has been of some debate (see Djupe and Gilbert 2003). Essentially, denominational clergy minister to particular congregations in distinctive communities, so while clergy find the balance of their inspiration to act politically from within themselves, they also receive cues from denominational, congregational, and community reference systems. Moreover, the roles clergy take on vary as well. While clergy generally represent their faith and values, at times they may see themselves as representatives of their faith *and* secular communities (Djupe and Gilbert 2002, 2003; Djupe and Sokhey 2003a; 2003b; Olson 2000). Either way, clergy involve themselves in social and political issues by exerting influence as opinion leaders within their congregations and communities (Beatty and Walter 1989; Jelen 2001; Morris 1984), and by gathering support on issues that resonate with faith teachings (Wald, Owen and Hill, 1988).

We follow this tack – rabbi political action should be the result of personal interests and theological orientations, but also the needs and influences of the congregation, denomination (i.e., movement), and community. By nature of their positions, rabbis mediate these levels. As religious professionals serving a congregation, it only makes sense that they would be influenced by both personal orientations reflecting their considerable education and experience, and a mix of external influences representing their ministries. Of course, the structure of influence is a bit different in the context of foreign policy. While personal attributes (ideology) should matter, congregations and immediate communities likely have a lesser effect on the foreign policy attitudes and actions of

American rabbis. Broader forces, however, such as movement and the efforts of media outlets and Jewish Advocacy Organizations, may have a greater impact.

RABBIS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Discussing some of the domestic determinants of American-Israeli policy, Novik (1986:5) talks about “the weight of the historical-moral commitment.” He asserts that the perception of support of Israel as a moral obligation to the victims of the Holocaust, once strongly held, is now fading with an aging American public. Younger generations, viewing those events as historical facts rather than memories, may not see these reasons justifying resolute support of Israel. Certainly, it is possible that Novik’s arguments may apply to some younger rabbis; these individuals may see the United States’ relationship with (and commitment to) Israel differently than older members of the rabbinate.

The primary force driving opinion and action on the Middle East and Israel is surely the “theology” of rabbis, which means their notions about what Jewish law dictates. How are Jews defined, what role should women play, and can the dictates of religious teachings be overlooked for practical gain? Answers to these questions draw the boundaries around movements. Because of Orthodox dominance in Israel, a non-Orthodox stance on Jewish law may bring opposition to Israel state policy. While peace is desired, it is the process of arriving at that point that is contested. If Israel is a gift from God, as some believe, its integrity must not be compromised. But, if Israel is just a place where many Jews live, then it is easier to believe that peace can be best accomplished through concession.

Some of the more contentious issues in Judaism concern the role of women – whether they should be allowed to join the rabbinate and worship alongside men. These issues map onto movement divisions quite closely, so a rabbi’s gender may not find purchase on issues of foreign

policy. However, we do have explicit measures of opinions on both sets of issues, and thus, the ability to parse this out. Overall, we expect that female rabbis (and possibly those supportive of women in the rabbinate) will be more likely to adopt a peace and justice perspective (e.g., Olson et al. 2005), which lends itself to advocating compromise with the Palestinians.

Relations of rabbis to the larger Jewish and non-Jewish communities differ considerably by movement, and Djupe and Sokhey (2003a) posit that reference group theory helps to explain this difference. Reference group theory suggests that groups can serve in both normative and comparative functions (Kelley 1952) – the normative function encourages individuals to take on the norms and behaviors of the group, while the comparative function suggests that groups define one’s norms and behaviors in opposition of those of a particular group. In terms of foreign policy attitudes, we posit that the construction of significant social barriers against the outside community—such as those erected by Orthodox and to a lesser extent, Conservative Judaism—will lead a rabbi to take a “harder” stance on issues pertaining to Israel.

In commenting on the political development and involvement of Jews in America, Isaacs (1974; see also Goren 1999) writes that “religion was a surrogate for ethnicity, a more acceptable basis for group distinctiveness.” The Jewish community has struggled to maintain some semblance of “social insulation” and group identity in the American milieu of cultural assimilation (Dollinger 2000). The Orthodox have been particularly adept at maintaining insulation, flowing from strict religious practices (Kelley 1972; Finke and Stark 1992). Following a stricter religious canon, the Orthodox are particularly ardent supporters of the preservation of Jewish tradition and community. In this case, movement socialization should exert a potent influence on rabbi beliefs about Israel and foreign policy – greater concerns about threats to the faith (from intermarriage, etc.) should translate into greater concern about Israel and its security needs.

Of course, not all Jews advocate unflinching support of Israel by the United States – a break that has become a source of contention within the community. Novik (1986: 69) writes that the debate over support for Israel “reflects a perception of unease and vulnerability stemming at least in part from the fear of being accused of dual loyalty.” While some American Jews may disagree with the actions of the Israeli government in dealing with the Palestinians or other Arab neighbors, others are afraid of increased anti-Semitism at home as a response to strident support of Israeli policies. This suggests that those faced with a greater incidence of anti-Semitic incidents in their community (operationalized as their state) will favor compromise in the peace process.

Rabbi concern with foreign policy may also be structured by other external factors, most prominently mobilization efforts of the Jewish Advocacy Organizations (Djupe and Sokhey 2003a). The JAOs have been called the first line of defense for the Jewish community and search diligently for issues that might concern Jewish security. Along with anti-Semitism, Israel has been the polar star guiding the activity of the JAOs. Greater identification with the JAOs will lead to a harder line on the peace process and augmented engagement with foreign policy issues.

In the end, a combination of factors will affect rabbi views on Israel, the Middle East, and American foreign policy. As representatives of their congregations and communities, rabbis may feel an obligation to address these issues as part of guarding the flock. This call to service is likely to be motivated by personal views and a response to the call of the community and congregation for leadership.

OPINIONS ABOUT PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

We asked a number questions probing opinions about Israel and the Middle East – most of them were concerned with the conflicts in the region, a few tapped opinions on American involvement, and still others were about particular movement issues concerning Israel. We begin by

reporting the opinions of rabbis of the four major movements of American Judaism on Israel and the Middle East.

In Table 1, over one-third of rabbis agree with the statement that “Israel should cede land in the Golan Heights to achieve peace with Syria.” But support varies dramatically by movement; this is a pattern to be repeated often. Sixty percent of Reconstructionist, and nearly one-half of Reform rabbis believe that Israel should surrender portions of the Golan Heights, but less than fifteen percent of Conservative, and only eight percent of Orthodox rabbis agree. A similar question on the need for concessions to achieve peace (this time with the Palestinians) also breaks down into two camps, with Reconstructionist and Reform rabbis on one side, and Conservative and Orthodox rabbis on the other. This time, however, the difference is not nearly as dramatic – approximately half of Reconstructionist and Reform rabbis agree, while thirty-five percent of Conservative rabbis and just over 20 percent of Orthodox rabbis agree.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

In late 2000, Israel began a dramatic new initiative: the construction of walls around settlements in the West Bank. In the time since these walls have been under construction, peace has been attempted by means of enforced separation. When asked about the segregation of peoples in the region as a path to peace, rabbis seem to believe that a lasting peace can be achieved without it – only about one-fifth agree that “the only way to achieve a lasting peace is to maintain separation of people of different religions.” Once again the numbers by movement break down into two groups. While only about a tenth of Reconstructionist and 12.6 percent of Reform rabbis agree with the statement, nearly one-fourth of Conservative, and over forty percent of Orthodox rabbis believe that Middle-Eastern people of different religious traditions cannot live together peacefully. Conservative and Orthodox rabbis (12 percent for each) are also more pessimistic that Israel and the Palestinians will achieve a lasting peace in the near future. The liberal camp is almost equally dour

on the chances for peace, an outlook born out in recent history – a slightly higher number of Reconstructionist (approximately one-fifth) and Reform rabbis (18 percent) expressed optimism about the chances for a lasting peace.

The relative agreement of Conservative and Orthodox rabbis on these issues lends support for the importance of movement socialization. Both the Conservative and Orthodox movements of Judaism emphasize the maintenance of religious traditions and laws – preserving religious tradition is a high priority. Because Israel is seen as a religious issue, these rabbis seem less willing to compromise and, therefore, are less optimistic about the prospects for peace. That these sentiments are even more extreme for Orthodox rabbis is no surprise, for their adherence to religious law and tradition is more extreme than for Conservative rabbis. The particularly strong position that Orthodox Judaism holds in Israel could also help to explain this pattern.

Though Conservative and Orthodox opinions on international affairs often seem to coincide, Orthodox rabbis can still be regarded as on their own. For example, while one-fourth or less of the rabbis in the Reconstructionist, Reform, and Conservative movements agree that Israel should *not* be willing to dismantle settlements in the West Bank, nearly three-fifths of Orthodox rabbis agree. This again reinforces the importance of movement in opinion formation on international affairs.

Do rabbi opinions about Israel fit in with a broader ideology of international affairs? To examine this, we asked questions on a number of other questions about American involvement abroad. We first asked about whether or not the United States should move its embassy to Jerusalem, and with the exception of the Reconstructionists, rabbis across the board strongly agree that the United States should move its embassy. Roughly 80 percent are in agreement, and this increases with the orthodoxy of the movement.

We next asked about whether more resources should be devoted to American military and defense spending – less than one-fifth of all respondent rabbis agreed that more funding should be provided. Again we see a break between the opinions of Orthodox rabbis and the other three movements. Only three percent of Orthodox rabbis believe that the United States should spend more money on the military, while nearly ten percent of Reconstructionist and Conservative, and nearly 14 percent of Reform rabbis agree. Though support is almost nil across the board, the disjuncture between Orthodox views on the need for the support of Israel and their views on military spending is the most intriguing. Orthodox rabbis agree most strongly that the United States should move its embassy to Jerusalem and assist Israel, yet agree least that the United States needs to spend more on defense. This finding seems to lend some support to a “selective interventionist” view of American foreign policy – a paradigm of foreign policy characterized by a willingness to push American interests and presence abroad, yet a reluctance to commit military resources (Novik 1986).

Another issue on which we questioned rabbis was whether or not China should be given permanent normal trading (PNTR) status (which it since has) until it has stopped religious persecution. Though the Jewish political agenda has shifted a bit over the past fifty years, civil rights and the fight against domestic and international anti-Semitism continue to be hallmarks (Chanes 1999). Because of these concerns, the Jewish community has tended to show solidarity for other battles against discrimination and religious persecution, and our sample of rabbis does so here. Over half of all rabbis agree that in order for China to be given PNTR status, it must stop religious persecution. This varies a bit by movement – Orthodox and Reconstructionist rabbis lead the way with over 60 percent in agreement, while Reform and Conservative rabbis trail by about ten percent.

Though these questions tap only a few specific issues, the responses begin to reveal a structure of rabbinical beliefs about American foreign policy. Rabbis seem to believe that the

United States should make at least a stronger symbolic showing of support for Israel (by moving the Embassy to Jerusalem). Likewise, many support a refusal to grant China permanent normal trading status in light of human rights abuses – another highly symbolic act. At the same time, rabbis do not believe that the United States should increase spending for the military and defense – one means for more direct action abroad. Overall, the results point to much variation within the Jewish community, especially on issues central to the peace process and governance of Israel—a view of foreign policy contradictory to the monolithic one intimated by Representative James Moran. What seems clear is that matters pertaining to the Middle East are structured by movement, but that other issues (defense and PNTR for China) are not. That is, we see the most diversity in the rabbinical community where we expected the most unity.

MULTIVARIATE MODELS OF OPINION

Having developed a sense of the general forces that structure the political behavior of rabbis, it is appropriate to operationalize and test our hypotheses more systematically. This we do in Table 2, which presents multivariate estimation results of a Middle East affairs index composed of agreement with four statements: Israel should cede land in the Golan Heights to achieve peace with Syria; Israel should not be willing to dismantle Jewish settlements in the West Bank; a lasting peace in the Middle East will require Israel to make greater concessions to the Palestinians; and the U.S. Embassy should be moved to Jerusalem. The combination of these elements was confirmed with an exploratory factor analysis; the index earns a respectable cronbach's $\alpha=0.71$. We also estimate separately two variables from the index – whether the U.S. should move the embassy to Jerusalem and whether Israel needs to make concessions to the Palestinians – in order to look for different influences among the items. We choose these two items since the former involves the U.S., and the latter is suggestive of how the peace process should proceed.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

The explanatory factors in Table 2 are presented in several categories roughly paralleling the theory of clergy political behavior discussed above. Essentially, we are looking for effects from movement, individual political and theological inspirations, and the community.

The model results explain an adequate amount of the variance, especially for the index (the adjusted $R^2=0.40$ – see the first column of Table 2). This suggests that rabbi opinions about Middle East affairs are highly structured by a few variables (interestingly, *not* including age). Political ideology and views on Jewish law (roughly comparable to a theological orthodoxy measure for Christians) are strong and significant predictors of these opinions. The more conservative and more religiously orthodox are more hard line on the peace process – disagreeing with a compromising stance. When these effects are controlled for, no movement variables attain significance, which serves to identify the true mechanism of influence from the movements.

We see a similar pattern of effects for the other two dependent variables (columns 2 and 3 in Table 2), except that sporadic other variables appear significant. Reconstructionist rabbis, compared to the excluded category of Reform rabbis, are more in favor of moving the embassy to Jerusalem – Reconstructionists value the communal dimension of religion, and the embassy move would come closer to uniting religious symbolism and political reality. Orthodox rabbis disagree more with the need for Israel to make concessions, suggesting an additional, direct effect from the movement—an effect that mobilizes this sentiment beyond that achieved through theological conviction. Interestingly, more anti-Semitic incidents in the rabbi's state in 2000 predict increased opposition to moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem. Perhaps rabbis exposed to a more antagonistic climate are more hesitant to encourage a move that would likely heighten tensions between Jews and Muslims. Still, these other effects tinker on the margins of well-developed, consistent opinions structured along ideological lines.

SPEAKING OUT ON THE MIDDLE EAST

We have investigated rabbi opinions about the Middle East and American foreign policy, and what might structure those beliefs. We now turn to activity, for rabbinical opinions only matter to the extent that they are shared. How often do rabbis speak out about Israel and the Middle-East?

In Table 3, four-fifths of sampled rabbis report “often” addressing the peace process in the Middle East in 2000. Orthodox rabbis lead the way with nearly 87 percent reporting addressing this issue, but activity is high across movements. A good portion of rabbis also report addressing the status of non-Orthodox Jews in Israel in 2000. Reform rabbis report at the highest rate (about 75 percent), followed by Conservative and Reconstructionist rabbis. That Reform rabbis speak about this issue in the highest percentage comes as no surprise – it is probably explained by the heated disagreement between their movement and Orthodox Judaism over the issue of patrilineal descent.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Over sixty percent of all rabbis report having addressed U.S. policy towards Israel, *but it varies greatly by movement*. Just under one-half of Reconstructionist and Conservative rabbis report talking about the issue; over sixty percent of Reform rabbis do the same. However, Orthodox rabbis are again distinct – over 80 percent report talking about American policy toward Israel. This distinction remains when looking at speech on religious persecution abroad. Nearly half of Orthodox rabbis address this issue compared to the next highest group – Reconstructionist rabbis – at close to 20 percent. Differences between movements are further demonstrated by looking at the number of rabbis that report talking about international trade issues; movement socialization is again underscored by the higher rates of speech for Orthodox rabbis.

Overall, on issues pertaining to Israel and the Middle East we see fairly high rates of speech among *all* rabbis. Again, however, the most notable observation is that once again we see great

variation in speech when looking at the issues for which we would expect to see the least – those pertaining to Israel and the Middle East.

MULTIVARIATE MODELS OF PUBLIC SPEECH

As we noted above, opinion leaders—such as rabbis— are only important actors insofar as they share their opinions publicly. Therefore, we estimate the effects of variables affecting rabbis’ frequency of public speech on Middle East affairs; we estimate three models. The first uses an index of three items capturing speech on a range of Middle East issues: U.S. policy toward Israel; the peace process in the Middle East; the status of non-Orthodox Jews in Israel (cronbach’s $\alpha=0.80$). We choose two of the items to model individually – speech on U.S. policy toward Israel, and the status of the non-Orthodox in Israel. The first is clearly political; the second should show much more division within the Jewish community, tapping both civil rights and religious concerns.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

The determinants that we use change slightly from those used in Table 2. We add a measure describing one facet of the relationship between the congregation and rabbi – the number of years the rabbi has served in the current congregation. Some studies have found that over time clergy build credit—capital— that can be expended from time to time on political or other controversial matters (Guth et al. 1997). Of course, addressing the Middle East is unlikely to be a controversial matter in the Jewish community, but we expect longer-serving rabbis to speak out more often. We also add several opinion items with the notion that those with certain foreign policy opinions may engage them publicly more often; primarily, we have an eye on whether there is any effect here which would suggest an imbalance of information presented to congregants. We also include an item asking whether peace will be achieved soon, thinking that it taps a form of efficacy –that is, if there will be peace soon, rabbis may feel a greater motivation to address related issues.

Jewish advocacy organizations (JAOs) are often considered the political voices of the Jewish community. As such, they command the respect and attention of policymakers and community members. Rabbis have a rather lukewarm relationship with the JAOs, preferring to keep their distance from the organizations while supporting many of the same causes through other avenues (Djupe and Sokhey 2003a). Still, we suspect that rabbis' public engagement with U.S. policy toward Israel will be driven by JAO mobilization and test this notion with an index capturing how closely rabbis feel to the three major JAOs.

The estimation results are presented in Table 4; they reveal some hints about the structure of action on these issues. The primary theme running through the results is that the differences in addressing these issues are organized around stable, long-term attributes. Older rabbis more often address Middle East affairs, as do female rabbis. Older rabbis, likely, are more steeped in the history of World War II and its legacy, and see Israel as integrally linked to the fate of the Jews worldwide. Women more than likely are concerned about the treatment of Israeli women who labor under laws and norms generated by the dominant Orthodox factions in Israel – i.e., they are concerned with these issues primarily as they concern civil rights.

[Insert Table 4 About Here]

Another factor that suggests the long term, stable nature of speech patterns is the effect of movement. Orthodox rabbis speak about the Middle East less often, while Conservatives speak out more (compared to Reform rabbis, the excluded reference category). More liberal stances on Jewish law (favoring women as rabbis, accepting pluralism, etc.) also drive up discussion of the status of the non-Orthodox, which is no surprise. Religious concerns have no bearing on the more political items, suggesting a degree of unity in the frequency of addressing these issues, if not in what they say about them. That is, there are no systematic differences in public speech frequency based on

particular opinions held about the peace process. Only those in favor of Israel compromising to achieve peace address the status of the non-Orthodox more often – a natural result.

At the same time, feeling close to the JAOs drives up speech on the index and on U.S. policy toward Israel, in particular, showing at least one short-term influence on the public speech of rabbis. Since Israel and the peace process occupy a near permanent place on the agendas of American Jews, it is not surprising that organizations dedicated to keeping these issues hot can periodically ignite discussion. However, the JAOs are limited in the effect they have on these opinion leaders, since their efficacy rests on the openness of rabbis to their efforts, and relatively few are open to them (Djupe and Sokhey 2003a).

DISCUSSION

At this point, it is useful to combine these two analyses to derive an estimate of what the religious Jewish community is hearing from rabbis. This we attempt in Table 5, which presents cross-tabulations between our opinion measures and selected speech items. Of course, a correlation does not mean rabbis' speech takes the same direction as their opinions. But, the analysis is still useful and at least suggestive. Table 5 presents the data in two ways: the amount of speech for those with various opinions (row percentages), and the opinions of those speaking out in varying amounts (column percentages).

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Either way the data are sliced, there are no significant differences. Roughly eighty percent of rabbis speak out frequently about the peace process in the Middle East regardless of their own opinion about how that process should or will go. From the row percentage results, the only opinion measure that approaches a meaningful distinction is about whether peace will be achieved in the near future, which produces a 7 point difference.

The column percentage results, while again yielding no differences of statistical significance, give us a flavor of the messages reaching the Jewish community. Rabbis who speak out on the peace process frequently, on balance, urge granting land concessions to advance the peace process, but express trepidation about dealing with the Palestinians. At the same time, they desire a religious alignment of church and state by moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem; they also desire that Israel maintain complete jurisdiction over Jerusalem. All in all, few outspoken rabbis have any faith in the efficacy of the peace process in the near future.

Are rabbis having any effect? While the comparison is perilous (since opinion data on American Jews are not broken down by movement, and because only a portion attend a synagogue regularly), it is at least interesting to note that there is some diversity within the Jewish community on the peace process. For instance, from the 2000 Annual Survey of American Jewish Opinion (AJC 2005), 36 percent say that Israel should be willing to compromise on the status of Jerusalem. Thirty-two percent disagree that American Jews should support the policies of the Israeli government even if they disagree with that government's pursuit of the peace process. This has to be seen, of course, in the context of unity of support for the concept of Israel, represented in one way by only 10 percent agreeing that "Israel no longer needs the financial support of American Jews." Once dealing with internal policies of Israel, however, 72 percent of respondent Jews blame ultra-Orthodox Jews in Israel for sharpening tensions with the non-Orthodox.

In the 2002 annual survey, a bare plurality (49 to 47 percent) supported the establishment of a Palestinian state; 41 percent were now willing to compromise on the status of Jerusalem, and 65 percent suggested Israel should dismantle all (10 percent) or some (55 percent) Jewish settlements to advance the peace process. This pattern accords roughly with the opinion measures asked to our sample—roughly 70 percent of rabbis suggested that Israel should make concessions on Israeli settlements, and 56 percent thought Israel should maintain complete jurisdiction over Jerusalem.

CONCLUSION

We began this paper with the comments of Representative James Moran, who provided an oversimplified, incorrect, and perhaps even offensive characterization of the opinions of the American Jewish community—one labeling it politically (if not ideologically) united – especially on issues pertaining to Israel and the Middle East. We might speculate that the loud messages of Jewish Advocacy Organizations, though rational and serving legitimate purpose, may in some ways contribute to the false perception of unanimity held by some.

Nevertheless, the findings in this paper certainly discredit the notions described above. Reflecting the greater Jewish community (and other American religious communities²), American rabbis display a diversity of opinions concerning Israel and the Middle East. And, their patterns of speech on the issues are equally manifold. Interestingly, the state of the state of Israel occasions the most diversity of opinion among American rabbis, breaking fairly cleanly along religious lines. But again, we find the most diversity of opinion here—on these issues—where we would expect to find the least.

While American rabbis' opinions concerning Israel and the Middle East are heavily influenced by theological orientations (i.e., stances on Jewish law), their political ideology also plays a key role—thus, their views on these issues have tangible referents in U.S. politics. American rabbis are receiving information from multiple sources, and their responses are structured by both these sources and their personal conceptions of rabbinical mission and propriety. Surely the opinions of American rabbis will continue to evolve—along with the broader Jewish community (and the American public)—as does the nature of the United States' involvement in the Middle East, and the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

² Guth et al. (1996) find that “Evangelical Protestants are more favorable to the state of Israel than mainline Protestants, who in turn are more supportive than Catholics and secular citizens” (353).

APPENDIX: VARIABLE CODING

Note: Variables are listed in the order presented in Tables 2 and 4.

Age: in years.

Sex: 1=female, 2=male.

Years in current congregation: In years.

Partisanship: 1=strong Democrat, 2=weak Democrat, 3=leaning Democrat, 4=independent, 5=leaning Republican, 6=weak Republican, 7=strong Republican.

Political Ideology: Many people use the terms liberal, moderate, and conservative to recognize different political opinions. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is the most liberal position and 5 the most conservative, where would you rank yourself when you think of your general political views? 1=Most liberal, 2, 3=Moderate, 4, 5=Most Conservative.

Peace will be achieved in the Middle East: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree.

Jewish Law Stances Index: An additive index, ranging from 8 to 40, including the following statements, each coded 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree: Orthodox rabbis who refuse officially to recognize Reform and Conservative rabbis are right to do so; *Halacha* must sometimes be ignored for the sake of Jewish unity; In my eyes, the child of a Jewish father and a non-Jewish mother is a Jew; Women should be able to become rabbis; Women should be confined to the women's section at the Western Wall in Jerusalem; Reform rabbis are most responsible for the divisions among Jews; Jewish unity is not as important as pluralism.

Middle East Affairs Opinion Index: An additive index, ranging from 4 to 20, including the following statements, each coded 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree: Israel should cede land in the Golan Heights to achieve peace with Syria; Israel should not be willing to dismantle Jewish settlements in the West Bank; A lasting peace in the Middle East will require Israel to make greater concessions to the Palestinians; The U.S. Embassy should be moved to Jerusalem.

Middle East Affairs Public Speech Index: An additive index, ranging from 4 to 20, including the following issues, each coded 1=never, 2=rarely, 3=seldom, 4=often, 5=very often: U.S. policy toward Israel; The peace process in the Middle East; The status of non-Orthodox Jews in Israel.

State Anti-Semitic Incidents, 2000: Obtained from Anti-Defamation League for each state in 2000. See their website for how the data were collected (http://www.adl.org/main_anti_semitism.asp).

Closeness toward JAOs: An average of the closeness ratings given to the Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and B'nai B'rith International. It ranges from 1=very far to 5=very close.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, Elliot, ed. 2001. *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- American Jewish Committee. 2005. "2000 Annual Survey of American Jewish Opinion" and "2002 Annual Survey of American Jewish Opinion." Online.
<http://www.ajc.org/site/c.ijITI2PHKoG/b.846741/k.8A33/Publications__Surveys/apps/nl/newsletter3.asp>
- Anderson, Nick. 2003. "Showdown with Iraq: Congressman Apologizes for Remarks About Jews and Iraq." *Los Angeles Times*. March 12, 6.
- Beatty, Kathleen, and Oliver Walter. 1989. "A Group Theory of Religion and Politics: The Clergy as Group Leaders." *Western Political Quarterly*. 42: 129-146.
- Bennis, Phyllis, and Khaled Mansour. 1998. "Praise God and Pass the Ammunition!: The Changing Nature of Israel's U.S. Backers." *Middle East Report*. 208: 16-18,43.
- Campbell, Ernest Q. and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 1959. *Christians in Racial Crisis: A Study of Little Rock's Ministry*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press.
- Chanes, Jerome A. 1999. *A Primer on the American Jewish Community*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Djupe, Paul A. and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2002. "The Political Voice of Clergy." *The Journal of Politics* 64(2): 596-609.
- Djupe, Paul A. and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2003. *The Prophetic Pulpit: Clergy, Churches, and Communities in American Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Djupe, Paul and Anand E. Sokhey. 2003a. "The Mobilization of Elite Opinion: Rabbi Perceptions of and Responses to Anti-Semitism." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(3): 443-454.
- Djupe, Paul and Anand E. Sokhey. 2003b. "American Rabbis in the 2000 Elections." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(4): 563-576.
- Dollinger, Marc. 2000. *Quest for Inclusion: Jews and Liberalism in Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goldberg, David Howard. 1990. *Foreign Policy and Ethnic Interest Groups: American and Canadian Jews Lobby for Israel*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Goren, Arthur A. 1999. *The Politics and Public Culture of American Jews*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Guth, James L., John C. Green, Corwin E. Smidt, Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Margaret Poloma. 1997. *The Bully Pulpit: The Politics of Protestant Clergy*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- Green, John C., James L. Guth, Corwin E. Smidt, and Lyman A. Kellstedt. 1996. *Religion and the Culture Wars: Dispatches from the Front*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hertzke, Allen D. 2001. "The Political Sociology of the Crusade Against Religious Persecution." In The Elliot Abrams, ed. *Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Holsti, Ole R. 1992. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus Mershon Series: Research Programs and Debates." *International Studies Quarterly*. 35(4): 439-466.
- Hsu, Spencer S. 2003. "Moran Said Jews Are Pushing War; Apology Denies Anti-Semitism." *The Washington Post* A01. March 11.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1999. "The Erosion of American National Interests." In Eugene R. Wittkopf and James M. McCormick, eds. *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy*, 3rd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Issacs, Stephen D. 1974. *Jews and American Politics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

- Jelen, Ted. 2001. "Clergy as Political Leaders: Notes for a Theory." In Sue E.S. Crawford and Laura R. Olson, eds., *Christian Clergy in American Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kelley, Dean M. 1972. *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kelley, Harold. 1952. "Two Functions of Reference Groups." In G. Swanson, T. Newcomb, and E. Hartley, eds., *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Morris, Aldon D. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press.
- Novik, Nimrod. 1986. *The United States and Israel: Domestic Determinants of a Changing U.S. Commitment*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Noll, Mark A. 1990. *Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olson, Laura R. 2000. *Filled with Spirit and Power: Protestant Clergy in Politics*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Olson, Laura R., Sue E.S. Crawford, and Melissa M. Deckman. 2005. *Women with a Mission: Religion, Gender, and the Politics of Women Clergy*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Public Opinion*.
- Ribuffo, Leo P. 2001. "Religion in the History of U.S. Foreign Policy." In Elliot Abrams, ed. *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Sands, David R. 2003. "Powell Denies 'Cabal' Drives Iraq Policy." *The Washington Times* A17. March 14.
- Trice, R.H. 1977. "Congress and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Support for Israel in the U.S. Senate, 1970-1973." *Political Science Quarterly* 92: 443-463.
- Wald, Kenneth D. 1997. *Religion and Politics in the United States*, 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Wald, Kenneth D., Dennis E. Owen, and Samuel S. Hill, Jr. 1988. "Churches as Political Communities." *American Political Science Review* 82: 531-48.
- Watanabe, Paul Y. 1984. *Ethnic Groups, Congress, and American Foreign Policy: The Politics of the Turkish Arms Embargo*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Table 1

Rabbi Opinions on Israel and the Middle East and American Foreign Policy Issues
(Percent agreeing with the following statements – overall and by movement)

<i>Issues</i>	Reconstructionist	Reform	Conservative	Orthodox	Total
<i>Israel and the Middle East</i>					
Israel should cede land in the Golan Heights	60.0	47.5	14.5	8.0	36.7
Israel should not be willing to dismantle Jewish settlements in the West Bank	20.0	17.9	19.1	59.8	28.2
A lasting peace will require Israel to make greater concessions to the Palestinians	50.0	47.2	35.8	22.0	38.8
Israel and the Palestinians will achieve lasting peace in the near future	20.0	17.9	12.0	11.4	15.3
The only way to achieve a lasting peace is to maintain separation	10.5	12.6	24.6	41.6	22.0
<i>American Foreign Policy</i>					
The U.S. Embassy should be moved to Jerusalem	43.0	73.5	80.9	94.3	78.2
The U.S. should spend more on the military and defense	9.5	13.8	10.4	3.0	19.2
China should not be given permanent normal trading status until it has stopped religious persecution	63.3	48.0	54.4	60.9	53.3
Number of cases	46	198	50	64	358

Source: The 2000 American Rabbi Study.

Note: Each is coded 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral/not sure, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree. Percent in agreement is the total of responses scored 1 and 2.

TABLE 2
 Estimated Opinions of Rabbis on a Middle East Affairs Index
 and Selected Components of the Index
 (OLS regression estimates)

<i>Variable</i>	Middle East Affairs Index Coeff. (S.E.)	Move U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem Coeff. (S.E.)	Israeli Concessions Needed for Peace Coeff. (S.E.)
<i>Personal Attributes</i>			
Age	-0.001 (0.013)	-0.002 (0.004)	0.005 (0.005)
Sex	0.146 (0.552)	0.040 (0.192)	-0.155 (0.221)
<i>Jewish Movement</i>			
Orthodox rabbi	1.088 (0.908)	0.412 (0.316)	0.679 (0.364) *
Conservative rabbi	0.408 (0.503)	0.105 (0.175)	0.132 (0.202)
Reconstructionist rabbi	0.003 (0.004)	0.478 (0.291) *	-0.056 (0.338)
<i>Political and Theological Orientations</i>			
Partisanship	-0.060 (0.159)	0.002 (0.055)	0.062 (0.064)
Political ideology	-1.470 (0.262) ***	-0.268 (0.091) ***	-0.463 (0.105) ***
Jewish Law stances index	-0.197 (0.046) ***	-0.029 (0.016) *	-0.059 (0.018) ***
<i>Community Factors</i>			
State anti-Semitic incidents, 2000	0.000 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000) **	0.000 (0.000)
Constant	18.35 (1.272)	3.205 (0.442)	4.856 (0.509)
Number of cases	274	277	275
Adjusted R ²	0.400	0.115	0.193
Standard Error of the Estimate	2.99	1.04	1.20

Source: 2000 American Rabbi Study. See Appendix for variable coding.

*** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$

Table 3

Rabbi Frequency of Speech on Israel and the Middle East and Other International Issues
(Percent reporting “often” addressing these issues in 2000 – overall and by movement)

<i>Issues</i>	Reconstructionist	Reform	Conservative	Orthodox	Total
<i>Issues Involving Israel and the Middle East</i>					
The peace process in the Middle East.	84.2	80.4	71.6	86.8	80.3
The status of non-Orthodox Jews in Israel	63.2	74.1	72.1	56.0	68.8
<i>Other U.S. Foreign Policy/International Issues</i>					
U.S. policy towards Israel	47.4	63.2	47.0	83.1	63.7
International trade policy	10.5	8.7	6.3	17.4	10.2
Religious persecution abroad	21.0	29.0	4.5	45.8	27.2
Approximate number of cases	42.0	179	49	55	325

Source: The 2000 American Rabbi Survey

Note: Each is coded 1=very often, 2=often, 3=seldom, 4=rarely, 5=never. Percent reported “often” speaking is the total of responses scored 1 and 2.

TABLE 4

Estimated Public Speech of Rabbis on a Middle East Affairs Index and Selected Components of the Index
(OLS regression estimates)

<i>Variable</i>	Middle East Affairs Speech Index		U.S. Policy Toward Israel (v49z)		Status of Non-Orthodox in Israel (V49AB)				
	Coeff.	(S.E.)	Coeff.	(S.E.)	Coeff.	(S.E.)			
<i>Personal Attributes</i>									
Age	0.019	(0.013)	0.148	0.009	(0.005)	0.103	0.001	(0.005)	
Sex	-0.956	(0.609)	0.118	-0.388	(0.219)	*	-0.463	(0.235)	**
<i>Jewish Movement and Congregation</i>									
Orthodox rabbi	-1.299	(0.885)	0.144	-0.707	(0.368)	*	-0.351	(0.348)	
Conservative rabbi	1.636	(0.461)	***	0.742	(0.192)	***	0.163	(0.182)	
Reconstructionist rabbi	0.036	(0.857)		0.050	(0.338)		-0.089	(0.336)	
Years with current congregation	-0.009	(0.018)		-0.009	(0.008)		-0.001	(0.007)	
<i>Political and Theological Orientations</i>									
Partisanship	0.273	(0.148)	*	0.010	(0.061)		0.190	(0.058)	***
Political ideology	0.032	(0.268)		-0.072	(0.111)		0.098	(0.102)	
Middle East affairs opinion index	0.032	(0.061)		-0.002	(0.025)		0.037	(0.024)	0.124
Peace will be achieved in the M.E.	-0.047	(0.180)		-0.015	(0.075)		-0.058	(0.071)	
Jewish Law stances index	0.029	(0.045)		0.011	(0.019)		0.037	(0.018)	**
<i>Community Factors</i>									
State anti-Semitic incidents, 2000	0.001	(0.001)		0.000	(0.000)		0.000	(0.000)	
Closeness toward JAOs	0.374	(0.220)	*	0.152	(0.093)	0.105	0.080	(0.088)	
Constant	4.464	(1.992)			(0.442)		1.233	(0.777)	
Number of cases		206			204			206	
Adjusted R ²		0.081			0.146			0.101	
Standard Error of the Estimate		2.44			1.01			0.96	

Source: 2000 American Rabbi Study. See Appendix for variable coding.

*** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$; specific p values slightly above 0.10 are listed.

TABLE 5

An Estimate of the Messages Heard by the Religious Jewish Community – Cross-tabulations between Speech and Opinions on the Peace Process

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Row Percentages</i>		Chi-square	<i>Column Percentages</i>		Chi-square
	Infrequent Speech	Frequent Speech		Infrequent Speech	Frequent Speech	
<i>Israel should cede land in the Golan Heights to achieve peace with Syria.</i>						
Agree	21.2	82.5		50.8	58.2	
Disagree	17.5	78.8	$p=.402$	49.2	41.8	$p=.292$
<i>Israel should not be willing to dismantle Jewish settlements in the West Bank.</i>						
Agree	19.7	80.3		24.5	25.4	
Disagree	20.9	79.1	$p=.814$	75.5	74.6	$p=.884$
<i>A lasting peace in the Middle East will require Israel to make greater concessions to the Palestinians.</i>						
Agree	20.4	79.6		39.6	35.5	
Disagree	18.2	81.8	$p=.625$	60.4	64.5	$p=.549$
<i>Israel should maintain complete jurisdiction over Jerusalem.</i>						
Agree	20.6	79.4		50.8	58.1	
Disagree	18.7	81.3	$p=.681$	49.2	41.9	$p=.302$
<i>It is likely that Israel and the Palestinians will achieve a lasting peace agreement in the near future.</i>						
Agree	12.8	87.2		16.2	11.5	
Disagree	20.2	79.8	$p=.230$	83.8	88.5	$p=.355$
<i>The U.S. Embassy should be moved to Jerusalem.</i>						
Agree	19.9	80.1		75.9	75.8	
Disagree	18.2	81.8	$p=.751$	24.1	24.2	$p=.993$
<i>The only way to achieve lasting peace in the Middle East is to maintain a separation of people of different religions.</i>						
Agree	20.8	79.2		19.4	19.4	
Disagree	19.8	80.2	$p=.841$	80.6	80.6	$p=.996$

Source: The 2000 American Rabbi Study.

Note: ‘Very often’ and ‘often’ were collapsed into frequent speech, while ‘seldom’, ‘rarely’, and ‘never’ were collapsed into an infrequent speech category.