

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XLV : NUMBERS 1 and 2 : 2003

CONTENTS

A Questionable Connection: Community Involvement and
Attitudes to Intermarriage of Young American Jews

ERIK H. COHEN

Jews in Today's Germany

DORIS BENSIMON

Community Self-Help: San Francisco Jews
and the Great Depression

SHELLY TENENBAUM

Lubavitch Messianism

GEOFFREY ALDERMAN

The Conservative Party and the Jews:
A Matter of Taste – not Ideology

RORY MILLER

Book Reviews

Chronicle

Books Received

Notes on Contributors

Editor: Judith Freedman

ISSN 0021-6534

OBJECTS AND SPONSORSHIP OF THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

The Jewish Journal of Sociology was sponsored by the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress from its inception in 1959 until the end of 1980. Thereafter, from the first issue of 1981 (volume 23, no. 1), the Journal has been sponsored by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Limited, which is registered as an educational charity by the Charity Commission of England and Wales (no. 326077). It has as its main purpose the encouragement of research in the sociology of the Jews and the publication of *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*. The objects of the Journal remain as stated in the Editorial of the first issue in 1959:

'This Journal has been brought into being in order to provide an international vehicle for serious writing on Jewish social affairs . . . Academically we address ourselves not only to sociologists, but to social scientists in general, to historians, to philosophers, and to students of comparative religion. . . . We should like to stress both that the Journal is editorially independent and that the opinions expressed by authors are their own responsibility.'

The founding Editor of the *JJS* was Morris Ginsberg, and the founding Managing Editor was Maurice Freedman. Morris Ginsberg, who had been Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics, died in 1970. Maurice Freedman, who had been Professor of Social Anthropology at the London School of Economics and later at the University of Oxford, succeeded to the title of Editor in 1971, when Dr Judith Freedman (who had been Assistant Editor since 1963) became Managing Editor. Maurice Freedman died in 1975; since then the Journal has been edited by Dr Judith Freedman.

Applications for subscriptions and enquiries regarding back numbers should be addressed to:

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY
187 GLOUCESTER PLACE
LONDON NW1 6BU
ENGLAND

TELEPHONE: 020-7262 8939

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Volume XLV : Numbers 1 and 2 : 2003

CONTENTS

A Questionable Connection: Community Involvement and Attitudes to Inter-marriage of Young American Jews ERIK H. COHEN	5
Jews in Today's Germany DORIS BENSIMON	20
Community Self-Help: San Francisco Jews and the Great Depression SHELLEY TENENBAUM	34
Lubavitch Messianism GEOFFREY ALDERMAN	46
The Conservative Party and the Jews: A Matter of Taste—not Ideology RORY MILLER	51
Book Reviews	64
Chronicle	87
Books Received	119
Notes on Contributors	119

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

INSTITUTIONS: £20.00 (U.S. \$35.00)

INDIVIDUALS: £15.00 (U.S. \$26.00)

Applications for subscriptions should be sent to The Jewish Journal of Sociology,
187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England. Telephone: 020-7262 8939

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

EDITOR Judith Freedman

ADVISORY BOARD

JACQUES GUTWIRTH (<i>France</i>)	MARLENA SCHMOOL (<i>Britain</i>)
ERNEST KRAUSZ (<i>Israel</i>)	WILLIAM SHAFFIR (<i>Canada</i>)
HAROLD POLLINS (<i>Britain</i>)	NORMAN SOLOMON (<i>Britain</i>)

© MAURICE FREEDMAN RESEARCH TRUST LTD 2003

PRODUCED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY J. W. ARROWSMITH LTD, BRISTOL

BOOK REVIEWED

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Titles</i>	<i>Reviewers</i>	<i>Page</i>
D. Berger	<i>The Rebbe, the Messiah, and the Scandal of Orthodox Indifference</i>	G. Alderman	46
D. Bloxham	<i>Genocide on Trial</i>	W. D. Rubinstein	64
J. Cocks	<i>Passion and Paradox: Intellectuals Confront the National Question</i>	W. D. Rubinstein	65
H. Defries	<i>Conservative Party Attitudes to Jews, 1900-1950</i>	R. Miller	51
I. Finestein	<i>Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800-2000</i>	J. Freedman	67
L. A. Jones, ed.	<i>Crossing Boundaries: The Exclusion and Inclusion of Minorities</i>	W. D. Rubinstein	69
E. Krausz and G. Tulca, eds.	<i>Starting the Twenty-First Century</i>	H. Pollins	70
H. Pollins and V. Rosewarne	<i>Louis Kyezor 'The King of Whitton'</i>	J. Freedman	76
M. Shain and R. Mendelsohn, eds.	<i>Memories, Realities and Dreams. Aspects of the South African Jewish Experience</i>	H. Pollins	78
R. R. Shield	<i>Diamond Stories</i>	J. Gutwirth	82
L. Tessman and B. Bar On, eds.	<i>Jewish Locations. Traversing Radicalized Landscapes</i>	H. Pollins	84

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Papers submitted to *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* should be addressed to the Editor at 187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England. The papers must be original. They should not have been published previously, or be committed to publication elsewhere, in any language. When a paper has been accepted for publication, the author may not publish it elsewhere in any language, without the written consent of the Editor of the *JJS*.

Articles (please send at least two copies) should be typewritten on one side only and double-spaced with ample margins. Pages (including those containing illustrations, diagrams, or tables) should be numbered consecutively. All quotations should be within single inverted commas; quotation marks within quotations should be double inverted commas.

Notes should follow the style of this *Journal* and should be given at the end of the article in numerical sequence according to the order of their citation in the text. They should be double-spaced.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

A. *Books*

Give author, title, place of publication, year, and page reference. Underline all titles of books.

B. *Articles*

Place titles of articles within single inverted commas. Underline the title of the book or journal in which the article appears.

In the case of a journal, cite numbers of volume and part, and year of publication.

PROOFS. An author making major revisions in proof will be required to bear the cost. Unless proofs are returned to the Editor promptly, authors' corrections will not be incorporated.

A QUESTIONABLE CONNECTION: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE OF YOUNG AMERICAN JEWS

Erik H. Cohen

Introduction

THE high, and rising, rate of marriage between American Jews and non-Jews is a major concern of American Jewry. In the 1920s, fewer than five per cent of American Jews married Gentiles.¹ The widely-quoted National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) of 1990 found that the proportion of American Jews married to non-Jews (that is, to those who did not convert to Judaism) had risen to 52 per cent.² The low levels of community involvement or affiliation of children of such marriages,³ have led to predictions about the 'vanishing American Jew'.⁴ 'Jewish continuity' has become a catchphrase used by educators and community leaders to refer to the preservation of the Jewish people at the most fundamental level: to ensure that subsequent generations of Jews will consider themselves Jewish, will remain attached to their religion, culture, and/or Israel and will intend to bring up their children as Jews.⁵

The social implications of intermarriage are deep and far-reaching, touching upon every facet of communal life. According to Feingold,⁶ intermarriage is

... part of a process of cultural dilution that is marked by a loss of communal memory. The tribe no longer knows who it is or why it should be.

A commitment to endogamy may be a theological issue, or it may be based on familial, social, or economic concerns.⁷ 'Effective fertility', the rate at which children are likely to be raised as members of the ethnic or religious community, falls as intermarriage rates climb.⁸ Endogamy is seen as a key component of ethnic identity and of an adaptable strategy to combat assimilation.⁹ It can be used as an

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

indicator of general levels of commitment to one's religion or ethnicity.¹⁰ At a personal level, conflict over religious issues may cause friction at home and affect marital stability.¹¹

People marry outside their religious or ethnic group for a variety of reasons. Several categories of individuals are likely to intermarry: rebels, nonconformists, adventurers, escapists who wish to improve their social standing; and those who are psychologically or socially unstable.¹² However, in an increasingly secular and integrated American society, religious background may simply not concern a young couple. That strongly reflects social change. Nowadays in American Jewry, families are seldom involved in the process of choosing a mate. As successive generations are born and raised, there is a tendency for groups to move into more integrated neighbourhoods which do not exert much social pressure and which provide greater opportunities to intermarry.¹³ In addition to the number of generations since immigrants first came to the United States, there is a factor of minority status in the home country and in the host country.¹⁴ The decline of antisemitism in the United States has led to a decline in opposition to intermarriage in both Jewish and Christian communities.

The high level of intermarriage makes it difficult to confront the issue: a very large majority of participants and counsellors involved in American Jewish youth organizations have at least one member of their close family who is married to a non-Jew. One needs to tread warily for fear of insulting or alienating people.¹⁵ In the circumstances, most Jews may believe it to be futile to cling to an ideal of endogamy, while many parents and grandparents are unwilling to distance themselves from the intermarried members of their family, especially in Conservative and Reform Jewry.¹⁶ The trend in those communities is for rabbis to officiate at inter-faith weddings and to attempt greater accommodation generally. Some families cope with the situation by way of '... an informal conversion to symbolic religiosity rather than a formal religious conversion',¹⁷ using religious symbols for religious practice as a means of identification. However, Orthodox Jewish communities — who are comparatively more isolated from general trends in American culture — maintain a more stringent opposition to intermarriage without the conversion of the non-Jewish spouse: rabbis insist on a supervised conversion before officiating at the ceremony of marriage.

The most common tactics for dealing with the issue indirectly are attempts to enhance the Jewish identity of adolescents and to provide opportunities for them to meet other young Jews — primarily through Jewish day schools, youth organizations, and tours to Israel.¹⁸ It is expected that young people who are active in the community and are more exposed to potential Jewish spouses will eventually

ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE

marry one of them. In fact, some studies have shown that Jews who attended day schools and had taken part in Jewish organizations or had gone on trips to Israel did marry a Jewish spouse at a rate significantly higher than that of the national average;¹⁹ while one survey found that those who were more involved were less likely to marry a non-Jewish spouse.²⁰

However, there is an underlying problem in using the surveys conducted by youth organizations to reach conclusions about the impact of community involvement on intermarriage. In such cases the survey population is compared to the national population, leading to difficulties in determining cause and effect. Other analyses have found that controlling for factors such as gender, family affiliation, number of generations in the United States, and intermarriage of parents yields significantly different results about the influence of Jewish education or participation in Jewish youth groups.²¹ The young persons who take part in such programmes and their families are much more strongly affiliated with the Jewish community than are the majority of American Jews.

The National Council of Synagogue Youth (NCSY), which had the lowest intermarriage rate, is an organization of primarily Orthodox youth, and their tendency to marry Jews may be unrelated to participation in the group's activities. In a survey of the North American Federation of Temple Youth (NFTY) — which is affiliated to the Reform movement — more than 40 per cent of the respondents said that they go out with non-Jews as well as with Jews.²² In a study of youth involved in activities at Jewish community centres, only 52 per cent stated that marrying someone Jewish was important to them — a proportion which is close to the endogamy rate of the general American-Jewish population.²³ In other words, intermarriage rates may be more dependent on denominational affiliation than on levels of participation. A more revealing comparison of intermarriage rates would be either between different organizations or between those who participate regularly and those who are only occasional participants.

In 1988, the Commission on Jewish Education in North America explored the question of whether Jewish education necessarily leads to positive Jewish identification.²⁴ The findings of that commission, and of other research, led to the recommendation that Jewish education must include informal education and involvement in a Jewish sub-culture such as youth groups, trips to Israel, and summer camps.²⁵ This issue should now be reconsidered to determine whether the time, energy, and money invested by the wider Jewish community are likely to have the desired effect. This paper attempts to discover whether there is in fact a significant correlation between community involvement and opposition to intermarriage. Further, if

there is such a correlation, does it vary along denominational lines? And can any recent trends or changes in attitudes towards intermarriage be discerned among Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox teenagers?

Methodology

Data collected during the ongoing survey of Israel Experience tours between 1993 and 2000 were analysed, chiefly using standard cross-tabulation and correlations. Owing to the escalating violence and danger of terrorism during the second *intifada*, participation in Israel Experience programmes has since dropped dramatically — as has tourism in Israel generally. The average participant in these tours is aged between 15 and 18 years and most of these young people are affiliated to a Jewish youth group or to a synagogue and have some Jewish educational background. Of course, they do not represent the majority of unaffiliated Jewish-American youth but they do range along the spectrum of religious observance and of Zionist beliefs. We asked them to define themselves as affiliated with one of the three major denominations, and we used their definitions in interpreting the data, rather than the affiliation of the group with which they toured. Only participants from the United States are included in this analysis. Similarly, only those participants who came to Israel under the auspices of the Department of Education of the Jewish Agency for Israel were considered. At the end of their trip to Israel (which may last from two to eight weeks), they are asked to complete a comprehensive questionnaire on the programme. In similar surveys, responses may be affected by the timing of the questionnaire — that is, whether at the beginning or at the end of the tour. In our case, as noted above, the questionnaires were always given at the end of the tour, so that any possible effect on the overall trend from year to year would not be significant. Data were collected from 19,321 American participants during the eight years of the survey. The response rate was approximately 85 per cent, so that we may consider the data to represent not a sample, but essentially the entire population.

The two survey questions which are of interest here are those concerning levels of community involvement and attitudes to intermarriage: 'How often do you participate in activities in your Jewish community?' and 'If a close member of your family expressed the intention of marrying a non-Jew, what would your reaction be?'

Results

Table 1 shows the response to community activity and Table 2 is about the attitudes to the intermarriage of a close relative. The

ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE

TABLE 1.
Frequency of participation in Jewish communal activity*

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Number of respondents	1806	2657	2025	2430	2597	2631	2358	2817	19321
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	6	6	6	6	6	7	8	6	6
Once or twice a year	19	20	19	19	20	21	18	22	20
Once a month or more	28	30	29	28	29	30	27	31	29
Once a week or more	46	44	46	47	44	43	47	42	45
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* All percentages are rounded up, so that the total is not always 100% in Tables 1, 2, 4, 5; 6.

TABLE 2.
Reaction to intermarriage of a close family member

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Number of respondents	1758	2261	2019	2420	2618	2635	2366	2818	18895
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing wrong with it	11	15	19	20	25	24	29	27	22
Ambivalent to this	9	11	12	16	17	14	14	16	14
Slightly opposed to it	41	42	40	35	32	33	28	31	35
Vehemently opposed to it	39	31	29	29	27	28	29	26	29
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Not all respondents answered both questions, hence the difference in the total number of participants in Tables 1 and 2.

cross-tabulations allow us to make several initial observations about the responses to these two questions. Overall, levels of participation have remained stable: three-quarters of the respondents were active in their communities at least once a week; the reasons for such participation may have changed over time, but the levels of involvement have not. On the other hand, the results concerning intermarriage are quite different: the proportion of the overall survey population who said that they saw nothing wrong with a member of their close family marrying a non-Jew increased annually, while the proportion of those who were 'vehemently opposed' dropped by 11 per cent over the eight years of the survey, and of those who were 'slightly opposed' dropped by 13 per cent. This rapid and dramatic change in attitude about such a fundamental issue as intermarriage — which is laden with many social implications — is highly unusual in a demographically stable population. It must be taken seriously and examined further for possible explanations. The various surveys which were cited in the earlier part of this paper tracked the current marital status of young adults, most of whom had been participants in Jewish organizations a decade or more earlier.²⁶

The change in attitude indicated by the data presented in this paper occurred very recently and very rapidly, in particular when considering the stability of other demographic and attitudinal find-

ings of the same survey.²⁷ When the data from Tables 1 and 2 are broken down by denomination, as shown in Table 3, we can see that the percentage of Orthodox participants involved in weekly communal activities has fluctuated somewhat and is lower now than when the survey began. Some of the participants defined themselves as Secular, Reconstructionist, Just Jewish, or Other. Here, only the three major denominations are considered.

Among the Conservative participants, there has been a slight but steady decline in involvement. In contrast, the number of Reform participants who are active in their communities on a weekly basis has increased by 15 per cent. The Orthodox participants demonstrate some annual fluctuations in the percentage who say that they are vehemently opposed to intermarrying, but overall an average of 75 per cent hold this opinion. The respondents' commitment to endogamy appears to be connected more to their denominational affiliation than to community participation, since even in the years which saw a drop in participation, opposition to intermarriage remained high. Those from the Conservative movement are consistently more moderate in their opposition to mixed marriages than those who defined themselves as Orthodox. Moreover, the Conservative data show a significant drop in the percentage of those who say that they are vehemently opposed.

At the other end of the spectrum from the Orthodox are the Reform participants, a mere 12 per cent of whom said that they are opposed to intermarriage within their close family. The Reform, like

TABLE 3.
Communal Participation and Attitudes to Intermarriage according to
Denomination (percentage of relevant answers)

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Orthodox									
Number of participants	94	100	143	180	227	239	385	429	1797
Involved in community once a week or more	62	66	58	50	48	50	54	47	52
Vehemently opposed to intermarriage	74	85	67	78	75	73	83	80	78
Conservative									
Number of participants	1020	1150	964	1035	1089	1148	887	1228	8521
Involved in community once a week or more	56	50	53	53	48	49	50	48	51
Vehemently opposed to intermarriage	48	46	38	40	36	35	31	24	37
Reform									
Number of participants	438	877	528	812	891	865	737	693	5841
Involved in community once a week or more	29	41	38	46	44	39	45	37	41
Vehemently opposed to intermarriage	23	15	13	12	9	11	9	5	11

ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE

the Conservative, show an 18 per cent decline in opposition since 1993. That may be the most important result of the survey in terms of examining the connection between community involvement and attitude to intermarriage. The decline in opposition among the Reform group mirrors their increased involvement in the community!

An interesting finding in Table 4 is that respondents from all three major denominations show a pattern of religiosity similar to that of their parents. In each case, more than half consider themselves 'as religious' as their parents, slightly less than a third consider themselves to be more religious; while 12-13 per cent see themselves as more religious. Only among those who define themselves as secular or 'just Jewish' is there a significant trend towards being less religious than the previous generation. That finding is significant because it refutes the tempting, but perhaps over-simplistic, explanation of rising intermarriage rates being the consequence of a diminishing religious belief. Even the Reform respondents, who are increasingly tolerant of intermarriage, consider themselves at least as religious as their parents. That phenomenon may be explained in one of two ways: either young American Jews do not think that endogamy is an important aspect of Judaism, or their parents were not particularly observant (and therefore the present generation is at least 'as religious') but believe that Jews marrying Jews is important for cultural or other reasons.

An examination of the data in Tables 5 and 6 distributed by gender once again calls into question the connection between community involvement and opposition to intermarriage. Each year, a slightly higher percentage of the females than of the males stated that they were involved in community activities at least once a week, while a slightly higher percentage of males than of females said that they would be vehemently opposed to a family member marrying a non-Jew. This finding demonstrates a shift in attitude, since conventional wisdom considers that women are more likely than men to oppose intermarriage. In order to explore further this relationship

TABLE 4.
Religiosity compared to respondents' parents, 1996 (in row percentage)

	More Religious	As Religious	Less Religious	Total	Number of respondents
Orthodox	30	57	13	100	545
Conservative	32	56	12	100	3200
Reform	30	57	13	100	2253
Just Jewish	26	47	28	100	589
Secular	12	46	42	100	207
Not Jewish	14	17	69	100	58
Total	30	54	16	100	7368

TABLE 5.
Attitude comparison between males and females: frequency of
participation in Jewish communal activities

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
MALES									
N	699	1054	779	918	910	1100	1059	1180	7699
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	8	7	7	6	7	7	11	7	8
Once or twice a year	20	21	18	19	20	21	20	22	20
Once a month or more	29	31	31	31	30	31	25	30	30
Once a week or more	43	40	44	44	42	41	44	41	42
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
FEMALES									
N	1050	1424	1152	1364	1486	1413	1202	1427	10518
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	4	5	5	6	5	6	6	5	5
Once or twice a year	18	19	20	19	20	19	17	21	19
Once a month or more	29	28	28	26	28	29	28	32	29
Once a week or more	49	48	47	50	47	46	49	42	47
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 6.
Comparison of attitudes of males and females: attitudes towards a close
family member marrying a non-Jew

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
MALES									
Reaction to intermarriage of a close family member									
N	520	787	780	919	981	1103	1069	1182	7291
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing wrong with it	11	14	20	20	25	24	31	26	23
Ambivalent to this	7	12	10	15	17	13	11	15	13
Slightly opposed to it	41	38	39	34	31	32	26	28	33
Vehemently opposed to it	42	36	31	31	28	30	32	31	32
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
FEMALES									
Reaction to intermarriage of a close family member									
N	809	1151	1145	1359	1488	1416	1202	1428	9998
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing wrong with it	10	15	17	20	25	24	27	27	22
Ambivalent to this	11	11	12	17	17	14	15	17	15
Slightly opposed to it	40	45	42	36	32	34	30	32	36
Vehemently opposed to it	39	29	29	28	26	27	28	23	28
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

between community involvement and attitudes to intermarriage, the correlation between the responses to these two survey questions was modelled on computer. The traditional Pearson's correlation, a linear model, and the non-linear MONCO were used.²⁸ The correlation was determined for the total population as well as for each of the denominational sub-groups, using the data from all eight years.

ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE

TABLE 7.

MONCO and Pearson's correlations between community involvement and attitude towards intermarriage for the various denominations

	MONCO	Pearson's correlation
Whole population	38	22
Orthodox	43	20
Conservative	33	19
Reform	16	9

Since each of the matrices involves only two items and one correlation, the results are shown in table form: Table 7.

Discussion

The correlation between community involvement and opposition to intermarriage is much stronger amongst the Orthodox than it is among the Reform, with the Conservative falling in between. However, even among the Orthodox the correlation is moderate and certainly does not indicate that increasing the hours young people spend in Jewish schools and organizations would counteract the rising rates of intermarriage. Schools, even religious day schools, are mainly designed to transmit information and practical skills. They are less effective in instilling values, especially if these values are not reinforced at home. Moreover, the Conservative — and especially the Reform — movements give the children of intermarriages the opportunity to participate in Jewish organizations; this is particularly important for those who have a non-Jewish mother and who are not therefore considered to be Jewish according to Orthodox Jewish law (*halakha*).

The messages which young people receive at home are likely to have more impact than those from a youth group attended once a week. If the family signals are strong (that is, many relatives marrying non-Jews and being accepted into the family) and those from the Jewish institutions are subtle or ambiguous, it is not surprising that the latter would not have a significant effect. The participants can be divided into two camps: the Orthodox, firmly opposed to intermarriage despite slight annual fluctuations, and the Conservative-Reform who are steadily becoming more tolerant of family members marrying non-Jews, even as their level of community participation is increasing.

Historically, Jews made no distinction between religious and ethnic aspects, as evidenced by the words 'a holy people'²⁹ and this is still the case in the Orthodox community. But, according to Steven Cohen, American culture has created a separation between the

ethnic and the religious components of Judaism, and while the religious aspect is stable, the ethnic aspect (which includes endogamy) is in decline.³⁰ A similar phenomenon has been seen among British-Pakistani youth, who emphasize their religious identity over their Pakistani or 'Asian' ethnic identity.³¹ This is a topic of much study and discussion in the field of ethnic studies³² but it is beyond the scope of this paper to explore the implications of why groups emphasize one aspect of their identity more than another.

In Cohen's factor analysis on data concerning Jewish identity, commitment to endogamy and affiliation with Jewish institutions are not in the same cluster of items.³³ An increased involvement in Jewish organizations may not necessarily translate into opposition to intermarriage. As the more liberal movements reach out to intermarried families and avoid confronting the issue in order not to condemn or alienate members, the link between the two may become even weaker. Another study,³⁴ which examined the connection between formal Jewish education and intermarriage rates, called into question the effectiveness of participation in Jewish educational activities.

... Respondents who finished six or more years of day school are only 1.09 times as likely to intermarry as respondents with no Jewish education at all, (...) a rather modest endogamy gain considering the large input of Jewish education.

On the other hand, Jewish parentage has been found to have a significant influence. In the case of respondents with no formal Jewish education, 31.4 per cent of those with two Jewish parents married non-Jews; while 80.7 per cent of those who had only one Jewish parent married non-Jews who did not convert. Interestingly, while the intermarriage rate among children of mixed marriages has remained comparatively consistent over the past century (62 per cent of marriages in 1900–1949 and 69 per cent in 1985–1990), the trend toward intermarriage among children of two Jewish parents has increased dramatically from a mere five per cent in 1900–1949 to 45 per cent in 1985–1990.³⁵

Conclusion

The assumption that increasing the involvement of young Jews in the community will lead to a decrease in intermarriage needs to be re-examined. Such attitudes may be dependent less on the number of hours spent in Jewish institutions and more on the philosophical leanings of the movement to which one is affiliated and on the attitudes of one's family. In fact, an analysis of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey found that family attitudes have much more importance than Jewish community educational programmes on the

values and beliefs of young people.³⁶ Notwithstanding the predictions of Talcott Parsons, it seems that the family is still the prime and most influential socializing institution.³⁷

Further research is needed to refine and shed light on the theoretical link between community involvement and endogamy. In our survey, participants were not asked whether they go out with non-Jews or whether they themselves would only consider marrying a Jew. Future studies which track intermarriage rates among Israel Experience alumni or active members of youth organizations would be particularly enlightening. It may be that involvement in Jewish groups which do not explicitly oppose intermarriage influences the dating and marriage choices of participants without necessarily leading them to 'vehemently oppose' the marriage of close family members to non-Jews. It is particularly important to learn about the dating habits of these teenagers because while adolescent dating patterns have been shown to be more reliable than stated opinions as an indicator of future marriage choices, teenagers have also been found to hold more lenient attitudes about going out with non-Jews than about marrying a non-Jew.³⁸ The 2000 National Jewish Population Survey is currently being analysed, and the data will be valuable in documenting more recent trends and changes in intermarriage rates among the younger generation of American Jews.

From initial findings, however, it seems that organizations may have to decide whether it is more important to reach out to unaffiliated youth, side-stepping the issue of intermarriage, than to take a clear position against intermarriage and risk alienating potential members. Programmes concerned primarily with providing a relaxed atmosphere and opportunities for involvement to all Jews may need to recognize that an indirect approach to the issue of intermarriage might no longer be effective. Perhaps programmes nowadays should take a more direct approach and consider promoting endogamy as one of their goals.

The rapid increase in acceptance of intermarriage among this study's highly-involved group of young American Jews indicates that affiliation with an ethnic or religious group may not have the same connotation today as it did a generation or two ago. Although, on the one hand, ethnicity seems to be making an unexpected resurgence in the post-modern world, it has also become increasingly common and acceptable for individuals to have multiple affiliations.³⁹ Moreover, although ethnic groups have not totally assimilated or become completely acculturated, as was once predicted, attitudes towards ethnicity have changed fundamentally. Today, ethnic groups in the United States may be described as communities of Faith, not communities of Fate. Affiliation is becoming a matter of choice. In societies where people do have the option of leaving the particular ethnic group into

which they were born, and joining another group, or if they do so means completely severing ties with one's family, the decision to marry out clearly has serious and usually irrevocable repercussions. Nowadays in many Western societies people may move freely between groups with few or no social repercussions. Just as Jews are free to be totally unaffiliated with any Jewish community, they are also free to marry a non-Jew and to continue playing an active part in synagogue life. Those who already juggle many, and often conflicting, identities may take it in their stride to be active in one's own Jewish community while being married to a Christian, a Muslim, or a Buddhist. That may also pose no problem for other members of their community. In many Reform and Conservative synagogues, a significant proportion of active members have non-Jewish spouses while their associated schools and camps tend to refrain from sending strong messages against intermarriage because of the sensitivity of the topic. In the absence of family pressure, community involvement alone provides no guarantees that a young person will decide to marry a Jew.

Acknowledgements

The Youth and Hechalutz Department of the World Zionist Organization (1993–1997) and The Department of Jewish Zionist Education of the Jewish Agency for Israel (1998–2000), commissioned the survey on Israel Experience Programs. This article is based on part of that survey. Allison Ofanansky and Tania Hershman gave me valuable editorial assistance. I am grateful to Professor Paul Ritterband and to Eynat Cohen for all their suggestions to improve and refine this paper.

NOTES

¹ E. Mayer, *Love and Tradition: Marriage Between Jews and Christians*, Plenum Press, New York, 1985.

² See B. A. Kosmin *et al.*, *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*, Council of Jewish Federations, New York, 1991 and S. M. Cohen, 'Why Intermarriage May Not Threaten Jewish Continuity', *Moment*, December 1994, pp. 54–57, 89–90.

³ See L. M. Winer *et al.*, *Leaders of Reform Judaism*, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York, 1987; P. Y. Medding *et al.*, 'Jewish identity in conversionary and mixed marriages', *American Jewish Yearbook*, 1992, pp. 3–76; D. Mittelberg, *The Israel Visit and Jewish Identification*, The American Jewish Committee, New York, 1994; and S. M. Cohen, *Religious Stability and Ethnic Decline: Emerging Patterns of Jewish Identity in the United States*, The Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1997.

⁴ A. M. Dershowitz, *The Vanishing American Jew*, Little, Brown, New York, 1997.

⁵ See B. Chazan, 'The Israel Trip as Jewish Education' in *The Israel Experience*, CRB Foundation, Jerusalem, 1992; R. Kafka *et al.*, 'The impact of "Summer in Israel" experiences on North American Jewish teenagers' in *ibid.*; and S. Fox and I. Scheffler, *Jewish Education and Jewish Continuity: Prospects and Limitations*, Mandel Foundation, Jerusalem, 2000.

⁶ H. Feingold, 'From commandment to persuasion: Probing the "hard secularism" of American Jewry' in S. Cohen and G. Horenczyk, eds., *National Variations in Jewish Identity: Implications for Jewish Education*, State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 1999, p. 158.

⁷ J. A. Pike, *If Your Marry Outside Your Faith: Counsel on Mixed Marriages*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1954.

⁸ P. Ritterband, 'The fertility of the Jewish people: A contemporary overview' in S. DellaPergola and S. Cohen, eds., *World Jewish Population: Trends and Policies*, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1992, pp. 93-105.

⁹ W. A. Adams, 'Dispersed minorities in the Middle East: A comparison and a lesson' in G. P. Castile and G. Kushner, eds., *Persistent Peoples: Cultural Enclaves in Perspective*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1981 and H. Gans, 'Symbolic ethnicity and symbolic religiosity: towards a comparison of ethnic and religious acculturation' in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1994, pp. 577-592.

¹⁰ M. Rimor and E. Katz, *Jewish Involvement of the Baby Boom Generation: Interrogating the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*, the Louis Guttman Israel Institute of Applied Social Research, Jerusalem, 1993 and J. Reitz, *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*, McGraw-Hill, Toronto, 1980.

¹¹ J. G. Chinitz and R. A. Brown, 'Religious homogamy, marital conflict, and stability in same-faith and interfaith Jewish marriages' in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 40, no. 4, 2001, pp. 722-733.

¹² D. Romano, *Intercultural Marriage: Promises and Pitfalls*, Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, Maine, 1988.

¹³ L. Greber *et al.*, *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*, Free Press, New York, 1970; A. Dashefsky and H. Shapiro, *Ethnic Identification Among American Jews: Socialization and Social Structure*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, 1974; and P. Spickard, *Mixed Blood, Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1989.

¹⁴ See F. Yang and H. R. Ebaugh, 'Religion and ethnicity among new immigrants. The impact of majority/minority status in home and host countries' in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2001, pp. 367-378.

¹⁵ Personal communication (1998) from Dan Krakow, Israel National Director of Young Judaea. See also J. Wertheimer, 'Surrendering to intermarriage' in *Commentary*, March 2001.

¹⁶ Wertheimer, *op. cit.* in note 15, pp. 25-32.

¹⁷ Gans, *op. cit.* in note 9, p. 587.

¹⁸ G. Bubis and L. Marks, *Changes in Jewish identification. A comparative study of a teenage Israel camping trip, a counselor-in-training program and a teenage service camp*, Florence G. Heller-JWB Research Center, 1975; S. B. Fishman and A. Goldstein, *When They Are Grown They Will Not Depart: Jewish Education and the Jewish Behavior of American Adults*, CNJS Research Report no. 8; Katz, *op.*

cit. in note 10; B. A. Phillips, 'Intermarriage and Jewish education. Is there a connection?' in *Journal of Jewish Education*, vol. 66, nos. 1–2, 2000, pp. 54–66; B. A. Phillips, *Re-examining Intermarriage: Trends, Textures and Strategies*, Susan and David Wilstein Institute of Jewish Policy Studies and the American Jewish Committee, New York, 1996; A. Ganapol and S. Cohen, *Building Jewish Identity: A Study of Young Judaea Alumni*, MarketQuest and Hadassah, New York, 1998.

¹⁹ L. L. Isaacs *et al.*, *The Alexander Muss High School: Impact Evaluation*, JESNA, North Miami, Florida, 1997; N. Friedman and P. Davis, *Faithful Youth: A Study of the National Conference of Synagogue Youth. Executive Highlights of Alumni Survey*, NCSY, New York, 1998; and Ganapol and Cohen, *op. cit.* in note 18.

²⁰ A. Ganapol, *Young Judaea 1993 Continuity Study*, MarketQuest, New York, 1994.

²¹ S. Cohen, *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1988; Fishman and Goldstein, *op. cit.* in note 18; and Phillips, *op. cit.* in note 18.

²² S. Seltzer, *Reform Jewish Teenagers: Attitudes, Beliefs and Family Backgrounds*, UAHC, Department of Youth Activities, New York, 1991.

²³ See, by A. Sales, a) *Jewish Youth Databook: Research on Adolescence and its Implications for Jewish Teen Programs*, 1996 and b) *Values and Concerns of American Jewish Youth: JCC Maccabi Teen Survey*, 1994. Both published by Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.

²⁴ In 1988, a group of educators, rabbis, scholars, community leaders, and heads of philanthropic foundations met under the auspices of the Mandel Associated Foundations, JCC Association, JESNA, and CJF; see M. Mandel, commission chair, *A Time to Act. Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America*, University Press, of America, 1991.

²⁵ See Fox and Scheffler, *op. cit.* in note 5.

²⁶ See Kosmin, *op. cit.* in note 2; Ganapol, *op. cit.* in note 20; Isaacs, *op. cit.* in note 19; Ganapol and Cohen, *op. cit.* in note 18; and Friedman and Davis, *op. cit.* in note 19.

²⁷ See, all by E. H. Cohen: a) *Israel Experience Programs — Summers 1993–1997. Preliminary International Data*, published by the Youth and Hechalutz Department of the World Zionist Organization and the Joint Authority for Jewish Zionist Education, Jerusalem, 1993–1998; b) *Towards a Strategy of Excellence: the Israel Experience. Ongoing Survey & Evaluation*, 1994, same publishers; c) 'Informal Marketing of Israel Experience tours' in *Journal of Travel Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, 1999, pp. 238–243; d) 'Prior community involvement and "Israel Experience" educational tours' in *Evaluation and Research in Education*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1999, pp. 76–91; and e) *Israel Experience: A Sociological and Comparative Analysis*, The Birthright Foundation and the Department for Jewish Zionist Education, JAFL, Jerusalem, 1999.

²⁸ MONCO correlations take into account the similarity in direction of two variables — whether both are increasing or decreasing. 'Given two numerical variables x and y , the weak coefficient of monotonicity [m_2] tells us how much the two variables vary in the same sense. In other words, when x increases, does y increase or not?' in R. Amar and S. Toledano, *HUDAP Manual with Mathematics*, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997, p. 115.

Because of the characteristics of the monotonicity, which is regression-free, the MONCO will always be stronger than the Pearson coefficient: 'When Pearson's correlation coefficient equals +1 or -1, the weak monotonicity coefficient [m2] for the same data will have the same value. In other cases, the absolute value of [m2] will be higher than of Pearson's coefficient' (ibid.).

²⁹ D. Elazar, 'Jewish religious, ethnic, and national identities: Convergence and conflicts' in S. Cohen and G. Horenczyk, eds., *National Variations in Jewish Identity: Implications for Jewish Education*, State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 1999, pp. 35-52.

³⁰ Cohen, op. cit. in note 3.

³¹ J. Jacobson, 'Religion and Ethnicity: Dual and alternative sources of identity among young British Pakistanis', *Ethnic and Religious Studies*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1997, pp. 238-256.

³² Cohen and Horenczyk, eds., op. cit., in note 29, pp. 35-52.

³³ Steven Cohen's sample was selected from the Market Facts Consumer Mail Panel of Americans who agreed to take part in surveys on a wide range of topics. Only those who identified themselves as Jewish were used in this study.

³⁴ Phillips, op. cit. in note 18, p. 58.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 57.

³⁶ A. Goldstein and S. Barrack Fishman, 'Jewish Education in America Today' in *Bisdeh Hemed* (Hebrew), vol. 37, nos. 9-10, 1994, pp. 5-15.

³⁷ T. Parsons, *Sociological Theory and Modern Society*, The Free Press, New York, 1967; and R. Boudon and F. Bourricaud, *Dictionnaire critique de la sociologie*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1982, p. 365.

³⁸ Phillips, op. cit. in note 18; Sales, op. cit. in note 23; and W. B. Helmreich, *The March of the Living: A Follow-up Study of its Long-range Impact and Effects*, 1994, unpublished work.

³⁹ H. Bertens, *The Idea of Postmodernity: A History*, Routledge, London, 1995; R. S. Suleiman, 'The politics of postmodernism after the Wall (Or, what do we do when the ethnic cleansing starts?)' in H. Bertens and D. Fokkema, eds., *International Postmodernism*, John Benjamin's Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1997; and Wertheimer, op. cit. in note 15.

JEWS IN TODAY'S GERMANY

Doris Bensimon

OVER a period of five decades after the Second World War, demographers who specialized in comparative Jewish populations studies noted that German Jewry was an ageing community with a very low birth rate — a community on the way to the disappearance predicted for European Jewry by Bertrand Wasserstein in his *Vanishing Diaspora*.¹ But in 2002 there were in Germany more than 180,000 Jews or persons of Jewish origin and 87 per cent of that total had come to settle in Germany since 1989. German Jewry now ranks as the third largest in Western Europe, after France and the United Kingdom. That recent large wave of immigration has entailed some social problems and the necessity of making social adjustments on the part of the newcomers as well as of the native population of the host society. Inevitably, the questions raised since the Holocaust (henceforth in this paper more accurately referred to as the *Shoah*) about relations between Jews and Germans have been re-examined.

My aim in this paper is to begin with an overview of the rebuilding of a Jewish community in Western Germany and of the situation of Jews in East Germany after the Second World War. I will then deal with the problems which have arisen since the major wave of immigration of Jews from the former Soviet Union.

The renewal of the German Jewish Community (1945–1989)

At the end of the Second World War, 14 million Displaced Persons were roaming in Europe. Germany had been defeated and was disintegrating, but the country was peopled by refugees.² The Allied military commanders (American, British, French, and Russian) were gathering homeless millions and settling them provisionally into camps. Hitler and his lieutenants had decreed that Germany would be *judenfrei* (free of Jews) but by June 1945 there were some 50,000 Jews in the country — survivors of concentration and extermination camps — and their numbers were rapidly increasing. By the summer of 1947, there were 182,000 Jewish Displaced Persons in West Ger-

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

many; three-quarters of them were natives of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. Some of them had settled in cities (Berlin and Munich mainly) joining German Jews who had remained hidden during the Second World War; but the majority had sought refuge in the camps for Displaced Persons, especially in those established by the American military authorities. From the beginning, there were conflicts between Jewish and non-Jewish Displaced Persons, especially among former Polish citizens. Americans therefore decided to provide Jewish refugee camps. Survivors later left Germany in large numbers to make their way to Palestine as illegal immigrants during the British Mandate, then openly to the newly-established State of Israel. Others emigrated to the United States and elsewhere. Some Jews who were in the Soviet Zone of occupation had found refuge in Soviet Russia during the war.

After the end of the war in 1945, some German Jews returned to their native land — to East Germany as well as to West Germany — and it was evident that they had retained a profound attachment to their country of birth. Moreover, in the camps for Displaced Persons, some of them refused to be resettled in other countries. They believed that in a Germany in the process of democratization, the renaissance of a Jewish community would be a victory against Hitler; but these 'pioneers' of a Jewish renewal in Germany met a vigorous opposition: for how could a Jew think of living on an accursed soil, steeped in Jewish blood? The World Jewish Congress and other international Jewish bodies, and later the State of Israel, voiced their indignation and condemnation.

Jews in West Germany

Jews rarely live in total isolation from non-Jews in the host country; they are therefore affected by political and economic conditions in the wider society. After the Second World War, the occupying Allied powers began a process of denazification and of education along the principles of Western democracy. In 1947, the Marshall Plan undertook the economic reconstruction of West Germany. France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America allowed the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) in March 1949, with a constitution inspired by the Western democratic model. A few months later, in October 1949, the Soviet-occupied sector became the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The iron curtain came down. For the next four decades, the Jews living in Germany's two territories — and especially those residing in Berlin — found themselves in the heart of the cold war.

Those Jews in the Western zone (FRG) who lived at first in the camps for Displaced Persons managed, in spite of the difficulties of

their situation, to organize religious and cultural activities. They formed 'Jewish committees' and gradually, as they settled in German towns, they established communities. Jewish natives of Germany, who had either survived the extermination camps or had come back after they had managed to escape from Nazi Germany, now tried to return to their previous localities while others came in the 1950s, when the FRG was starting to pay reparations. In 1952, there were 17,427 Jews resident in West Germany; a decade later, there were some 23,000;³ and with the arrival of new immigrants, the total rose to about 30,000 in the 1980s. Sergio Della Pergola gives estimates which vary somewhat: he quotes the official census figures for 1987 which recorded 32,319 Jews in the FRG. The Central Council of Jews in Germany had 27,000 registered members in its various communities in 1989.⁴ This Central Council was established in Frankfurt in 1950, after protracted negotiations with about a hundred communities whose members had resettled in Germany and who now wished to unite themselves into one formal national organization.

Since the nineteenth century, Germany had legislated for the establishment of religious associations. The Weimar Republic in 1919 gave them a precise juridical status. The Basic Law of the GFR, and later of reunified Germany, reaffirmed the Weimar legislation with its article 140.⁵ Unions of religious associations have the legal right to impose taxes on their members — taxes which are collected together with general income taxes. Since the Central Council of Jews in Germany has acquired that legal status, it has an important role in the organization of religious and cultural activities for the Jews in Germany. It also supervises the social services provided by the Central Welfare Board of Jews in Germany. However, the Basic Law firmly recognizes freedom of conscience and it is up to the communities to grant or refuse membership of their association. Jewish communities are nowadays edging closer to traditional Orthodox Judaism and they follow the rules of *halakha* (Orthodox Jewish law) when they decide whether an individual can be considered to be Jewish. And that is a serious problem. There had been many 'mixed' marriages since 1945 — and even earlier. Moreover, either because of ideological convictions or because of a wish not to pay the tax collected by the government for the Central Council of Jews, many Jews or persons of Jewish descent have refused to become members of a Jewish community. In such cases, they were (and still are) legally bound to assert that they are 'without religion' in a declaration to a tribunal in their local area, which will then issue for them an official notification. Thus, the number of Jews resident in Germany is far greater than that to be found in the registers of that country's Central Council of Jews.

Most of those who have been concerned with German Jewry from

the end of the war until 1989 distinguish two main periods. The first begins in 1945 and lasts until the end of the 1960s while the second starts in 1970 and ends with the fall of the Berlin wall. That first period was marked by a great instability and stress. The *Shoah* was still vivid in the memory of every Jew who had decided to remain in Germany or who had returned to Germany. Antisemitism had not vanished and survivors regarded their non-Jewish neighbours with suspicion and reticence. Moreover, as noted earlier, Jewish international bodies and Jews in other countries voiced their opposition to a renewal of a Jewish settled presence in Germany. Those who had opted to live in the country were uncertain about their future and were said to be sitting on packed suitcases, ready to leave. The older persons often felt guilty to have chosen to return, while the younger generation silently developed that feeling of guilt. Some members of German Jewry were impoverished during these years, but the rest benefited in the 1950s and 1960s from the 'economic miracle' of West Germany.

However, a new situation developed in 1967–1968. By then, two new generations of Jews had been born in Germany; these young persons questioned their parents or their grandparents since they wished to be acknowledged as German citizens. Their economic integration was to be accompanied by the wider German society's recognition.⁶ During this first period, the Central Council of Jews in Germany was largely concerned with the reconstruction of Jewish communities and with the problems connected with the German government's reparations; but it also strived at the same time to have its representative status acknowledged by the regional and the national German authorities, while attempting to improve relations between Jewish and non-Jewish inhabitants of Germany. The Council also remained watchful when manifestations of antisemitism were suspected.⁷ The reconstruction of Jewish communities was achieved, even if some of these may consist of no more than a few dozen members. The Central Council and other German Jewish organizations finally attained recognition in Europe, in the United States, and in Israel.

By the end of the 1980s, the Jews of Germany had different geographical and cultural backgrounds and the tensions between those of German origin and those from Eastern Europe had persisted. The clash between those who were natives of Germany, and who adhered often to the Reform movement, and those Eastern Europeans who followed an Orthodox, traditional form of Judaism was virulent — in spite of the assertion of *Einheitsgemeinde* (a community unified under one single administration). Meanwhile, although new synagogues and communal centres had been established, the majority of Jews in West Germany were secular and the number of marriages

between them and Gentiles rapidly increased. It was then that West German Jews — of varying degrees of religious observance and without any institutions specifically established to deal with a large wave of immigrating fellow-Jews — had to face the challenge resulting from the fall of the Berlin Wall.

The Jews of East Germany

The collapse of the German Democratic Republic at the end of the 1980s and the subsequent reunification of Germany revealed the existence of Jews from the other side of the Berlin Wall. There have been varying estimates of their numbers. According to Schmelz and to Della Pergola, there were some 500 in 1988⁸ while Ostrow states that on 31 December 1990, there were eight communities totalling 376 members in the Association of Jewish Communities of the German Democratic Republic. There were 209 in East Berlin; 52 in Dresden; 34 in Magdeburg; 32 in Leipzig; 24 in Erfurt; 11 in Chemnitz (named Karl Marx-Stadt by the GDR); eight in Halle/Saale; and six in Schwerin. A further 2000 to 3000 GDR citizens of Jewish origin had not joined the community.⁹ On 11 May 1945, three days after the signing of the armistice, some Jews had emerged from hiding and had come together to celebrate their first post-war prayer meeting in the Jewish cemetery of Berlin-Weissendorf, in the Soviet Zone. In November 1946, there were 7,900 Jews in Berlin; more than half of them (4,600) had Gentile spouses; 1,900 were concentration camp survivors; and a further 1,400 had survived by remaining hidden. They established Jewish communities.¹⁰

However, most of them later left the Soviet zone, while others arrived. The latter had escaped Nazi Germany and found refuge in the Soviet Union; some of them were dedicated Communists and on their return to Germany they became civil servants in the government of the German Democratic Republic. The Germans of the GDR considered themselves to be 'the resisters to Fascism' and the authorities granted 'privileges' to victims of fascism. However, such victims fell in two distinct groups: those who had 'actively' fought fascism and suffered as a result of that political stand and, on the other hand, those who were victims of fascism because of their racial or religious affiliation but who had not 'actively' fought against fascism. The former received an allowance which was higher than that allocated to the latter. But both groups had priority for housing and gainful employment if they subscribed to the political tenets of the German Democratic Republic.

That decision was hotly contested by both Jews and non-Jews. Officially the GDR declared that it was anti-fascist: antisemitism was taboo, but it persisted. Moreover, Marxist-Leninism had its own

position about Jewish history and identity and it was opposed to Judaism, just as it was opposed to other religions. It advocated assimilation and many GDR communists of Jewish origin held the same belief.¹¹ Others, however, begged to differ and they moved to West Germany. There had been an Association of Jewish Communities in the GDR, which was established in 1952 and became affiliated to the Central Council of Jews in Germany in West Germany; but that union was short-lived after the 1953 Stalinist trials of Jewish doctors in the Soviet Union and the Slansky tribunal in Czechoslovakia.¹²

Jews and those of Jewish origin were closely involved in the cold war. The eight Jewish communities in the GDR had an ageing membership and the leaders of these communities were carefully supervised by the communist authorities. Indeed, in some cases, they themselves were members of the Communist Party. Then in the mid-1980s there was a new development: the younger generation, whose parents were Jewish, were feeling estranged from the communism of their parents and they established in East Berlin a new association for their group, which they named *Wir für uns* (We for us). These young adults wanted to get back to their roots, to discover the identity of their grandparents through the culture and religion of that older Jewish generation; they were dissatisfied with the political tenets of their parents but on the other hand, they did not wish to join the existing GDR Jewish communities which they considered to be based exclusively on the Jewish religion. In December 1989, they founded a Jewish Cultural Association.¹³

At the end of the 1980s, the Soviet Union started to open its gates: Jews could leave the country, in theory in order to emigrate to Israel. In fact, Jews from Soviet Russia were already living in the GDR in increasing numbers.¹⁴ That great wave of Jewish migration was a challenge and an opportunity for the two German Jewries. In the history of massive Jewish migrations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the migrants came from communities which had either strong Jewish religious traditions or ethnic or cultural affiliations. The Jewish communities in Western countries which had then to help them to settle might sometimes have been hostile to the incomers, but at least they recognized that the migrants were bringing a renewal of Jewish observances or of Jewish cultural activity. However, the new Soviet immigrants who came to Germany in large waves had been uprooted from their religious and cultural heritage by seven decades of Communist rule.

The Jews in Reunified Germany

After the fall of the Berlin Wall on 9 November 1989, the process of reunification progressed with bounds. The five *Länder* and East

Berlin joined the German Federal Republic and the GDR ceased to exist. On the other hand, West Germany survives and its Basic Law remains and now rules the 16 *Länder* of reunified Germany after the signing of the treaty of unification on 3 October 1990.¹⁵ However, that political and constitutional unification did not entail a unification of the population groups which had been ruled during four decades by opposing political regimes. It was to take more time and effort to attempt to achieve some harmony — and indeed that aim has not yet been reached.

When German unification was established, the official Jewish organizations of both West and East Germany immediately united. Those of East Germany — East Berlin and the *Länder* of Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt, and Thüringen — joined, as members, the Central Council of Jews in Germany. That Council was then already concerned with the immigration of Soviet Jews and their resettlement. There were protracted negotiations between the authorities of East and West Germany at first, but eventually these new immigrants, with the assistance of the Central Council, obtained in January 1991 a special refugee status, that of quota refugee (*Kontingentflüchtlinge*). That status entitled them to become residents, to find employment, and to receive social benefits. That was a political decision. United Germany, concerned about its international image and standing, could not refuse to offer shelter and assistance to Jews who had suffered from antisemitism in Soviet Russia and who were now worried about the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The former Soviet Union then formally opened its gates but its Jewish citizens could not easily cross the borders of the new autonomous republics of the former Soviet Union; the various authorities imposed a series of regulations for various permits before allowing Jews to emigrate. Moreover, if they wished to go to Germany, they had to make applications to the German consulates of the New Independent States and wait for these applications to be sent to the Interior Ministry of Germany and processed there. From 1990/1991 until June 2002, about a quarter of a million (239,227) such applications were made. The majority were successful: 189,560; and 155,915 Jewish immigrants came to Germany.¹⁶ On arrival, they were sent to various *Länder* according to the quota allocated in proportion to the inhabitants in each *Land*.

Available Statistics

There are two sets of statistics available concerning Jewish immigration in Germany. The first is compiled by the Administrative Council of the Federal Republic (*Bundesverwaltungsrat*); it shows the quota

in each *Land*, and the distribution of Jewish immigrants, including the members of the household who were not Jews by religion or descent. According to a statement published on 30 September 2002, there had been 241,542 individual requests from the former Soviet Union for admission as quota refugees since 1990–1991. Several thousand such requests were rejected or were still in 2002 under consideration, while 159,027 immigrants believed to be Jewish came to Germany; about three-quarters of these (77.65 per cent) went to the *Länder* of the former German Federal Republic, while 20 per cent went to the five *Länder* of the former German Democratic Republic. Berlin, the area most favoured by the newcomers, was permitted to receive only 2.35 per cent of these new immigrants.¹⁷ However, West Germany is still more prosperous than East Germany and provides more possibilities of economic integration.

The second set of statistics is supplied by the Central Welfare Board of Jews in Germany (*Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der Juden in Deutschland*). It must be stressed here that this Welfare Board has strict rules concerning the identification of a Jewish person, according to the *halakha*, formally affiliated with a Jewish community in Germany. In 1990, there were 29,089 such members but by the year 2000¹⁸ there were 87,756 while another source cites 93,326 in 2001.¹⁹ Thus there is a considerable discrepancy between the government's official figures and those established by the Jewish Board. However, that Central Welfare Board provides more detailed demographic data. Before the arrival of the Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union, the outlook was somewhat gloomy: the prediction was that the total membership of 28,081 in 1990 would be reduced to 17,902 by the year 2002 and on the way to extinction. However, recent immigration has not greatly affected the age structure: as in 1989, 33 per cent were older than 60 in the year 2000; those under the age of 21 constituted 18 per cent of the total in 1989 and the comparative proportion in 2000 was 19 per cent. Thus, those Jews aged between 22 and 60, the economically-active age group, constituted the same percentage of the total: 49 per cent in 1989 and 48 per cent in 2000. Since this is an ageing population, 934 deaths were recorded but only 147 births in 2000.

But these statistics must be seen here in their proper context: the family of a non-observant Jew (indeed even of a self-described atheist) may ask for a religious burial, while parents may be slow to register a birth to the Jewish communal authorities. Moreover, a large proportion of Jews in Germany remain aloof from Orthodox communities and therefore only socio-demographic research would provide reliable material on the demographic reality of German Jewry. Nevertheless, changing conditions have greatly altered the Jewish structure as a result of the massive immigration of Jews from

the former Soviet Union; and that immigration is ongoing, in spite of some rise in antisemitism and of the present economic crisis in Germany.

Moreover, according to the Central Welfare Board's statistics, there has been a threefold increase between 1994 and 1999 in the membership of Jewish communities throughout Germany, while in the new *Länder* of the former GDR, it has more than quadrupled. The new immigrants are either sent to the towns which have existing Jewish communities, or to small localities where no Jew is known to live; in the latter case, those from the former Soviet Union have established their own organizations. Nowadays, the most numerous Jewish communities are to be found in Berlin (11,190 members); Munich (7,219) and Frankfurt (6,602).²⁰ There have been several studies published on the process of integration of Soviet Jews into the Jewish communities and into the wider German society, but most of these studies are monographs about one town or one region of Germany. However, the Moses Mendelssohn Zentrum of Potsdam carried out two pieces of research: one in 1993–1994 and another in 1998 on immigrants from the former Soviet Union. According to the latter study, the large majority (86.5 per cent) had been residents of Russia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Moldavia while 6.2 per cent came from the Baltic countries. Most of them live in the larger cities of Germany and the native Germans refer to them as 'White Russians' — a term used to indicate the European area of the Confederation of Independent States (heirs of the former Soviet Union) as opposed to the regions of Soviet Asia. These distinctions are important when emigrants decide on the country of their choice: those from the European area of the former Soviet Union prefer a European country close to their native region and where they may have family links. Moreover, the Jews from the periphery of the Soviet Union, those from Soviet Asia, have remained closer to their Jewish roots and religious and cultural traditions than have the 'White Russian' Jews. Nearly three-quarters (72.7 per cent) of those who settled in Germany had acquired university or higher education qualifications in their native lands; they are engineers, scientists, doctors, pharmacists, as well as artists (musicians, writers) and journalists. But their qualifications are not recognized in Germany.²¹

Economic and Social Integration

People who choose to emigrate do so generally because they wish to improve their situation; they are motivated by political, economic, or family factors. Germany is the only country in Europe which has opened its gates to the Jews from the former Soviet Union and which has, moreover, promised to provide for them favourable conditions

for their economic integration. Thus, the newcomer arrives with great expectations of a higher standard of living, but is frustrated by German bureaucracy — a bureaucracy neither better nor worse than that of other Western countries — to obtain the promised help. For a start, one must learn the German language; but the immigrant finds a different alphabet — not the Cyrillic used in Russia. A knowledge of the language is an essential requirement in the process of integration and the six-months course provided for the newcomers seems inadequate. It is also more difficult for the older ones to learn a new language — and this in turn causes rifts between generations, and even within the same household. The older ones prefer to congregate with their fellow-immigrants while the younger ones are quicker to adapt and to seek employment, albeit with increasing difficulty nowadays. The older group come to depend increasingly on their children and grandchildren and lose their status as heads of household.

Of course, this situation is usually found among all movements of migration, but it is especially painful for the Soviet Jews whose superior qualifications, their degrees and diplomas, and their professional experience, are not generally recognized in Germany. Therefore, when they do find employment, it is in positions which are inferior to those which they were trained to occupy. Moreover, the employment in an economy directed to the ideals of Marxism-Leninism is quite different from that in a capitalist economy. Again, it is easier for the younger generation to adapt to the standards of the host society. Another difficulty is in the allocation to various *Länder*: an immigrant who decides to move to a *Land* other than that to which he or she has been directed loses the material and social help which the *Land* chosen by the authorities must provide. An immigrant will therefore leave this *Land* only if offered a firm promise of employment in another *Land*. However, unemployment of native Germans is much higher in the former East Germany than it is in the *Länder* of West Germany — so that geographical mobility is linked to economic mobility.

As to xenophobia and antisemitism in Germany as compared to the situation elsewhere in Europe, it is true that Germany, conscious of the country's past record, had forbidden open antisemitic manifestations. However, since the 1980s that taboo has become less strict. More and more Germans would like to draw a line on their past and these include not only the right-wing extremists but also those of the extreme left-wing who are nowadays anti-Zionists. And since German reunification, the German past has become even more complex because of the wish to draw a line not only across the Nazi past but also across the communist past of East Germany. Young Germans want to live in the present of a democratic society; but

some Germans feel the guilt of their parents or grandparents. That 'guilt' can make relations between Jews and non-Jews in Germany somewhat uneasy. The Jews who have decided to settle in Germany and tried to rebuild a Jewish presence in the country are aware that the non-Jewish Germans must bear the responsibility of having destroyed a German Jewry which before 1933 had played an important role in the economic, scientific, and cultural development of Germany. On the other hand, the present Jewish immigrants of Russian origin do not carry the same burden of memory.

Jewish Identity and Integration into the Resident German Jewish Community

The identity of Jews from the former Soviet Union was based on seven decades of a communist regime. These Jews were legally considered to belong to a 'nationality' and were so recorded in official censuses of population. Their passports were stamped with the word 'Jew'; but they were not allowed to practise the religion of Judaism. In the course of various changes in political practice of the authorities, and as a result of very large numbers of Jews taking a non-Jewish spouse, some were able not to have the word 'Jew' displayed in their passports. However, they retained the memory of antisemitic discrimination and they were aware that even if their passports did not identify them as being Jewish, the communist authorities continued to regard them as Jews. Eventually, some came to resent their exclusion from many official positions and in doing so, they returned to their Jewish roots.

The Soviet Union at first began to allow hesitantly a small trickle of Jews to emigrate to Israel; and when that permission to emigrate was officially granted, to be Jewish meant to have an advantage for the many Soviet nationals who wished to leave the country. The Soviet authorities by then were willing to allow some of their Jewish citizens to emigrate but they were reluctant to give free exit visas to non-Jews. The Central Council of Jews in Germany undertook, in the course of consultations with the German government, to verify the claims of Jewish identity of the self-described Soviet Jews who applied to emigrate. Here it must be remembered that from the outset of the re-establishment of Jewish communities in Germany, the communities recognized as Jews only those individuals who were Jewish according to the *halakha* — that is, those born of a Jewish mother. That policy is still followed, as strictly as possible, by the communities affiliated to the Central Council of Jews in Germany. However, Jewish institutions do not have an adequate number of competent officials to implement that policy when processing a massive influx of applications. In the last 50 years, since the end of the Second

World War, German Jews have had to rely on rabbis originating from Israel, the United States, or a European country.

Since the start of the wave of emigration from the former Soviet Union, the German Jewish communities appointed Russian immigrants who had been settled in Germany for some years to supervise the reception as well as the provision of educational and social services for the newcomers. Both professional and voluntary workers have been energetically active in their efforts to help in the integration of Russian Jews in Jewish communal life. However, these immigrants are far more interested in the benefits of the social services, in the numerous cultural activities, and especially in the opportunity of meeting fellow Russian Jews than they are in the observance of Jewish rituals or in participation in synagogue services.

Language is also a serious problem. How does one interact with established German Jews if one cannot speak their language? The larger communities employ social workers who are learning Russian. However, Russian Jews are as attached to Russian language and culture as German Jews were to their own language and culture. That was evident in the case of those who returned to Germany after the Second World War; and their children and grandchildren in turn were in positions of leadership of Jewish communities in 1989. The old hostilities between Jews of German origin and those of Eastern Europe have not totally disappeared. However, the immigrants from the former Soviet Union are uniting and organizing themselves; they publish Russian newspapers while some periodicals are printed in both Russian and German. They are also establishing their own associations, some of which are sponsored by the Central Council of Jews in Germany. Moreover, Russian Jews now account for the majority of members of many communities, including some of the old-established ones, and they have already stood for election to the councils of the communities. So far, only a few of them have won seats but their very presence is altering Jewish communal life in Germany.

What of the Future?

The process of integration of the massive influx of Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union will take some time to achieve a measure of success. That would depend not only on the Jews themselves but also on the Gentile German population. For the Jews who settled in Germany after the Second World War and re-established their communities, this new wave of immigrants represents an opportunity for them to solidify their cultural creativity and to be rejuvenated. But the 'melting-pot' will occur only if the 'old ones' and the 'newcomers' attain a form of mutual understanding and respect.

Moreover, the future is even more dependent on the attitude of the wider German host society. New legislation, enacted in 2002, allows the immigrants to apply for German nationality after they have been resident in Germany for seven years, while the quota refugees will be allowed to retain their original nationality. It will be interesting to see how many Jews from the old Soviet Union will apply for German nationality and how many of them will have their applications granted. Finally, will German society happily tolerate the presence of a larger Jewish community within its borders? One can only use this well-worn phrase: only time will tell.

Acknowledgement

This article has been translated from the French by Dr Judith Freedman.

NOTES

¹ See Bernard Wasserstein, *Vanishing diaspora. The Jews in Europe since 1945*, London, Penguin Books, 1997.

² See Michaël Marrus, *The Unwanted. European Refugees in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1985.

³ See Michael Brenner, *After the Holocaust. Rebuilding Jewish Life in Germany*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1997, p. 139. There is now a large bibliography on Jews in Germany from 1945 to 1989, in both German and English; it consists of some academic research, reports of discussions, autobiographies, and novels. Among most recent publications there is Ruth Gay, *Das Undenkbare tun. Juden in Deutschland nach 1945*, München, Verlag C.H. Beck, 2001, 310 p. The author stresses the religious and cultural vitality of the Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe.

⁴ Sergio Della Pergola, World Jewish Population, *American Jewish Yearbook*, vol. 99, 1999, pp. 562–563.

⁵ *Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, in force November 2001, published by the Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Bonn.

⁶ See Ignatz Bubis, *Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland (1945–1995)* (pp. 37–51), Michel Friedmann, *Deutschland und die jungen Juden. Einblick und Ausblick* (pp. 234–240) in Günther B. Ginzel, ed., *Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland. 1945 bis heute*, Düsseldorf, Droste Verlag, 1996, Rachel Heuberger, *Jüdische Jugend in Deutschland* in Otto Romberg/ Suzanne Urban-Fahr, *Juden in Deutschland nach 1945*, Bonn, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 1999, pp. 199–208.

⁷ Micha Gutmann, *Macht oder Ohnmacht der Nach-Shoah Generation: Jüdische Politik in Deutschland* in Günther B. Ginzel, ed. *op. cit.*, pp. 219–224; Michal Y. Bodemann, *Gedächtnistheater. Die jüdische Gemeinschaft und ihre deutsche Erfindung*, Hamburg, Rotbuch Verlag, 1996, pp. 32–38.

⁸ O. U. Schmelz and Sergio Della Pergola, World Jewish Population, *American Jewish Yearbook*, vol. 92, 1992, p. 502.

⁹ Robin Ostrow, German Democratic Republic, *American Jewish Yearbook*, vol. 92, 1992, p. 377.

¹⁰ Hermann Simon, Die jüdische Gemeinde Nordwest. Eine Episode des Neubeginns jüdischen Lebens in Berlin nach 1945 in Andreas Nachama, Julius H. Schoeps, eds., *Aufbau nach dem Untergang. In memoriam Heinz Galinski. Deutsch-jüdische Geschichte nach 1945*, Berlin, Argon Verlag, 1992, pp. 274–276.

¹¹ Nora Goldenbogen, Juden in der DDR. Erwartungen-Realitäten-Wandlungen in Günther B. Ginzel ed., *op. cit.* (in note 6 above), pp. 130–136.

¹² Peter Kirchner, Akzeptanz oder Widerspruch? Zwischen Religion und Kultur. Porträt der Ostberliner jüdischen Gemeinde in Günther B. Ginzel, ed., *op. cit.* pp. 89–91 (in note 6 above). Kirchner was the president of the Jewish community of East Berlin from 1971 to 1990.

¹³ Mertens (Lothar), Die Kinder Moses im Staate Marx in Andreas Nachama, Julius H. Schoeps, ed. *op. cit.* (in note 10 above), p. 288.

¹⁴ Madeleine Tress, Soviet Jews in the Federal Republic of Germany: The Rebuilding of a Community, *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 37, no. 1, June 1995, pp. 39–54.

¹⁵ Alfred Grosser, Hélène Miard-Delacroix, *Allemagne*, Paris, Flammarion, 1994, pp. 62–63.

¹⁶ Bulletin *Kpyr* (Ring), October 2002 (kindly made available by the Moses Mendelssohn Zentrum, Potsdam).

¹⁷ Bundesverwaltungsrat. *Verteilung jüdischer Emigranten aus der ehemaligen Sowietunion*, III.K.1.04.17/00, Stand: 30.09.2002 (kindly made available by the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland, Berlin).

¹⁸ Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der Juden in Deutschland e. V. *Mitgliederstatistik der einzelnen jüdischen Gemeinden und Landesverbände in Deutschland per 1. Januar 2001* (kindly made available by the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland, Berlin).

¹⁹ See note 16 above.

²⁰ See note 18 above.

²¹ Julius H. Schoeps, Willi Jasper, and Bernard Vogt, *Ein neues Judentum in Deutschland? Fremd-und Eigenbilder der russisch-jüdischen Einwanderer*, Potsdam, Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 1999, pp. 44, 46, 49.

COMMUNITY SELF-HELP: SAN FRANCISCO JEWS AND THE GREAT DEPRESSION

Shelly Tenenbaum

ERNEST Baum,¹ a young boy growing up in San Francisco during the Great Depression, described how his family was affected by the economic crisis: 'My mother really bore the brunt of it. We were very poor, poverty stricken, but she didn't really let us know it. She took most of it onto herself'. When asked how she did that, Baum replied:²

By working hard and by utilizing every . . . service of the Jewish Community She got them to help us as a form of welfare. My father's a very proud man, and my mother's a very pragmatic person and that helped a great deal.

For Baum, the intersection between Jewish self-help institutions and his personal economic experience was evident. In contrast, ethnic and religious organizations have received surprisingly little attention within studies of Jewish economic life in America. A study of a Jewish community during the Depression of the 1930s in the United States can show the value of communal strategies during times of crisis. A wide network of organizations provided Jews with material assistance (often unavailable to members of other religious or ethnic groups) and served as alternatives to government relief agencies.

Historians and others have shown that although Jews, like other Americans, suffered economic hardship during the Depression, they were able to manage with comparatively little call upon public funds.³ A 1935 New York Welfare Council study found that only 12 per cent of Jewish youth stated that their families received public benefits compared with 21 per cent of young Italian respondents.⁴ According to historians, the principal reasons for the fact that Jews were more successful in coping with the Depression was that they were concentrated in white-collar occupations — the economic sector most immune to the vicissitudes of the crisis — and were under-

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

represented in heavy industry and unskilled labour, the hardest hit economic spheres. Throughout the United States, two-thirds of gainfully employed Jews had white-collar employment during the years of the Depression.⁵ Thomas Kessner noted that '... relative to other groups, and especially the Italian group, they [the Jews] survived with more modest losses' while the authors of the New York Welfare Council study explained that Jews had 'unusually large proportions of white-collar workers, who were less widely affected by depression conditions than men in industrial employment'. In her discussion of the devastating impact of the crisis, Beth Wenger concludes:⁶

Jews did not escape the hardships of the Depression, however; many experienced unemployment, downward mobility, and persistent economic insecurity. Yet, because they were concentrated in certain sectors of the economy, Jews fared better during the Depression than many other groups.

However, the fact that Jews were largely in comparatively secure employment may not be the only reason for their success in limiting the economic effects of the Depression. Jewish white-collar workers contributed funds to communal self-help organizations which served as alternatives to government welfare agencies. Jewish mutual-aid associations included a broad range of services: charitable relief; medical aid; care of the elderly; life insurance; burial benefits; unemployment benefits; and housing and business loans. By satisfying many of these needs, Jewish organizations placed American Jewry at the top end of what Raymond Breton specified as a community marked by 'institutional completeness'.⁷

Like most sociologists who study ethnic organizations, Breton was interested in the importance of such associations for the maintenance of ethnic identity rather than in linking collective self-help institutions with economic mobility.⁸ Scott Cummings in 1980 attributed this omission to the American ideological celebration of rugged individualism, an ethos legitimated by Max Weber in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.⁹ Weber argued that religious values and orientations profoundly affected human behaviour and thus institutional systems of society.¹⁰ Later scholars have extended his thesis to argue that there is a relationship between personality traits and socio-economic status: groups who migrate to the United States with values conducive to success move up the economic ladder, while those whose culture does not embody the 'spirit of capitalism' lag behind. They have focused on cultural traits for explaining Jewish upward mobility and have paid little attention to the existence of communal self-help strategies and institutions.¹¹ Since Jews were hard workers, practised thrift, saved money, and delayed gratification, they assumed that Jews relied exclusively on their own abilities

to climb the economic ladder. But the degree to which an ethnic or a religious community can collectively mobilize its resources and 'take care of its own' also deserves serious scholarly investigation. An efficient communal network of organizations contributed to a comparatively quick rise from poverty in the case of immigrant Jews and enabled them to survive the Depression more successfully than was the case for the average American citizen. Collectivism, therefore, was at least as important as individualism for Jewish economic development.

To some extent, Jewish communal organizations are products of European history. When Jews emigrated to America, they came with a set of organizations which had long experience of providing practical help for needy co-religionists.¹² In 1654, when they first came to New Amsterdam, Governor Peter Stuyvesant petitioned the headquarters of the Dutch West India Company to forbid their entry. However, the directors of the Company instructed him to admit them but only on condition that 'the poor among them shall not become a burden to the company or to the community, but be supported by their own nation'.¹³ Later generations of immigrant Jews continued to fulfil that pledge.

This historical background explains the impressive array of Jewish communal organizations in America; but the economic class structure of American Jewry is at least as important a factor. For example, by the 1930s the vast majority of San Francisco Jews (83 per cent) were professionals, proprietors, managers, or clerks while less than half of the general population were in these categories. At the other end of the economic spectrum, only 0.7 per cent of San Francisco Jews were in unskilled occupations, compared with nine per cent of all San Franciscans.¹⁴ The earlier European experience and traditional philanthropic values of American Jews would have been of little practical use if they lacked the funds necessary for establishing a strong communal infrastructure for the provision of hospitals, homes for the elderly, settlement houses, credit organizations, relief agencies, vocational guidance, educational societies, orphanages, and summer camps.

During the early years of the Depression, San Francisco Jews accounted for only six per cent of the city's population but they contributed about one-third of the funds of the city's Community Chest, and they also raised \$600,000 for a new Jewish Community Center and \$800,000 for an expanded Mount Zion Hospital.¹⁵ Poor and working-class Jews were provided with cash assistance, student scholarships, subsidized hospital expenses, children's summer camps, vocational guidance, aid to prisoners and to the mentally ill in state institutions, interest-free loans, *matzot* at Passover, and spectacles and medical appliances. Housing was provided for orphaned

children, young single women, and the elderly. Moreover, during the last years of the Depression, the San Francisco Jewish community gave financial assistance to refugees fleeing Nazi Germany.

Records from San Francisco's Mount Zion Hospital — which was subsidized by the Federation of Jewish Charities and which largely (but not exclusively) served Jewish patients — illustrate the economic importance of ethnic or religious organizations during a crisis of the magnitude of the Great Depression. In 1932, Mount Zion patients paid only about half (54 per cent) of the cost of their treatment while those at Catholic hospitals such as St Luke's and St Francis paid 85 per cent and 99 per cent, respectively. Patients at the French Hospital paid 100 per cent of the medical costs. The only institution which subsidized the care of its patients to the same extent as Mount Zion did was the hospital administered under the auspices of the University of California.¹⁶ Throughout the Depression, Mount Zion Hospital provided free health care and free medical appliances (such as spectacles, dentures, and artificial limbs) to indigent Jews living in the Hebrew Home for the Aged Disabled, the Emanu-El Residence Club, and Homewood Terrace (an orphanage).¹⁷

The Hebrew Home for the Aged Disabled had spacious grounds, private rooms, and recreational and cultural programmes. In contrast, the non-Jewish elderly poor could go only to the Laguna Honda Home, the county almshouse. During the 1930s, the Federation of Jewish Charities of San Francisco spent one-quarter of its total expenditure on the care of the elderly. A 1935 study noted that Jews, who were a very small percentage of San Francisco's population, 'actually spend far more from private philanthropic funds on its dependent aged than all the rest of the community'.¹⁸ The young were also catered for. Sisterhood House (SH) provided accommodation for young Jewish women during the Depression; it was modelled after Jane Addams' Hull House in Chicago and housed single working women between the ages of 16 and 35. It was sponsored by the Congregation Emanu-El Sisterhood, and had been established in 1894 as the Emanu-El Sisterhood for Personal Service; it was renamed the Emanu-El Residence Club in 1935. In 1922, SH moved into a new building in what was then an Eastern European immigrant neighbourhood; it was designed by architect Julia Morgan, provided rooms for 60 residents, and had a courtyard and lecture hall. Residents were expected to work and to contribute a share of their wages for rent and food. But during the Depression, many SH residents could not find employment; in early 1935, 12 of the 46 women living in the club were unemployed.¹⁹

Throughout the Depression, SH provided inexpensive housing for single working-class Jewish women as well as a range of social ser-

vices such as medical care and vocational guidance. Some women, like Harriet Jacobs, a 25-year-old Russian immigrant, used SH as a temporary shelter while looking for work. She had moved from Los Angeles in late 1932 and listed her occupation as cap-maker on her SH application form. She failed to find paid employment and after two months returned to Los Angeles.²⁰ Rebecca Miller, who was 28-years-old, also came from Los Angeles in search for work. She arrived in January 1933, had nowhere to live, and three days later was given accommodation in SH. She was a trained beautician but could not find employment for more than a year and returned to live with her father in Los Angeles. Some former SH residents, who had moved out and were successfully settled in private accommodation, found themselves jobless or impoverished during the Depression. This was the case for Dorothy Lipschutz, a dressmaker who had a shop and her own car but lost both and returned to SH in the summer of 1931. She found a temporary job, lost it by September of that year, went to Los Angeles, but returned two years later to SH. But again, she could find no work and after five months left SH, this time to go to Chicago.

While some young women went to SH only for short-term housing, others found shelter there for several years during the worst period of the Depression. There were some women who had no home and no parents in America and were therefore particularly vulnerable. Bertha Isserman, whose parents had died, was a 26-year-old Russian immigrant and was unemployed when she came to SH in May 1932. She had been a patient at Mount Zion Hospital for a month and when she was discharged, the hospital staff referred her to SH. She eventually found employment as a dress finisher and stayed at SH for three and a half years until she left in October 1935 to be married. Bella Siegel, who was 19, was referred by the local Jewish orphanage to SH at the end of 1930. Like Bertha Isserman, she was an orphan and she had no home. She found work as a typist at the Jewish Community Center. Her younger sister Irma, who had also been in the Jewish orphanage, joined her four years later and by 1935 they moved out of SH to live together.

Although the SH rates for board and lodging were low, some women could not afford them. To help residents survive the economic crisis and maintain their financial independence, the SH resident social worker, Ethel Feineman, hired unemployed residents as waitresses and also engaged them in a cookery book project. Three editions of the book, entitled *Soup to Nuts*, were published during the Depression. Betty Rosenberg had come to SH in March 1932. She had found temporary work at the Hebrew Home for the Aged Disabled and at two area hospitals, and earned some extra money from the cookery book project. She left after 18 months to be married. In

1935, Ethel Feineman established the Institute for Practical Arts to train unemployed Jewish women in domestic work.²¹ One of the aims of many early twentieth-century feminists and reformers was to upgrade housekeeping to a professional status.²²

While SH catered to the economic needs of single women, the Hebrew Free Loan Association (HFLA) helped small Jewish businesses to remain viable during the Depression. The HFLA adhered to the Biblical instruction against charging interest to fellow Jews and gave business loans throughout the 1930s to San Francisco small traders.²³ In 1932, it provided 428 loans totalling more than \$72,000. In his 1935 annual report, the HFLA president stated: '... about fifty percent of the loans made are for business purposes, inasmuch as most of the borrowers are small business men — hucksters, and proprietors of drug stores, grocery stores, clothing stores, delicatessen shops, etc.'. In his review of the HFLA's activities from 1930 until the end of 1935, he noted that 70 per cent of the loans given during those years were to help persons 'either to become or to remain self-employed'.²⁴ The HFLA also decided to give particular help to those who had become downwardly mobile, and established a new fund for those 'who prior to 1930 were generous supporters of philanthropic enterprises'. Former philanthropists received loans of up to \$1,000 while all other applicants were limited to a maximum of \$500.²⁵

In addition to the HFLA, San Francisco Jews could apply to the Rehabilitation Loan Fund, also interest-free, sponsored by the Federation of Jewish Charities. After his clothing business failed in 1931, Abraham Tulchinsky, who had a wife and two children, applied in 1934 to the Rehabilitation Loan Fund for a \$500 loan to start a small business in either candies or cigars.²⁶ Earlier, in March 1930, the Fund's loan committee approved a \$500 loan to Arnold Seller to 'enable him to establish himself in tailoring business'. The committee member who had investigated the case recommended that Seller use \$250 to buy merchandise, \$150 to pay for machines, and the remaining \$100 for miscellaneous expenses.²⁷

Thus, mutual-aid societies during the Depression provided essential material benefits and assistance which often saved applicants from unemployment, bankruptcy, or homelessness. However, that period was also characterized by a growing welfare state which reduced the importance of self-help organizations in the economic lives of all Americans, including Jews. The government's growing role in welfare activities either displaced or transformed many mutual-aid societies. The Eureka Benevolent Society (EBS), a Jewish relief agency in San Francisco funded by the Federation of Jewish Charities, had an active role before the Depression and before the expansion of government welfare services. Jews, like all other Amer-

icans, then relied almost exclusively on private communal organizations to care for their poor. In the early years of the Depression, however, the government assumed a greater role in the provision of relief but channelled it through private or communal philanthropies such as the EBS. Poor San Francisco Jews went to the EBS building to receive public relief while indigent Italians applied to the Italian Board of Relief. The vast majority of San Francisco needy persons (85 per cent) applied for financial or other assistance to the Associated Charities. Every month private welfare organizations invoiced the city government for the amount they had given to relieve poverty.

Some private philanthropies, like the EBS, were able to supplement government allocations with their own funds. Since the EBS was a comparatively well-financed charity, the Jewish poor received more benefits than did those who applied to other private philanthropic agencies or to city and county welfare — \$30 rather than \$20 a month for a single man. The EBS also allocated grocery allowances higher than those of Associated Charities (\$9.62 rather than \$6.67 a week for a family of five) and also tended to give cash benefits to households while other agencies preferred to distribute actual groceries. Moreover, the EBS paid for electricity — an expense which the city considered non-essential — and for rental for about one-fifth of its unemployed families. The city covered rent only if eviction was pending.²⁸

As the Depression became more severe and resulted in depleting the resources of private benevolent organizations, the shift from private to public relief became more pronounced. The government assumed a more centralized role by dispensing welfare directly to individuals. Now, instead of going to the EBS office, unemployed San Francisco Jews — like all other unemployed people — went to city and county welfare agencies for relief benefits. Hyman Kaplan, executive director of the EBS, noted that it was only in 1933 that 'the Jewish group in the United States, for the *first time in its history*, has been forced to transfer to the state primary responsibility for relief to its dependents' (*italics in original*).²⁹ Most Jewish communal workers welcomed the shift from private to public, since private organizations could no longer provide all the financial assistance needed by the growing number of the poor. Kaplan had regular newspaper columns in the Jewish press and in professional journals, arguing for the urgent necessity of public relief and pointing with pride to the national role which Jews were assuming in promoting the shift from private philanthropy to public welfare.³⁰

However, Jewish social service workers were aware that public agencies were not as capable as the EBS in identifying and meeting the needs of poor Jews. In 1935, when the San Francisco Community Chest insisted that the EBS transfer 27 cases to the city and county,

the board of the EBS was reluctant to do so because 'the relief allowances were so low and the available service so inadequate that hardship would result'.³¹ Jewish social workers in New York were also concerned about transferring cases to state relief because they believed that Jewish agencies could provide better services for Jewish clients. Beth Wenger describes the failure of government agencies to accommodate even simple needs such as dietary preferences and cites one reporter's comments³² that federal grocery provisions

... contained much that the families did not know how to cook or did not like; for instance, the Negroes did not like what the Italians liked, and the Jews would not eat the things given to them, yet the things were common to all boxes.

With the transfer to public relief accelerating, the EBS case load was dramatically reduced: from March 1933 to March 1934 the number of EBS clients declined from 635 to 210 while the amount of money disbursed decreased from \$19,525 to \$6,365. In response, the EBS adjusted its focus in order to provide more social service than financial relief and its board of directors in 1938 voted to change the organization's name to 'Jewish Family Service' (JFS).³³ Thus, government social policies did not automatically bring about the dissolution of ethnic or religious societies whose aim was to provide help to the poor. Some, like the EBS, reinvented themselves by finding new goals and assisting new clients. Similarly, Hebrew free-loan societies did not close down when there was a decrease in the numbers of their applicants. Jewish entrepreneurs, who had accounted for the majority of borrowers, eventually followed in the footsteps of Chicago workers who had ceased to apply to their ethnic building and loan societies and increasingly turned to banks when they needed credit. Hebrew free-loan associations survived this period of declining activity by launching new programmes. For example, the San Francisco Hebrew Free Loan Association established a student loan fund while the Detroit HFLA created a loan programme to stabilize older Jewish neighbourhoods. New York *landsmanshaftn* (associations for Jews originating from the same European area or town) changed their aims of providing mutual aid in favour of memorializing hometown communities destroyed by the Nazis and of supporting the new State of Israel. After the 1943 publication of a volume about Lodz, hundreds of *landsmanshaftn* sponsored memorial books in honour of their towns.³⁴

Several historical studies illustrate the link between the growth of public welfare and the decline of ethnic self-help. David Beito has noted that there was a steep drop in membership of fraternal organizations and private societies mainly concerned with sick and funeral

benefits: from 7.2 million in 1930 to 4.7 million in 1940. He pointed out³⁵ that

a relationship existed between the emerging welfare state and the decline of fraternal services. Most notably, the first signs of benefit retrenchment appeared after 1935, the year the Social Security Act became law.

Italian and Jewish mutual-aid societies in Providence, Rhode Island, suffered a similar decline when government agencies increasingly supplied material benefits. As for Chicago, when the government began mortgage refinancing, the city's ethnic building and loan associations were affected. Jewish *landsmanshaftn* in New York lost many members when unemployment insurance and social security reduced the need of some of their mutual-aid functions. Beth Wenger has commented:³⁶

The Depression crisis and the creation of New Deal programs encouraged people of all ethnic backgrounds to demand federal solutions to the problems of daily subsistence.

Jews followed that pattern when they also began to expect that the government would take a more active role in providing for their economic security.

Studies of self-help organizations for religious or ethnic groups can help to establish the importance of communal strategies for ethnic economic development. Furthermore, they can illustrate the best ways of providing assistance to individuals or families in material need. The Jewish social workers during the Depression convincingly argued that small agencies based on a public-private partnership model, and with adequate funding, can deliver help more efficiently and more satisfactorily than can large government bureaucracies.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Lynn Davidman, Michael Katz, William Shaffir, and Beth Wenger for their comments on various drafts of this paper.

NOTES

¹ I have changed the name to protect confidentiality.

² See 'Growing Up in the Cities Project', Frederick M. Wirt, Bancroft Library, University of California-Berkeley, 80.7, Box II.

³ 1933 Survey of Unemployment Relief as cited in the Minutes of the Board of Directors, Eureka Benevolent Society, 26 September 1933, Western Jewish History Center (WJHC).

⁴ Beth S. Wenger, *New York Jews and the Great Depression: Uncertain Promise* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1996), p. 17.

⁵ Leonard Dinnerstein, 'Education and the Advancement of American Jews' in Bernard J. Weiss (ed.), *American Education and the European Immigrant: 1840-1940* (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1982), p. 53.

⁶ Thomas Kessner, 'Jobs, Ghettos, and the Urban Economy, 1880-1935' in *American Jewish History*, vol. 71 (December 1981), pp. 235-6; and Wenger, op. cit. in note 4 above, p. 17.

⁷ Raymond Breton, 'Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants' in *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 70 (September 1964), pp. 193-205. For a recent discussion of Breton's 'institutional completeness' argument, see: Sheldon Goldenberg and Valerie A. Haines, 'Social Networks and Institutional Completeness: From Territory to Ties' in M. A. Kalbach and Warren E. Kalbach (eds.), *Perspectives on Ethnicity in Canada: A Reader* (Harcourt Canada, Toronto, 2000), pp. 35-47.

⁸ Communal affiliation is a standard measure of Jewish cohesion. See, for example, Steven M. Cohen, *American Affiliation or Jewish Revival?* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1988).

⁹ Scott Cummings, 'Collectivism: The Unique Legacy of Immigrant Economic Development' in Scott Cummings (ed.), *Self-Help in Urban America* (Kennikat Press, Port Washington, New York, 1980), p. 7.

¹⁰ Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (Scribner and Sons, New York, 1958). This work was originally published in the form of two articles in 1904 and 1905.

¹¹ Examples of cultural analyses of Jewish economic behaviour include: Milton Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1964), p. 186; Nathan Glazer, 'The American Jew and the Attainment of Middle-Class Rank: Some Trends and Explanations' in Marshall Sklare (ed.), *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group* (Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 1958), pp. 143-144; Jacob Lestchinsky, 'The Position of the Jews in the Economic Life of America' in Isacque Graeber and S. H. Britt (eds.), *Jews in a Gentile World* (Macmillan, New York, 1942); Fred Strodtbeck, 'Family Interaction, Values, and Achievement' in Marshall Sklare (ed.), op. cit. above, pp. 147-165; Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1963), p. 56; Marshall Sklare, *America's Jews* (Random House, New York, 1971), p. 58; Edward Shapiro, 'American Jews and the Business Mentality' in *Judaism*, 27 (1978), pp. 214-221; and Harold Pollins, 'The Development of Jewish Business in the United Kingdom' in Robin Ward and Richard Jenkins (eds.), *Ethnic Communities in Business* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984), pp. 73-88.

¹² Jacob Shatzky, *Geschichte fun Yidn in Warshe* (YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York, 1953); William Glicksman, *Jewish Social Welfare Institutions in Poland* (Kalish Folkshul, Philadelphia, 1976); Isaac Levitats, *The Jewish Community in Russia, 1844-1917* (Posner & Sons, Jerusalem, 1981); and Jacob Lestchinsky, 'Economic Aspects of Jewish Community Organization in Independent Poland' in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 9 (October 1947), pp. 319-338.

¹³ Extract from Reply by the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company to Stuyvesant's Letter, 26 April 1655, reprinted in Morris Schappes (ed.), *A Documentary History of the Jews in the United States, 1654-1875* (Schocken Books, New York, 1976), pp. 4-5.

¹⁴ Samuel Moment, 'The Jewish Population of San Francisco' in *San Francisco Jewish Community Study*, January 1939. In this Jewish population study, comparisons were made between data which were collected on Jews in 1938 and on the general population in 1930.

¹⁵ Minutes, Provisional Committee of the Jewish Community Center, 26 May 1930, WJHC; *Emanu-El*, 9 May 1930, p. 12; *Emanu-El*, 25 April 1930, p. 9; and Mount Zion Hospital Annual Report, 1936, WJHC.

¹⁶ 'Hospital Council, Community Chest of San Francisco, Comparison of 1930-1932 Hospital Figures of Twelve Hospitals in San Francisco' in Federation of Jewish Charities Collection (FJC), Box 37, WJHC.

¹⁷ Mount Zion Hospital, Minutes of the Board of Directors, 18 March 1934, WJHC. See also 'Report of the Mount Zion Hospital, 1936', p. 34.

¹⁸ 'Memorandum on Care of Jewish Dependent Aged in San Francisco', 1935, FJC, Box 46, WJHC.

¹⁹ Lynn Fonfa, 'The Emanu-El Sisterhood: Agent of Assimilation' in *The Californians*, March/April 1986, pp. 34-38; and Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Emanu-El Residence Club, January-March 1935, Emanu-El Residence Club Collection, Box II, WJHC.

²⁰ Application cards, 1914-1948, Emanu-El Residence Club Collection, WJHC. I have changed the names of the residents to protect their privacy.

²¹ Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Emanu-El Residence Club, 26 June 1935, WJHC.

²² Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women* (Anchor Press, Garden City, NY, 1978).

²³ Deuteronomy 23:20-21 states: 'Thou shalt not lend upon interest to thy brother: interest of money, . . . interest of any thing . . . Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest . . .' See also Exodus 22:24; Leviticus 25:35-37; Ketuboth 67b; Sanhedrin 76b; and Yebamoth 631. For discussions on interest in Jewish law, see Siegfried Stein, 'The Laws on Interest in the Old Testament' in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 4 (1953), pp. 161-170; idem, 'The Development of Jewish Law on Interest from the Biblical Period to the Expulsion of the Jews from England' in *Historia Judaica*, 17 (1955), pp. 3-40; and W. F. Leemans, 'The Rate of Interest in Old Babylonian Times' in *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité*, 3 (1950), p. 32, n. 87. For a study of Jewish credit networks, see Shelly Tenenbaum, *A Credit to Their Community: Jewish Loan Societies in the United States, 1880-1945* (Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1993).

²⁴ San Francisco HFLA, Annual Reports for 1935 and of 28 December 1949; and Bureau of Jewish Social Research, Survey of Hebrew Free Loan Societies, ca. 1938, Out-of-Town File, Jewish Free Loan Association, Los Angeles.

²⁵ San Francisco HFLA, Annual Report, 5 April 1937.

²⁶ Minutes of the Meeting of the Rehabilitation Committee, 11 December 1934, WJHC.

²⁷ Minutes of the Meeting of the Rehabilitation Committee, 11 March 1930, WJHC.

²⁸ Eureka Benevolent Society, Minutes of the Board of Directors, 28 February 1933; 23 May 1933; and 25 June 1935; and letter from Kaplan to Billikopf, 6 June 1933, FJC, Box 6, WJHC.

²⁹ 'Trends in Jewish Philanthropy' in *Emanu-El and the Jewish Journal*, 7 September 1934, p. 8.

³⁰ See, for example 'Conquering the Depression' in *Emanu-El and the Jewish Journal*, 7 April 1933, p. 4.

³¹ J. Feigenbaum to Samuel Lilienthal, 5 September 1935, Eureka Benevolent Society collection, WJHC.

³² John F. Bauman and Thomas H. Goode, *In the Eye of the Great Depression: New Deal Reporters and the Agony of the American People* (Northern Illinois University Press, DeKalb, 1988), p. 92 cited in Wenger, op. cit. in note 4 above, p. 153.

³³ Eureka Benevolent Society Minutes, 25 April 1933 and 28 November 1938, WJHC.

³⁴ Tenenbaum, op. cit. in note 23 above, pp. 155-162; San Francisco HFLA, Newsletter, September-October 1986, p. 2; *San Francisco Jewish Bulletin*, 6 September 1974, p. 10; 'Detroit's Neighborhood Preservation Project' in *AHFL News*, January 1988, pp. 3-4; and Daniel Soyer, *Jewish Immigrant Associations and American Identity in New York, 1880-1939* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1997), pp. 190-205.

³⁵ David T. Beito, *From Mutual Aid to the Welfare State: Fraternal Societies and Social Services, 1890-1967* (The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2000), pp. 222, 228-229.

³⁶ Judith Smith, *Family Connections: A History of Italian and Jewish Immigrant Lives in Providence Rhode Island 1900-1940* (State University of New York Press, Albany, 1985), p. 160; Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1990), p. 276; Daniel Soyer, op. cit. in note 34 above, p. 201; and Wenger, op. cit. in note 4 above, p. 127.

LUBAVITCH MESSIANISM

Geoffrey Alderman

(Review Article)

DAVID BERGER, *The Rebbe, The Messiah, and the Scandal of Orthodox Indifference*, x + 195 pp., Littman Library of Civilisation, London & Portland, Oregon, 2001, £19.95 (hardback £29.50).

THREE messianic movements in Jewish history have survived well beyond the deaths of their founders. The first is of course Christianity. The second is Sabbatianism — the late seventeenth-century cult centred on the charismatic Shabetai Tzevi. The third is Lubavitch, or 'Habad' Hassidism — or rather, that strain of Lubavitch Hassidism which affirms that Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson (the seventh 'Rebbe', or spiritual leader, of the Lubavitch Hassidim) is the Messiah.

The Lubavitch Hassidim are undoubtedly the most dynamic, most outgoing and at the same time most self-publicizing and self-serving of all the Hassidic groups. Hassidism evolved in eighteenth-century Poland partly as a populist reaction to the perceived excessive intellectualism of the then rabbinical leadership; it emphasized and still emphasizes the ability of even the most ignorant Jew to make contact with the Almighty, through joyfulness and spontaneous, unstructured prayer. The Habad stream established by Rabbi Schneur Zalman of Lyady (1745–1813) reconciled Hassidism to the intellectual study of Jewish texts. During the century following his death the movement was centred on the White Russian town of Lubavitch, where its successive Rebbes lived. Persecuted without mercy during the Stalinist era, the Lubavitchers put up a pacifist but nonetheless heroic resistance. The survival of Jewish orthodoxy in the Soviet Union does indeed owe much — but not, as they and their apologists would like to think, everything — to their efforts.

In 1941, after a long campaign, the then Lubavitcher Rebbe, Yosef Yitzhak Schneerson, was permitted to leave the Soviet Union for New York. In 1950, following his death, he was succeeded by his son-in-law, Menachem Mendel Schneerson, whose headquarters (770 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn) soon became the epicentre of a breathtaking exercise in Jewish intra-communal missionary activity, four features of which are outstanding. First, a great many non-

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

observant Jews were 'converted' to orthodox observance. Second, a great many schools and other educational facilities were built throughout the world. Third, much of the money for all this activity was provided by non-observant Jews who were persuaded to support the movement whilst remaining non-orthodox. Fourth, Menachem Mendel Schneerson began to be spoken of, and came to be regarded — whilst still alive — as the Messiah.

Rabbi Schneerson (b. 1902) died in New York in 1994. Following his death a section of his disciples affirmed and continue to affirm that he is the Jewish Messiah, sent by God to redeem the world in general and the Jewish people in particular, in accordance with the prophecies and pronouncements of the Jewish Bible and its accepted orthodox Jewish interpreters. Indeed, so far as these modern messianists are concerned, Rabbi Schneerson never really died. Some believe that his grave is empty while others claim that 'The Rebbe lives and exists among us now exactly as he did before, literally.' Or, as the Vice-President of the Oldhill Street Chabad Community Centre in London wrote in 2001, 'The Rebbe is the Redeemer known as Moshiach. . . . The current Rebbe lives and leads us.'² And it is no doubt for that reason that the Lubavitchers have placed a fax machine next to his grave, to make communication with him that much easier in this digital age.

At one level the story that Professor Berger sets out to tell — of his own seven-year campaign against this awesome cult — does indeed have a surreal, almost comic quality about it. But at another it is a profoundly fascinating and at the same time profoundly disturbing story of admiration turning to adulation, thence through mass hysteria and mysticism to messianism. The book which Professor Berger has written does not tell us — and does not purport to tell us — why Rabbi Schneerson is regarded by a section of world Jewry as the Messiah. This would require a quite different study, perhaps by a quite different type of scholar. Christianity originated at a time of great ferment in the Jewish world, when the Jews of Palestine realized that they had lost several hundred years of 'home rule' under the Hasmoneans. They were looking for a saviour, someone who would fulfil the essentially post-Biblical eschatological concept that a descendant — a king no less — would arise, from within the House of David, whose rule would usher in a world of peace (and of monotheism), who would preside over the rebuilding of the Temple and the restoration of sacrifices, and under whom the Jewish people (including the resurrected dead) would be restored to their land.

Belief in this particular formulation of the coming of the Messiah has been a cornerstone of Jewish existence in the Diaspora. For the sake of this belief, hundreds of thousands of Jews have endured tor-

ture and martyrdom. Jesus of Nazareth clearly did not fit the formulation, which is why Judaism rejects the claim of his supporters that he is the Messiah. But the rejection of Jesus is also based on the fact that nowhere in post-Biblical statements about the Messiah — and certainly not in the classic formulation of the illustrious twelfth-century commentator Moses Maimonides — is allowance made for the possibility that the Messiah might die in the midst of his messianic labours, but will then continue these labours after his death and perhaps resurrection. The failure of Jesus of Nazareth to bring about world peace — let alone his failure to preside over the resurrection of the dead — would have been enough to brand him as a false Messiah by orthodox Jewish authorities then and since. To which we must add that his followers dispensed with most of the laws of orthodox Jewish observance — the *mitzvot*. The falsehoods of Shabetai Tzevi — who eventually turned his back on Judaism completely by agreeing to convert to Islam and thus avoid long imprisonment or even the death penalty — were even more palpable. But we should note that the phenomenon of Shabetai Tzevi was, likewise, a product of great ferment in the Jewish world, following closely as it did on the horrors of the massacres of Jews by Cossacks led by Bogdan Chmielnitski.

In some crucial respects Lubavitch messianism conforms to this pattern, coming hard on the heels of the Holocaust, the re-establishment of the Jewish State and, in 1967, the repossession of the Temple Mount. The Lubavitchers have cleverly exploited the atmosphere of messianic imminence which these events undoubtedly engendered; indeed to some extent, with their cry of 'We Want Moshiach [Messiah] Now', they have created or at least helped create it. To the argument that under the rule of the Messiah 'all Israel' will follow the Torah they have pointed to the very many Jews whom the Lubavitch movement has 'converted' to orthodoxy. To the charge that Rabbi Schneerson did not rebuild the Temple, they have argued that his headquarters in New York are to be regarded as the Temple. To the accusation that the Messiah must be seen to fight (in the words of Maimonides) 'the wars of the Lord' they have replied that the Lubavitch Hassidim themselves constitute an army, and that the wars they fight are no less real for being spiritual rather than physical.

Lubavitch messianism, like all previous messianic movements in Judaism, came into existence to fill very deep needs within a certain Jewish constituency. Lubavitchers prey on the emotionally crippled, on the socially inadequate, and on the guilt of the non-observant — hence their ability to raise money from non-observant wealthy Jews.³ The reward they offer for the allegiance they ask is nothing less than the promise that the adherent and the supporter will be remembered

by the Almighty as having played a part in making possible the coming and triumph of the Messiah. This is bribery at its most potent and at its most sophisticated. Rabbi Schneerson was not the Messiah whom Orthodox Judaism awaits because, although undoubtedly learned, charismatic (in the view of some) and caring, he fulfilled none of the classic messianic roles. He was almost certainly not a descendant of the House of David. He did not compel 'all Israel' to follow the Torah. He did not fight 'the wars of the Lord.' He did not rebuild the Temple. He most certainly did not, alas, 'perfect the entire world.' What is more, he died before any of these deeds (as set out in the classic formulation of Maimonides) were completed.

Judaism simply does not recognize a Messiah who dies during the course of his ministry (so to speak) and then returns from the dead to complete the task. That is the Christian view of the Messiah, not the Jewish one. On this ground alone, therefore, Lubavitch messianists stand accused of being sinners and heretics. But they must face these accusations on other grounds too — for example their worship of photographs of Rabbi Schneerson (some even, in my experience, endowing these images with potentially miraculous powers) but most sensationally for harbouring and spreading the view that Rabbi Schneerson *was and is* the Divine Essence: that he and God are one, a heresy referenced and explored at length in the tenth and most powerful chapter of Professor Berger's volume.

I believe that all orthodox rabbis in existence — without exception — would agree with Professor Berger in his condemnations. What he finds so disturbing, and so infuriating, is the failure of orthodoxy to speak out against the messianists, and to apply to them the same sanctions that would be applied to a Christian trying to pass herself or himself off as a Jew — for example, refusal to countenance such a person as an acceptable witness to a marriage or divorce, or refusal to eat meat or poultry slaughtered by such a person.

The nearest orthodoxy has come to a public condemnation of Lubavitch messianism was in June 1996 when, on Professor Berger's initiative, the Rabbinical Council of America adopted a declaration stating 'that there is not and never has been a place in Judaism for the belief that the Mashiach ben David [Messiah the son of David] will begin his Messianic mission only to experience death, burial and resurrection before completing it.' Individual rabbis, some of them admittedly of great renown, have issued statements reaffirming the heretical nature of belief in a Christ-like Messiah who will rise from the dead; but they have, for the most part, been careful not to name Lubavitch messianism as the major culprit. In at least one instance the condemnation (by the renowned Rabbi Aharon Soloveichik, of

Yeshiva University, New York) was followed almost immediately by a condescending clarification and, later, by a virtual retraction.

As an orthodox Jew Professor Berger is outraged at the silence and seeming indifference evinced by the overwhelming majority in the orthodox communities of the world to Lubavitch messianic heresies. Indeed, as he demonstrated, Lubavitch adherents, far from being ostracized and marginalized, have been able to make astonishing inroads into leadership positions within these communities. In the United Kingdom they constitute a very significant element of the rabbinate; I am not sure that Professor Berger's figure of '50 per cent' is accurate, but the proportion is undoubtedly a large one, probably nearer a third. Their presence is strongly felt throughout other European centres of Jewish population, above all in the former Soviet Union. In Moscow, in 2001, through a series of astute political manoeuvres, they seized control of the Chief Rabbinate. And they are strongly entrenched in Israel.

How has this come about? In a chapter which would have benefited from major expansion, Professor Berger lists some of the reasons for 'the scandal of orthodox indifference.' These really boil down to three: Lubavitchers do much good work; Lubavitch messianism is a 'transient insanity'; and it is necessary to avoid communal strife. I am sure that he is right in this analysis, but I would go further. Many orthodox leaders and clergy are fearful that, if they push at the Lubavitchers too hard, or perhaps 'expel' them *en masse* from the Jewish fold, a separate religion — possibly a new form of Christianity — will emerge. Or, put another way, they may believe that the best method of dealing with Lubavitch messianism is to kill it off through kindness rather than through sanction.

Professor Berger would argue that, in fact, a new form of Christianity has already emerged. I am sorry to have to say that I would agree with him. If scholars wish to understand how, from a socio-psychological perspective, Christianity arose and took hold amongst Jews, some two thousand years ago, they can do no better than observe the spread today, amongst observant and non-observant Jews alike, of Lubavitch messianism. And as they do so they would be well advised to have Professor Berger's authoritative volume close to hand, as both a guide book and a warning.

NOTES

¹ Rabbi Levi Yitzchak Ginsberg quoted in Berger, p. 25.

² *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 June 2001, p. 26.

³ See my own short essay 'Militants with £1 Million to Spend', *Manna*, No. 25 (Autumn 1989), pp. 8 and 10.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY AND THE JEWS: A MATTER OF TASTE — NOT IDEOLOGY

Rory Miller

(Review Article)

HARRY DEFRIES, *Conservative Party Attitudes to Jews, 1900–1950*, Frank Cass, London and Portland, Oregon, 2001, £18.50.

THERE are comparatively few scholarly accounts of British political parties and their attitudes to, and relationship with, Anglo-Jewry. Of those available, the most informative concern Jewish relations with the Left: one thinks immediately of Joseph Gorny's *The British Labour Movement and Zionism, 1917–1948* (published in 1983) and Henry Srebrnik's *London Jews and British Communism, 1935–1945* (published in 1995). Harry Defries obtained a doctorate in Modern History at Royal Holloway — a college of London University — where he became an honorary research associate. The title of his 1998 thesis was *The Attitudes of the Conservative Party towards the Jews c. 1900–c. 1948*. The book under review here was finished shortly before his premature death in May 2000.

He had decided to exclude the relationship between the Conservative Party and the Jewish elite and consequently the two dominant topics of his analysis are Jewish immigration to Great Britain and the Palestine conflict during the first half of the twentieth century. Seven of the nine substantive chapters deal directly with one or other of these two issues. The two remaining chapters are primarily intended as general examinations of how four of the great upheavals of the last century (the Great War, the Russian Revolution, the Second World War, and the Holocaust) impacted on Conservative attitudes to Jews.

Given the tendency for coalition rule during much of the period under review, Defries does not limit his study to attitudes of Conservative governments but rather attaches primary importance to the attitudes of individual cabinet members, backbenchers, constituency party organizations, and the Tory press. In these terms it very

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

quickly becomes evident that there was no homogeneous or coherent Conservative policy towards Jews and Jewish issues but rather a diversity of opinions — some hostile, some sympathetic, but all appearing to confirm William Ernest Henley's classic remark that 'Toryism is as much a matter of taste as a body of doctrine'.

The author's chronological approach leads him to begin with an analysis of Conservative attitudes to Jewish alien immigration into England; it had been taking place since the 1880s. Defries shows how many of the Conservative resentments towards Jewish immigrants were also held by other political parties and were attributable in part to what the historian David Vital has called a 'national conceit' among the English upper classes 'that they belonged to a race that was superior in all . . . central respects'.¹ Within society at large there was also widespread concern over the challenge that new Jewish immigrants posed to the native working population. By focusing primarily on the attitudes of the most outspoken anti-alienists and advocates of tariff reform within the Conservative party, Defries deftly manages to draw a picture of a distinctly Conservative attitude to Jewish immigration. In particular, he shows how in the years immediately preceding the First World War, there was a tendency within Conservative circles to view the Jewish 'invasion' and the perceived Jewish slums — with the vice and crime that they entailed — as a 'threat to the Anglo-Saxon race' (pp. 24, 27). Indeed, this attitude thrived among less sensitive Tories for many decades, with former Conservative MP Henry Longhurst opposing the opening up of England to Jewish survivors of the Holocaust in 1946 with the warning: 'there is a serious chance [of] our national stock being affected'.²

But Defries shows how more immediate concerns, such as perceived electoral popularity, also played a part in Conservative anti-alien attitudes. By making good use of immigration and electoral statistics throughout, he shows how Conservative animosity towards Jewish immigration became increasingly vocal from the time of the 1906 general election, even though between 1906 and 1914 the overall number of Jewish newcomers who settled in Britain was between four and five thousand a year — about two thirds of the annual average for the period 1891–1904 and half that of the peak year of 1905, which saw the passing of the Alien Act (p. 35). And yet this trickle of Jews into England had less of an impact on political (and popular) attitudes than did the fact that the population of Anglo-Jewry had risen from 65,000 in 1880 to 300,000 by 1914. This increase was most marked in the East End of London, a 'traditional immigration reservoir',³ which by 1914 was home to many of the 200,000 London Jews.

The outbreak of the First World War crystallized attitudes towards

immigrants and saw a surge in the debate over Jewish loyalty to England as the press and politicians speculated over the existence of a Jewish fifth column loyal to international Jewry or to the German military. This was most clearly seen in the legal attempts to remove two German-born Jews (Sir Ernest Cassel and Sir Edgar Speyer) from their positions as privy councillors as well as in the calls for the resignation of Arthur Strauss, the German-born Conservative MP for Paddington North. If war with Germany called into question the loyalty of such influential and established Jews as Speyer and Cassel,⁴ it is hardly surprising that the Bolshevik revolution in Russia increased resentment towards Eastern European Jews who were far less assimilated than their German co-religionists and who refused to support Russia (where, as Joseph Roth has noted, antisemitism was a pillar of government) in the war against Germany. But again — and with the exception of the Tory-supporting *Morning Post* which Defries notes 'represented the extreme right of Conservatism and [whose] hostility towards Jews was extreme' (p. 75) — the Conservative position in the 'Jew-Bolshevik' debate was not significantly more forceful than that of other political constituencies. Indeed, it was the Liberal politician Winston Churchill who in an emotive article of 1920 divided the world into 'good' Jews who opposed Bolshevism and 'bad' Jews who supported it.⁵

The general election of 1918, which gave women the right to vote for the first time and thus played a part in increasing the electorate from 7.7 million in 1910 to 21.4 million, also increased the number of Conservative/Unionist MPs who viewed Jewish immigration with hostility. In an informative section, Defries traces this development to the post-1918 domination of the party by businessmen and professionals (who gained 75 per cent of Conservative seats) and argues that this resulted in a party more radical in its conception of Conservatism and thus more receptive than the 'party of gentlemen'⁶ of late Victorian Britain to the imposition of legislation which was hostile to Jewish interests. That hostility led to the passing of the Aliens Restriction Act of December 1919 — which Defries sees as a 'seminal event' (p. 87) — and to the decision of Brigadier-General Prescott Decree to stand as an independent Conservative candidate in the 1922 general election against the sitting Conservative MP for Putney, Samuel Samuel, who was Jewish.

Samuel retained his seat (much to the credit of Putney's electorate) but such developments were significant because Bonar Law's October 1922 election victory marked the beginning of a period of Conservative domination of the House of Commons which lasted until the end of the decade; the October 1924 general election had given Conservatives the largest number of seats they had ever held up to that point. In the 1920s some of the party's leading anti-

alienists rose to positions of prominence — most notably William Joyson Hicks ‘the leading anti-alienist in the House’ (p. 108) was appointed Secretary of Overseas Development in 1922 and promoted to Home Secretary after the 1924 election.

During the 1930s a majority of Jewish voters supported the Labour party; they lived in constituencies which consistently returned Labour MPs. For Defries, this fact provides a better explanation of Conservative hostility to Jewish immigration and refugees than any attachments to the rising tide of fascism. Indeed, with some notable exceptions — such as Sir Joseph Ball, director of the Conservative Research department, who owned the ‘consistently anti-Semitic’ (p. 134) newspaper *Truth* and Captain Ramsay, Conservative MP for Peebles, who was the only British MP to be imprisoned in 1940 under Defence Regulation 18B — Mosley received ‘comparatively little support from within the Conservative party’ (p. 124). But the author also makes the subtle point that the same factors (xenophobia and an innate sense of superiority) which made most Conservatives view fascism as a nasty foreign political ideology were also responsible, in part, for the widespread distaste for the foreign-born Jews living in England.

The desperate attempt by Europe’s Jews to escape Nazi persecution (and ultimately extermination) by seeking refuge in Great Britain has been an ongoing source of historical interest and contention. Admittedly, a work covering half a century cannot deal with the decade of the 1930s in as much detail as one with the sole objective of concentrating on those tumultuous years (such as Louise London’s excellent recent study on Whitehall and the Jews⁷). However, Defries’s analysis never really conveys the flexibility of the refugee policy of all political parties in the first half of the 1930s, with German Jews (the first victims of Nazism and always the preferred group of Jewish refugees) allowed temporary entry into Britain on humanitarian grounds if that would place no strain on either the public purse or on Anglo-German relations. And while he is mostly correct in his contention that the issue of Jewish refugees — outside the context of Palestine — played almost no role on the national political stage until the late 1930s, he never shows just how *Kristallnacht*, the German annexation of Austria, and the occupation of Czechoslovakia (1938–1939) transformed the refugee issue from a primarily humanitarian concern which had been an irritant to relations with Germany into a full-blown political crisis where humanitarian considerations became increasingly irrelevant. Nor does he compare, or contrast, the Conservative response to these developments with the responses of other political parties.

The same is true for the war years. Defries never really manages to provide a distinctly Conservative perspective on the official war-

time policy on refugees, where entry on humanitarian grounds was considered only if it benefited the war effort (and even this was no guarantee of refuge); and where humanitarian aid abroad was permitted only if it did not compromise the allied economic blockade of Nazi-occupied Europe. Nor does he let us know the Conservative contribution to, and involvement in, the few wartime examples of officially-sanctioned humanitarian entry and relief. What he does do is to provide an interesting pen-portrait of Leslie Hore-Belisha (the Liberal National Minister for War 1937-1940) and a short, and somewhat superficial, section on Conservative responses to the Nazi extermination of Hungary's Jewish population.

As in the chapters on Jewish immigration, Defries deals with Zionism chronologically and shows how from the earliest years of the century there had been solid support for a territorial solution to the Jewish problem among those very Tories who were most outspoken anti-alienists (such as William Evans-Gordon, MP for Stepney and author of several anti-alien works) in the hope that it might help to solve the immigration problem. Support for Zionism in its earliest years also came from those who believed that a Jewish colony under the British flag would benefit Britain in her imperial role. Ironically, many of the same factors responsible for the negative (and at times hostile) Conservative attitude towards Jewish immigration and settlement in Britain in the first decade of the century — the perception of Jews as inherently foreign, mysterious, and powerful — were also responsible for much of the Conservative support for the Zionist venture in the second decade. In particular, the willingness to view Jews as members of a world-wide conspiracy capable of controlling, somewhat paradoxically, both world economic markets and an anti-capitalist revolution in Russia, was a significant factor at a time when Britain was attempting to influence the governments of both Russia and the United States.

Though Defries was aware of the scholarly debate and disagreements about what motivated Britain's decision to issue the Balfour Declaration, he was not primarily interested in adding to this or in assessing the precise import of what one author has called 'those strange combinations of romanticism and strategic reasoning, zealotry and altruism, pro-Jewish sympathy and professions of anti-Semitism'⁸ which culminated in Britain support for the Jewish National Home. Instead, he concentrates on the role of individual Conservatives in introducing, implementing, and consolidating pro-Zionist policies. His two main contentions are that previous scholars of British-Zionist relations have 'not been sufficiently focused on the actual decision-makers responsible for the Declaration'; and if they had they would have seen that the few actual decision-makers 'were primarily Unionist politicians' (p. 42).

In order to support this argument Defries deconstructs the make-up of the wartime government, noting that 15 of the 25 ministers of Cabinet rank in the coalition government formed in December 1916 were Unionists. Moreover, he argues that of the 'fewer than twenty men' involved in the 'discussions and decision-making process' leading up to the Balfour Declaration, the majority were Unionists. These were the members of the war cabinet — Bonar Law, Carson, Milner, and Curzon; Balfour and Lord Robert Cecil at the Foreign Office; and Lord Derby, the Minister of War. No less important were second-tier Conservative members of the Government: Sir Mark Sykes, Colonel Leo Amery,⁹ and Major William Ormsby-Gore (Unionist MPs for Hull, South Birmingham, and the Denbigh District respectively) who would be vital to the 'development and execution of British policy in respect of Palestine and Zionism' (p. 49).¹⁰

Defries is thus confident that the 'decision to issue the Balfour Declaration was . . . primarily the result of a debate amongst Unionists' (p. 50). Given this viewpoint it is not surprising that he rejects Meyer Verete's opinion that 'Balfour's share does not seem to be large'¹¹ and that Lloyd George (a Liberal) played a greater role (p. 50). To substantiate this, Defries points out that the most hostile opponent to the Declaration within the Cabinet was the Liberal Edwin Montagu. But it is doubtful whether Montagu's anti-Zionism, in and of itself, is indicative of Conservative support for Zionism as Defries maintains. Montagu's Liberal party affiliations had nothing to do with his distaste for Zionism any more than the Liberal politics of his cousin Sir Herbert Samuel were responsible for his support for Zionism or the Conservative politics of Colonel Louis Gluckstein (Conservative MP, Nottingham East, 1931–1945 — whom Defries does not mention) were responsible for his extreme anti-Zionism. Montagu was a thoroughly assimilated Jew who feared that a Jewish National Home would result in a surge in antisemitism and charges of dual loyalty which would threaten British Jews in general and his own position in particular. (Here one should recall that Lady Cynthia Asquith, the daughter-in-law of Prime Minister Asquith, noted in her diary in late October 1917: 'The War Cabinet had been buried . . . with the Zionists. What fun if Montagu and Venetia are forced to go and live in Palestine'.¹²)

Christopher (later, Lord) Mayhew, an outspoken and articulate supporter of the Arab cause, has argued that before the Six Day War of 1967 the efforts of Englishmen to explain the Arab point of view consisted simply of 'the spontaneous initiatives of a few courageous men'.¹³ Defries's examination of Conservative attitudes to Zionism in the 1920s and 1930s shows clearly that this claim by Mayhew (and echoed by most British Arabists and anti-Zionists) has no basis

in reality. Of course, there existed widespread support for Zionism among senior politicians both inside the Conservative party (Amery, Ormsby-Gore, Lord Robert Cecil, etc.) and outside (in 1922 the Liberal Colonial Secretary Winston Churchill clearly spelt out his support for the Jewish National Home both during, and after, a visit to Palestine). But there also existed influential politicians and statesmen (most notably Tory grandee Lord Curzon, for whom D. Z. Gillon rightly notes 'Zionism was nothing'¹⁴) whose early heartfelt opposition to the Balfour Declaration, the Jewish National Home, and the Mandate would be refined in later years by an increasingly organized and vocal anti-Zionist constituency.

Moreover, as Defries notes, even at the time of the Balfour Declaration, when the battle over Palestine was in its infancy, only 22 per cent of Unionist MPs either openly stated their support for, or were otherwise known to be supporters of, the Balfour Declaration (it was 24 per cent for Liberals). Indeed, Conservative antipathy to Zionism was shown in the Commons debates on the San Remo conference in April 1920 and on Palestine in July 1922. This nascent hostility was even more apparent in the Lords debate on the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration in June 1920. Exactly two years later, the anti-Zionists in the Lords succeeded in passing a motion (by 60 votes to 29) against the Palestine Mandate in a debate initiated by Lord Islington (who took the Liberal whip in the Lords but who had sat as a Conservative in the Commons). By 1923, the Arab cause could rely on the support of three Conservatives (Joyson-Hicks and Lords Curzon and Devonshire) inside the Cabinet Committee created in June 1923 to consider the Palestine issue. These three men were responsible for their committee's report (published in July 1923) proposing the establishment of an Arab Agency to balance the influence and accomplishments of the Jewish Agency. The following month, 111 Conservative MPs (40 per cent of Conservative backbenchers) signed a pro-Arab 'memorial' calling on the government to 'reconsider the Palestine question in the light of the Arab demands' (p. 115). This should be compared with the 37 Conservatives (10 per cent of the party's backbenchers) who joined an all-party parliamentary committee founded in the wake of the 1923 elections in support of the Balfour Declaration.

Defries's use of parliamentary figures and statistics to examine Conservative backbench attitudes to Zionism provides a valuable insight into the much-neglected subject of parliamentary anti-Zionism in the Mandate era and complements the work (which Defries has drawn on) of David Cesarani on the anti-Zionism (and antisemitism) of 'Tory Diehards' in these same years.¹⁵ Unfortunately, Defries does not delve deeply enough into the efforts of anti-Zionist Conservatives. For example, he rightly notes the consistently

anti-Zionist line followed by the *Times* and *Daily Mail* in these years and draws attention to the series of anti-Zionist articles by the *Daily Mail*'s special correspondent J. M. N. Jeffries. However, he does not chart the full extent of that journalist's involvement in the anti-Zionist effort: his series of anti-Zionist articles in the *Mail* were published in book form as *The Palestine Deception*¹⁶ and established him as a leading anti-Zionist. In the 1930s, he was a founding member of the Palestine Information Centre (created under the patronage of Haj Amin al-Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem, and his Arab Higher Committee). That Centre (the PIC) was the first permanent Arab propaganda office in London.

The PIC had the threefold task of defending the rights of Palestine's Arabs; providing a meeting place for Arabs and Englishmen; and supplying information to the press and to influential persons on the Palestine issue. Izzat Tannous, the head of the PIC, had a very close relationship with Jeffries and viewed him as a 'special visitor to the centre . . . [who] did a great deal of work . . . a great asset to us all'.¹⁷ In 1939, Tannous even agreed to buy 500 copies of his vehemently anti-Zionist work, *Palestine the Reality*, at 20 shillings a copy to be paid in advance, so that the publishing firm of Longmans would accept the manuscript for publication.¹⁸ It could be argued that Jeffries was only a journalist on a Tory newspaper rather than a member of parliament or a government official and thus Jeffries could be excused for ignoring the extent of that man's involvement in the anti-Zionist effort; but his close ties to the PIC (several members of parliament sat on the organization's executive committee) highlight the intimate relationship between English and Arab anti-Zionists during the inter-war years.

On the positive side, there are good analyses of the response of individual Conservatives to the major political developments in Palestine policy in the 1930s — such as the Passfield White Paper of October 1930 and the Palestine White Paper of May 1939. The study of Conservative attitudes to Zionism in the war years (when any final decision on Palestine had been postponed until the cessation of hostilities) rightly concentrates on the debate among Conservatives over the arming of the Yishuv and the creation of a Jewish brigade; on the reaction within Conservative ranks to the assassination of their colleague Lord Moyne by Zionist extremists in 1944; and on Churchill's attitude to Zionism.

However, the final chapter dealing with the Conservative Party and Palestine between 1945 and 1948 is less satisfactory and the efforts of the anti-Zionist and pro-Zionist Conservatives in these vitally important years deserves more than the cursory treatment it receives here. Admittedly, the July 1945 Labour election victory (which saw the Conservative party go into opposition for the first

time since 1931) meant that the crucial events — Britain's withdrawal from its Mandatory responsibilities; the vote of the United Nations for the partition of Palestine; and the birth of the State of Israel — took place under a Labour administration. But Defries should have attempted to explain the factors (other than the defeat of Leo Amery and the death of Victor Cazalet) which — with the exception of Churchill — left William Teeling as the only Conservative backbencher openly supportive of Zionism after the 1945 election.

It was Ghandi who said that 'belief without deed is nothing' and Defries could also have considered the widespread failure of Conservative supporters of Zionism to convert their pro-Zionist feelings into practical political gains when in high office. For example, there were few more committed Zionists in Westminster than Ormsby-Gore, but his failure to adopt any pro-Zionist policies during his brief stint as Colonial Secretary in the late 1930s (he resigned in 1938 'a broken reed'¹⁹) was a major disappointment to his old associates in the Zionist movement at a time of growing British hostility to their cause, during a period of anti-British resentment in the Arab world.

On a grander scale, Churchill rarely wavered in his public advocacy of Zionism, starting when he was a Liberal Colonial Secretary in the early 1920s, after his return to the Conservative party in 1924, and until the end of his political career. However, apart from providing valuable propaganda for Zionists who proudly boasted of the great war leader's support for their cause; his strong opposition to the White Paper policy within the wartime cabinet; and his role in pushing through the belated proposal for a Jewish fighting force in September 1944, Churchill made almost no attempt to use his dominance of British politics or his moral stature for the practical benefit of Zionism. Even taking into account the pressing demands of wartime leadership, this is striking for a man who declared during a 1954 tour of the United States: 'I am a Zionist, let me make that clear . . . I think it is a wonderful thing'.²⁰

In the last years of the Mandate there was a vociferous and organized attempt by Gentile anti-Zionists to prevent the creation of a Jewish State and Conservatives played an important role in this. Sir Edward Spears, Conservative MP for Carlisle 1931-1945, was the pre-eminent anti-Zionist in England in the post-war era. The organs of the British Zionist movement such as the *Gates of Zion* and the *Zionist Review* constantly admonished him and portrayed him as a 'notorious anti-Zionist and champion of Arab feudalism' and a 'man prepared to defend the point of view of the extreme Arab nationalist against all comers, and apparently at any sacrifice',²¹ while the *Jewish Chronicle*, the flagship paper of Anglo-Jewry, viewed him as both the most open and public opponent of Zionism and 'a Jew-hater'.²² Yet

Spears merits only a single reference in the entire work and that is in regard to his pre-war protest in the House against the Nazi treatment of Jews of British nationality (p. 126).²³ Defries does not even mention that, in February 1945, Spears founded the Middle East Parliamentary Committee (the MEPC) which the Zionists viewed as home to 'most of the opponents of the Jewish national home . . . [and a] . . . committee actively engaged against Zionist aspirations'.²⁴

Spears, like many of his anti-Zionist contemporaries in the Conservative party (including Ralph Beaumont, Henry Longhurst, and Pierre Loftus) lost his seat in the 1945 Labour landslide. In August 1945 he founded the Committee for Arab Affairs so that he and his former colleagues could continue their anti-Zionist efforts, or as Ralph Beaumont wrote to him eagerly: 'the idea of forming a Middle East committee outside parliament is a very good one and it will enable us who have been flung out of the House to keep in touch with those who are still in on the Middle East problem'.²⁵ That Committee also included most of the leading Conservative anti-Zionist MPs — E. H. Keeling, Kenneth Pickthorn, Sir Peter MacDonald, Commander Peter Agnew, and Victor Raikes — among its 40 prominent members.²⁶ Moreover, it provided a forum for present and former Conservative MPs to organize their anti-Zionist efforts with anti-Zionist Labour MPs (such as Richard Rapier Stokes) as well as former and serving members of the government and the Palestine administration such as Sir Harold MacMichael (High Commissioner for Palestine, 1938–44); Lord Altrincham (formerly Sir Edward Grigg) who had replaced the assassinated Lord Moyne as British Minister Resident in the Middle East; and Earl Winterton, British representative of the Inter-governmental Committee for Refugees, 1938–1945, and founder of the pro-Arab parliamentary committee in the House in 1945. Indeed, like Spears, Winterton was a particular *bête noire* of Anglo-Jewry in those years and the *Jewish Chronicle* paid so much attention to his anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish statements that he took the unusual step of writing to the paper in 1946 to ask why they reported on him every time he spoke in parliament.²⁷

Defries could also have paid some attention to the group of Jewish Conservative anti-Zionist MPs such as Sir Jack Brunel Cohen (Conservative MP for Fairfield, in Liverpool, 1918–1931), Daniel Lipson (Independent Conservative MP for Cheltenham, 1937–1950), and Colonel Louis Gluckstein (Conservative MP for Nottingham East, 1931–1945) who were among the most outspoken anti-Zionists in the House before, during, and after the Second World War. Indeed, the outspoken anti-Zionism of Gluckstein (who had voted in favour of the White Paper in 1939) led Professor Selig Brodetsky, the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and a leading Zionist, to reprimand him in 1942 that he had not

been elected MP for Nottingham 'to intervene with the government on Jewish questions or to represent Jewish interests in public'.²⁸

Lipson had not voted in favour of the White Paper but had supported the Land Transfer Regulations of 1940 which restricted the purchase of land by Jews in Palestine. By 1945 he was the most outspoken Jewish anti-Zionist in the House. One such speech resulted in an editorial in the *Jewish Chronicle* attacking his 'nauseating role' and his 'snivelling contemptible meanness'.²⁹ On another occasion a Jewish Labour MP, Lieutenant-Colonel Harry Morris, commented about Lipson during a 1946 Parliamentary debate: 'I know the honourable gentleman very well. I know his background ... I know his family ... his father would turn in his grave if he could have heard his son speak as he did in this House'.³⁰

Apart from leading the way with his unyielding anti-Zionism, Lipson had the distinction of being the only Jewish Conservative in the post-war parliament; he sat as an Independent Conservative because the Cheltenham Conservative Association had refused to adopt him as its candidate when he first ran in 1937. This low ebb in Jewish representation within the Conservative parliamentary party may surprise those readers who lived through the Thatcher era with its high-profile Jewish ministers, as well as those who know of the esteem which Queen Victoria had for Sir Moses Montefiore or of the rise of Benjamin Disraeli to the foremost political office in the country. But the minor role of Jews in the Conservative party between 1900 and 1950 had little in common with the success of Jewish politicians in the 1990s (one should remember the quip that during the Thatcher era there were more old Estonians than old Etonians in the cabinet) or the earlier achievement of Disraeli (in Churchill's words) 'the Jew Prime Minister of England, and leader of the Conservative party'.³¹ From 1900 to 1950, 28 Jewish MPs were elected as Conservatives. Of these only Walter Rothschild, Lionel de Rothschild, and Sir Isadore Salmon played a significant role in Anglo-Jewish communal affairs and only Samuel Finburgh could be called an outspoken promoter of Jewish causes in Parliament, while only Sir Arthur Samuel (financial secretary to the treasury in 1927) and Sir Philip Sassoon (first commissioner of works, in 1937) attained ministerial rank. All this is far less impressive than the achievements of Jewish Liberal politicians in the same years: Lord Melchett (Sir Alfred Mond); Edwin Montagu; Herbert Samuel; and the Marquis of Reading (Rufus Isaacs) played a far greater role within their party, and in governing the country, than did their Conservative contemporaries. Indeed, in their positions as Home and Foreign Secretary respectively, Samuel and Reading had the unusual distinction of being the only two Liberal cabinet members in the 1931 National Government.

In charting all these developments, Harry Defries has provided a valuable and informative work on a long-neglected subject. His decision to avoid more in-depth examinations of some of the issues he has raised is to be regretted but his pioneering effort has paved the way (even whetted the appetite) for more specialized studies on Conservative Zionism and anti-Zionism during the British Mandate and on Anglo-Jewish attitudes in the Conservative party. It is very sad that his early death has meant that he was not to be the person to undertake that research.

NOTES

¹ David Vital, *Zionism: The Crucial Phase*, Oxford, 1987, p. 103.

² See Captain Henry Longhurst to Sir Edward Spears, 3 June 1946, Box 6/4 Spears Papers, Middle East Centre, St Antony's College, Oxford University [hereafter SPSP].

³ Colin Holmes, 'J. A. Hobson and the Jews', in Colin Holmes (ed.), *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society*, London, 1978, p. 126.

⁴ According to recent research Cassel was probably the wealthiest Jew in Britain on his death in 1921, leaving an astronomic £7,333,000. See William Rubinstein's highly informative paper 'Jewish top-wealth-holders in Britain, 1809–1909', *Jewish Historical Studies, Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, vol. 37, 2001, pp. 133–161, p. 137.

⁵ Rt. Hon. Winston S. Churchill, 'Zionism versus Bolshevism: A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People', *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, 8 February 1920.

⁶ John Ramsden, *An Appetite for Power: A History of the Conservative Party Since 1830*, London, 1998, p. 82.

⁷ Louise London, *Whitehall and the Jews, 1933–1948: British Immigration Policy and the Holocaust*, Cambridge, 2000.

⁸ David Gilmour, *Curzon*, London, 1995, p. 480.

⁹ In recent years the issue of Amery's Jewish background has been raised by the historian William Rubinstein and has been developed by other historians such as Wm Roger Louis. For an analysis of the reasons why Amery kept his religious background a secret, see William Rubinstein 'Leo Amery and the Post-War World, 1945–1955', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, vol. 30, no. 3, September 2002, pp. 71–90.

¹⁰ The only exceptions being civil servants Lord Hardinge at the Foreign Office and Sir Maurice Hankey, secretary of the War cabinet and the Committee for Imperial Defence; Liberals Lloyd George and Edwin Montagu; the Labour Party's George Barnes; and South African General Jan Smuts who represented imperial interests.

¹¹ Meyer Verete, 'The Balfour Declaration and its Makers', *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 6, no. 1, January 1970, pp. 48–76, p. 66.

¹² See Lady Cynthia Asquith, *Diaries, 1915–1918*, London, 1968, p. 360.

¹³ See Christopher Mayhew (with Christopher Adams), *Publish it not ... The Middle East Cover Up*, London, 1975, p. 43. Mayhew was Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign Office in the post-war Attlee Government. He also founded, together with Conservative MPs Ian Gilmour and Dennis Walters and several other public figures, the Council for the Advancement of Arab-

British Understanding in 1969. See also Mayhew's *Time to Explain*, London, 1987.

¹⁴ D. Z. Gillon, 'The Antecedents of the Balfour Declaration', *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, May 1969, pp. 131-150, p. 131. For a similar view, see Jehuda Reinharz, 'The Balfour Declaration in Historical Perspective', in Jehuda Reinharz and Anita Shapira (eds.), *Essential Papers on Zionism*, New York, 1996, p. 602.

¹⁵ David Cesarani, 'Anti-Zionist Politics and Political Anti-Semitism in Britain, 1920-1924', *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1989, p. 40.

¹⁶ See J. M. N. Jeffries, *The Palestine Deception: A Daily Mail Enquiry on the Spot*, London, 1923.

¹⁷ Izzat Tannous, *The Palestinians: A Detailed Documented Eye Witness History of Palestine Under the Mandate*, New York, 1988, pp. 218-219.

¹⁸ *Palestine, The Reality*, London, 1939.

¹⁹ Cited in Norman Rose, 'The Debate on Partition, 1937-1938: The Anglo-Zionist Aspect II. The Withdrawal', *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 7, no. 1, January 1971, p. 3.

²⁰ See 'Report on Churchill in America', Summer 1954, PRO/FO 371/11072.

²¹ C. C. Aronsfeld, 'The Captivity of Zion', *Gates of Zion*, vol. 2, no. 2, January 1948, p. 28 and Mrs Edgar Dugdale, 'The Time has Come', *Zionist Review*, 23 February 1945, p. 5.

²² See *Jewish Chronicle*, 9 February 1945, p. 12 and 24 May 1946, p. 10.

²³ Defries spells his name Speirs, but as Max Egremont notes in his biography, he had changed the spelling to Spears in 1918 in order to appear more English. See Egremont's, *Under Two Flags: The Life of Major General Sir Edward Spears*, London, 1997, p. 1.

²⁴ *New Judea*, February-March 1945, p. 72.

²⁵ See Beaumont to Spears, 15 August 1945, Box 6/3, SPSP.

²⁶ See minutes of CAA meeting, 9 May 1946, 6/2, SPSP. Non-parliamentarians who joined the committee included Sir Ronald Storrs; Dr Maud Royden Shaw; Sir John Hope-Simpson; Colonel Stewart Newcombe; and the journalist Nevill Barbour.

²⁷ See 'Winterton Again?', *Jewish Chronicle*, 10 May 1946, p. 5.

²⁸ See Selig Brodetsky to D. I. Sandelson, 13 October 1942, MS 119 AJ3 151, Brodetsky Papers, Special Collection, Parkes Library, University of Southampton.

²⁹ See *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 March 1946, p. 10.

³⁰ See Palestine Debate, 21 February 1946, Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 419, 11 February-1 March 1946, p. 1394.

³¹ Churchill, op. cit. in note 5 above.

BOOK REVIEWS

DONALD BLOXHAM, *Genocide on Trial: War Crimes Trials and the Formation of Holocaust History and Memory*, xix + 273 pp, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001; paperback edition, 2003, £14.99.

This book is about the role of the Nuremberg Trials of 1945–1946 in the formulation of our common notions of the Nazi genocide. This is an important topic, which has been meticulously researched and argued. Bloxham claims that the Nuremberg Trials (and other post-war crimes trials, such as the Belsen trial of Joseph Kramer) distorted public understanding of the Holocaust. That was the case especially in Britain, in particular by consistently downplaying the centrality of the extermination of the Jews in the catalogue of Nazi crimes and in forcing a concentration on Hitler and a handful of other top Nazis in ordering these crimes — rather than on the role of thousands of ‘ordinary’ Germans and their associates.

Moreover, the war crimes trials were ended quickly soon after Nuremberg, with the result that tens of thousands escaped justice apart from those who were acquitted. Bloxham links acceptance of ‘a Nuremberg historiography of the Holocaust’ with the so-called ‘intentionalist’ interpretation of these events — that Hitler had mass murder in mind from the first and was centrally responsible for its adoption as policy — rather than the (to him) more subtle and convincing ‘functionalist’ interpretation. That interpretation sees the killings in Russia from June 1941, which set the stage for the attempt to exterminate European Jewry, as welling up chiefly from middle-ranking Nazi officials rather than being imposed from the top down. Bloxham also argues that Nuremberg distorted the essence of Nazi genocidal bestiality; he asserts: ‘for every piece of the mosaic that was presented at Nuremberg and elsewhere, another was missing’ (p. 3).

Bloxham’s book is a serious, well-researched, and wide-ranging study, as well as being well argued. The author is right to draw attention to the complex role of Jewish slave labour (pp. 208–220), about which there are various shades of interpretation. As he repeatedly notes, Nuremberg was not intended to be a trial about genocide: the first article of indictment against the defendants was that they had engaged in ‘crimes against peace . . . waging a war of aggression . . .’. That is not surprising, since few of the Nuremberg defendants (Hans

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

Frank and possibly Wilhelm Keitel being the most likely exceptions) had any direct connection with the Holocaust, especially with the actual killing process. However, Hermann Goering, Joachim von Ribbentrop, and the other most senior officials accused, certainly helped to initiate an aggressive war. But while the Nuremberg trial did not begin primarily as a trial about the Holocaust, it quickly came to be precisely that, with the documentary and film evidence about genocide coming to overwhelm everything else, such that today few remember it as anything else.

The Allies were certainly misguided not to have placed someone like Rudolf Hoess, the commandant of Auschwitz, on trial at Nuremberg; but it must be remembered that those most responsible for genocide, above all (obviously) Adolf Hitler but also Heinrich Himmler and Reinhard Heydrich, were already dead or (in the case of Adolf Eichmann) missing. In the decade or so after the Second World War, only a few significant works of scholarship or testimony were published to contribute to our understanding of the Holocaust — in contrast to the considerable number of volumes produced later. However, it is unconvincing to blame Nuremberg for the earlier situation since it was indeed Nuremberg which provided us with most of the data then available.

Bloxham's rejection of intentionalism in favour of functionalism is debatable: it neglects the central role which Adolf Hitler must surely have had in ordering the Holocaust — however much one might question the very doubtful notion that he had genocide in mind all along. Bloxham's interpretation is not as convincing as the view of historians such as Michael Marrus about the very positive effects of Nuremberg, in spite of the undoubted inherent failings of an international trial conducted by four rival great powers immediately after the Second World War.

WILLIAM D. RUBINSTEIN

JOAN COCKS, *Passion and Paradox: Intellectuals Confront the National Question*, xi + 220 pp., Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2002, n.p.

This book is a critique of modern notions and theories of nationalism as viewed through the eyes of a number of important theorists of the subject, among them radicals such as Karl Marx, Rosa Luxemburg, and Hannah Arendt; liberals such as Isaiah Berlin; and post-colonial writers such as Edward Said and V. S. Naipaul. Joan Cocks, who states that she is Jewish and an opponent of nationalism *per se* (at least in theory) dwells to a considerable extent on Jewish issues and

the question of Zionism, examining both sympathetic writers such as Sir Isaiah Berlin and Sir Lewis Namier and critics such as Edward Said. Central to her view, it would seem, is her realization of the apparent paradox that most intellectuals, even those who oppose nationalism from universalistic principles, often wind up by endorsing and supporting one or other nationalistic creed.

However, it is not entirely clear that the author has succeeded at producing any sort of coherent or general critique of nationalism or its supporters. She is an avowed opponent of nationalism, endorsing what she terms the 'new cosmopolitanism' — although mindful that the nationalisms of small nations are what once would have been termed 'progressive'. She is also an opponent of Zionism, apologizing, however, for attacking through Zionism 'the deformations that occur whenever any ethnic or religious identity becomes the basis of a political community' (p. ix). In other words, it is far from clear wherein lies the ultimate basis of her objection to nationalism, nor why (except from a more fundamental left-wing perspective) she is so hostile to it. Nationalism as a destructive force is never compared, for example, with other ideological forces in the modern world such as socialism or religious fundamentalism.

Her views on Zionism are both highly derivative — she gives no evidence of having studied the Zionist classics — and often biased, being taken in the main from sources hostile to the movement. Indeed, apart from a fairly limited body of writings derived from sociology and political theory, her knowledge appears to be surprisingly limited. For instance, she devotes several pages to discussing 'L. B. Namier'; but her views on Namier appear to be wholly derived from reading Isaiah Berlin's essay on that great historian and Zionist. She also appears to know very little about Namier's life or his writings or about his seminal place in modern British historiography.

These faults go hand-in-hand with what could be described as a considerable misunderstanding of Zionism, which was not merely a response to European antisemitism but an attempt to 'normalize' the Jewish social structure and to place the Jews on an equal footing with the Ecuadorians and the Portuguese, whose right to a nation-state of their own no one denied. Nor does she seem to be aware that Zionism as an ideology was only one among a number of other 'competing' Jewish ideologies at the time, such as Bund Socialism. Zionism succeeded in large measure simply because the Holocaust and other horrors of twentieth-century life made its competitors both unviable and unpopular.

Of course, nationalisms are destructive forces, quite arguably the most destructive ideologies in the modern world. But, as Joan Cocks rightly notes, they provide a kind of rough justice in giving power and meaning to the powerless. If statelessness is good for the Jews,

it is surely also very good for the Palestinians — to say nothing of the Tibetans, the Kurds, and the Bosnian Muslims. Although the author is fully aware of the paradoxes at the heart of nationalism, including both its universal appeal and its liberating nature, she never seems to relinquish her bias against the entire concept.

WILLIAM D. RUBINSTEIN

ISRAEL FINESTEIN, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000*, xiv + 322 pp., Parkes-Wiener Series on Jewish Studies, Vallentine Mitchell, London and Portland, Oregon, 2002, paperback £17.50 (hardback, £35.00).

This is the third volume of Israel Finestein's essays. One of the editors of the Series in which it is published is Professor Tony Kushner; he states on the back cover of the paperback edition:

The . . . essays take us from the late eighteenth to the start of the twenty-first century and cover ground as varied as mass social history through to elite politics. They are united, however, by the attention to detail, constant insight and genuine joy in discovery, from an author who has been both an excellent historian and a leading figure within British Jewry for half a century.

A sceptical reviewer might be tempted to say that the editor of the Series 'would say that, wouldn't he?' However, in this case, the praise is fully justified. Israel Finestein has been closely involved for more than five decades as a historian of Anglo-Jewry. He is an observant Jew in more senses than one: he adheres to the precepts of Orthodox Jewry, observing the Sabbath and the laws of *kashrut*; but he also observes shrewdly the politics and stratagems of Anglo-Jewry's establishment. He has been well qualified to do so: the press release of this book tells us that he became a member of the Board of Deputies of British Jews in 1945; by 1991 he was elected President of that Board. He is a Queen's Counsel and became a Crown Court judge in 1972, retiring in 1987, but found time during those years to be an active historian and to occupy positions in various communal institutions as a committee member, vice-president, or chairman.

Inevitably, his prose sometimes reflects his judicial background. In the first page of his Introduction he states that a conference was held in Oxford and that the first chapter is based on his 'address thereat'; in the next sentence he says that the Institute for Jewish Policy Research 'adopted therefrom as the title . . .'. On the other hand, this judicial background is valuable because it has enabled him to be objective and analytical as well as restrained in his criticisms. If he believes that a critical approach is valid, he may hesitate to say

so himself but he will quote another scholar's criticism. In the short twelfth chapter on Isaiah Berlin (first published in 1999 as a review of an anthology of essays by Isaiah Berlin) he quotes A. L. Rowse's comment that Berlin was 'unintelligible in several languages' and adds that although that was an unfair remark, it 'makes a point. To read Berlin seriously calls for stamina' and Finestein then refers to Berlin's involved sentences with 'protracted , unbracketed parentheses' (p. 249). Israel Finestein is quite right, and so up to a point was Rowse. They were both Fellows of All Souls, as was from 1970 until his death in 1975, Maurice Freedman, one of the founding editors of *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*. Many who heard Isaiah Berlin's BBC broadcasts several decades ago certainly had difficulty in understanding him (and so did I sometimes, both in Oxford and in London). But Finestein is also generous in his praise of Berlin's intellect, stating that one is 'left somewhat enriched by the strenuous intellectual adventure which each essay involves' (p. 249). He ends that appreciation with a sentence that is somewhat involved but which makes good use not only of brackets but also of hyphens; he comments (p. 251) that Berlin

did not preach, but by his works he advanced the idea of the practical value — and he would not, I think, have been shy to say the moral worth — of the difficult art (it is also a science) of cultivating mutual respect amid intense differences.

The chapter on Vivian Lipman (pp. 244–248) reprints the text of the Memorial address which Finestein gave in 1990 to the Jewish Historical Society of England. It does full justice to the scholar who was an Orthodox Jew, a senior civil servant, and a distinguished historian. Vivian Lipman was dedicated and generous but also devoted to rigorous standards. Many years ago, this *Journal* sent a book on an aspect of Jewish history to an American reviewer whom the author of the book had once praised in writing. The reviewer sent a text which bordered on the libellous, harshly criticizing the author for his superficial and inadequate treatment of the subject. I was the editor of this *Journal* and there was no copy of that book readily available to me. I wrote to three historians of Jewry, in strict confidence, seeking their advice. I knew them all personally. One of them hedged, saying he was reluctant to commit himself; another asked if he could come to see me to talk about the matter and when he came, he admitted that the book was unworthy of the author — who was an established full professor of history. On the other hand, Lipman was ready to give me his considered opinion in writing; he started by saying that I had put him in a quandary because, as I knew, the author of the book was an old friend and a colleague; but with a heavy heart he had to admit that the reviewer was fully justified to

be so harshly critical. In the event, that review was published in full and the author of the book did not send a letter of complaint.

The 'personalities' who are the subjects of earlier chapters of Finest's book are Moses Montefiore, Israel Zangwill, Lucien Wolf, Selig Brodetsky, and Arthur Goodhart. The author writes with authority about the 'governance of Anglo-Jewry' in the second half of the twentieth century and about the Board of Deputies of British Jews; there is a long chapter about Hull — Finest's native town. The two-page glossary is useful but the inclusion of 'Mortara Case' between 'Mohel' and 'Rosh Hakohel' is puzzling. It is astonishing that such a learned volume, with more than 300 pages of text, should conclude with an index in such tiny print that most readers would have to use a magnifying glass to consult it. Finally, the illustrations are well-chosen and bring back to life for those who knew them Isaiah Berlin, Hugo Gryn, Vivian Lipman, and Chief Rabbi Jakobovits — among several earlier personalities of Anglo-Jewry.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

LARRY EUGENE JONES, ed., *Crossing Boundaries: The Exclusion and Inclusion of Minorities in Germany and America*, v + 266 pp., Berghahn Books, Oxford and New York, 2001, £17.00 (hardback, £47.00).

This is a collection of essays, chiefly from a conference held in Buffalo, New York, to honour Georg G. Iggers. He was a Jewish refugee academic who had written on German historiography; in America, he became actively involved in the black civil rights movement and, according to the editor, 'has done his best to break down the professional and disciplinary boundaries' in academic life.

The focus of this volume is on migration and ethnicity in the United States and in Germany and on the struggle for equal rights in both countries. There are also some reflective historiographical essays; and as in most such collections, the various essays are uneven in interest and accomplishment. Only a few — chiefly the historical ones, dealing with the German Jewish experience — are particularly valuable.

The autobiographical account by Werner T. Angress, a Jewish refugee who became a history professor in America, is notably gripping. The contribution by Ronald H. Bayor, 'Racism as Public Policy in America's Cities in the Twentieth Century' surprisingly fails to mention 'white flight' — the exodus of millions of whites from the country's inner cities, among them hundreds of thousands of Jews, chiefly in order to escape what they perceived as extraordinary levels of black crime and social disintegration in largely-black neighbour-

hoods and schools. Jewish American liberals were just as likely to participate in 'white flight' as anyone else — it may be, indeed, to a greater extent than many other groups. There is a lesson here, perhaps one more fundamental than anything conveyed in these essays.

WILLIAM D. RUBINSTEIN

ERNEST KRAUSZ and GITTA TULEA, eds., *Starting the Twenty-first Century. Sociological Reflections & Challenges*, xv + 231 pp., Sociological Papers Volume 8, Transaction Publishers for The Sociological Institute for Community Studies of Bar-Ilan University, New Brunswick and London, 2002, paperback, n.p.

This volume is a collection of eleven essays in four parts, after a brief Introduction by the editors. Three of the essays have appeared in some form in earlier publications. A Preface explains the purpose of the volume as being twofold: 'to look at some of the major changes — indeed upheavals — of the twentieth century, as well as to provide some insights into the likely future trends as we enter the new millennium' (p. vii). This quite general and somewhat vague set of themes is explained further in the first page of the Introduction. The tone is somewhat pessimistic: 'In spite of its huge technological, informational, and knowledge achievements, postmodern society at the end of the century was confronted with facts and problems that were completely unpredictable, and the actual basic patterns of explanation furnished by sociological thought are still unable to furnish a meaningful explanation for these events and their future course'. This is despite the fact that sociologists have been aware of the changes, such as the emergence of fascist and totalitarian regimes as well as the growth of 'the excluded' within the affluent consumer society. The authors run through the ideas of the Frankfurt School and of Raymond Aron and others, noting with approval Wallerstein's core and periphery ideas whereby there are states, groups, and individuals who do not have access to power and thus do not participate in the benefits of economic growth.

They have another theme. It is that the Enlightenment implied a universal ethos of a set of values and of morality which unified mankind. But modern society, 'based on the principle of reasonable thought [that] was supposed to achieve "the good society" not only by creating economic prosperity but by eliminating wars, violence, despotisms, and dogmatisms', turned out differently (p. xiii). Post-modern society is pluralistic with the danger that various schools of thought declare 'their beliefs as being the only just and right ones' (p. xiv). The Introduction ends with the rallying cry, 'we have to find

a fundamental unifying conception that should express the universal values that give men and society the honorable basis upon which the very idea of universal humanity can be sustained' (p. xv).

It might be argued that these particular themes are quite vague, too general, and omit too much. Some readers might have other issues in mind. But the Introduction is very brief and perhaps the substance of the book seeks to expand on these and other topics. This is realized in part but it has to be said that not all the essays are on the main themes. The three chapters in Part I, under the heading 'Values and Cultural Changes in the Postmodern World', continue the theoretical discussion; they are by the three most venerable and best-known of the authors, Zygmunt Bauman, S. N. Eisenstadt, and Irving Louis Horowitz. They look at different topics but continue the pessimistic tone of the Introduction; Bauman writes on 'Space in the Globalizing World' proposing a paradox: globalization, on the one hand, means that territorial sovereignty is no longer of great importance; but, on the other, people are more committed to specific places. There is now less importance attached to the possession of territory. The pursuit of free trade means that 'the direct involvement in the administration of a territory and the assumption of a direct responsibility for keeping it in order would be blatantly counter productive' (p. 9). Such wars as there are, are punitive, 'decommissioned' down the global hierarchy (the essay is hirsute with quotation marks); globalization also means the decline of the state which was once co-terminus with society, the state having the dual functions of enforcement and also of rectifying injustice. Moreover, the global world implies the decline of community. At this point he refers to the creation of new communities, well guarded behind electric fences and the like, although he deals with only one such establishment.

The tone of pessimism is continued in Eisenstadt's essay, 'Barbarism and Modernity: The Destructive Components of Modernity — The Perennial Challenge'. Since it has a wide sweep, the essay is only partly related to the themes of the title of the book. Eisenstadt states: 'Barbarism is rooted in some basic characteristics of human nature' (p. 25) but he does draw distinctions between two barbarisms — Communism and National Socialism. The former was set within the framework of the Enlightenment whereas the latter 'negated the universalistic components of the cultural program of modernity'. Within modernity, he concludes, there are destructive potentialities 'most fully manifest in the ideologization of violence, terror and wars' (p. 34).

Horowitz writes at first more positively on 'Social Science as Cultural Formation: A View from America'. Social science is now part of modern living, from social surveys of all kinds to the pervasiveness

of social benefit analysis. But he quickly refers to the current crisis in the subject, why 'so often our professional efforts fall dramatically short of expectations' (p. 38). In part this is explained by the increasing division of labour within the profession, which results in an inability to reach generalizations precisely because of the increasing specialization in its study. He explains: 'The present status of the social sciences reveals polarization between those performing book-keeping functions that do not require a theoretical grounding much less a culture, and those engaged in a mysticism that requires for evidence little else than one's own personal proclivities, biases, and experiences' (p. 43). His remedy is to suggest a return to the notion of a common culture which would, *inter alia*, negate the widespread belief that it is only with violence that conflicts can be resolved.

Part 2 is entitled 'Social Development and Policies in Contemporary Society' — which would suggest that the two chapters in it would provide an empirical base. But the first chapter is largely theoretical. It is 'Development of Applied Social Science — The World Bank Experience' and is written by Michael M. Cernea who is Senior Advisor, Social Policy and Sociology, at the World Bank. It is, perhaps, surprising that that institution has anything to do with the social sciences (apart from economics). But 'the World Bank experience' comes at the end of the chapter and is primarily a list of published reports with very brief resumé's. One typical example is 'Noneconomic social scientists have made very substantial contributions in the formulations of several of the Bank's major sector development policy statements in cooperation with technical specialities, such as the urban growth policy . . .' (p. 72). The bureaucratic speak is plain to see. Otherwise the author discusses, *inter alia*, the necessity for anthropology to move from theory and to become an applied subject. Some might think that this is hardly a novel suggestion.

However, the second chapter is indeed on an empirical subject. David Marsland writes on 'Progressing Health and Healthcare: A Positive Role for Sociology?' It is geared towards a discussion of the British National Health Service but covers a wider field. The author is well known as a critic of much of the research done on the subject and he rehearses his arguments here. He complains that there has been an over-emphasis in the research on such topics as inequality and other negative aspects of healthcare provision and policy. He criticizes some authors for their lack of methodological rigour and their objections to reform. His suggestions for a positive role for sociology include improvements in research design as well as the adoption of a more holistic approach by making use of 'the whole range of biomedical sciences . . . alongside the behavioral sciences and applied synergetically within the over-arching discipline of epidemiology' (p. 91). He explains the reason for including epidemi-

ology: its significance 'arises from its synthetic combination of causal variables in the pursuit of robust explanations of the patterning of health and illness' (p. 92). But that laudable objective is intermingled with a more polemical touch. He advocates (p. 94) a much greater role for the private sector:

Imagine supply handed over to health companies, independent and voluntary hospitals, and genuinely professional independent healthcare practitioners. Conceive of purchasing in the hands of individual consumers and their families, insurance companies, professional associations, and trade unions. Contemplate at least the possibility of those genuinely incapable of self-reliance being supported by health vouchers in choosing freely in a dynamic, high-quality, carefully regulated market. We could have just such a system within a decade, given political leadership and — instead of sabotage — positive R & D support from social scientists. Healthcare quality would improve substantially.

He quotes research findings into the workings of the independent sector in Britain, showing its positive side, but he does not consider either the familiar economic analysis of the imperfections of the market system or the difference in ethos between the public and private sectors.

Part 3 is entitled 'Societies in Transition — Eastern Europe' and its two chapters would appear to be central to the themes of the book. The first is 'Socialist and Capitalist Experiments in the Twentieth Century — The Case of Russia'. This is both descriptive and analytical and the joint authors, Rozalina Ryvkina and Leonid Kosals, provide plausible explanations for the failures of the Soviet Union and of the subsequent institution of capitalism. The Russian variation of the latter includes the notion of 'clan capitalism' defined as 'groups of business people affiliated with the state and criminal elements who exclusively control the most profitable markets and do not admit those who can produce cheaper, better quality goods' (p. 119). The authors conclude a thoughtful paper by wondering whether there will be a third social experiment in Russia if the second, capitalism, fails.

This chapter is complemented by the next one, 'Post-Communist Societies: Ten Years After.' Its author (Jerzy J. Wiatr) deals, along with Russia, with the post-1945 Eastern European countries which fell under Soviet control. He explains the differences between them in terms of the degree of totalitarianism each experienced and similarly the variations in the development of their economies. Thus the most successful countries after the end of Communism were the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia; the second — slightly less successful — were the three Baltic republics and, in the Balkans, Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, and Romania. The

third group (those that performed least well) were the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States. But all the countries suffered from a lop-sided structure; the majority were poor while there was a narrow class of highly-privileged people (tycoons, high-ranking managers, and members of the political elite) and a middle class which was also narrow. Moreover, there are limited opportunities for upward social mobility and this tends to generate social unrest. The future rests on the countries improving their economic performance and the adoption of more progressive policies of income distribution, of social services, and of education. The author notes the importance in this connection of some of these countries joining the European Union and he ends judiciously: 'The most serious political conflicts in the politics of the post-Communist era concern the direction of change. Since the outcome of these conflicts is not predetermined, at the end of the century the final shape of change remains uncertain' (p. 143).

The subject of Part 4 is 'The Jewish World: Pre- and Post-Holocaust'. Two of its four chapters look back to the past and presumably fit in with the editors' objective of studying some of the major changes of the twentieth century (as well as examining the future). Chapter 9, by Nathan Cohen, is entitled 'The Jews of Independent Poland — Linguistic and Cultural Changes'; it deals with the 20 years between the two World Wars. Whether or not the topic can be considered a 'major change' must be a matter of opinion. The chapter is primarily a discussion of the cultural (and especially the linguistic) patterns of the Jews of Poland. There were four cultural systems; the largest was the traditional one, and there were three modern, secular systems, distinguished linguistically (Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish) as well as ideologically — Socialism, Zionism, and 'various modes of integration in the society of the majority' (p. 162). The author examines critically the statistics of language in the 1931 population census, the only official data for the 20 years, but they do indicate variations between the different districts. Thus the highest linguistic assimilation was in Galicia and the lowest in the eastern districts. It was in the latter that most of the Yiddish and Hebrew educational institutions were situated. However, the general point was the growing usage of the Polish language throughout the period; the author concludes, 'it was only natural that a population under constant despair will find some consolation in the one field of life — the daily spoken language — in which, *apparently*, there was no conflict between it and the surrounding general population' (p. 172).

Another essay, mainly dealing with the past, is 'Despoliation, Reparation, Compensation: The Case of the Jews of France' by Annette Wieviorka. It is obviously about the Second World War and its aftermath and centres on the setting up of a task force on the

despoliation of French Jews, after a 1995 speech by Jacques Chirac in which he recognized the responsibility of the French state in the wartime events. The job of the task force was to 'analyze the conditions in which the properties belonging to the French Jews were confiscated or in general, purchased by fraud, violence or deception both by the occupier and the Vichy authorities between 1940 and 1944' (pp. 202-3). The author describes some of the problems involved in that work but also rehearses some of the facts of the German occupation, such as the looting of Jewish apartments, the furniture being sent to Germany for those families whose homes had been bombed. There was in addition the acute problem of Jewish survivors who, on returning to their apartments, found them occupied by others.

Eva Etzioni-Halevy argues in 'Who Rules Israel?' that the country is ruled by 'some eight or nine major, mutually interconnected elites, encompassing slightly over a thousand men and (to a lesser extent) women — out of a population of six and a quarter million people' (p. 177). They include the elected heads of government parties, and of those of the opposition, as well as the leaders of the Histadrut. In addition there are the non-elected groups — business magnates; heads of state bureaucracies; top military commanders; key people in the media; major members of the judiciary including the attorney general and the solicitor general; chief religious leaders; and a small number of individual intellectuals. Moreover, these are elitist in the sense that they are closely integrated among themselves, with links 'expressed through a circular and mutual flow of resources between them' (p. 178). They thus enhance and solidify their power — which explains in part the growing inequality in Israeli society. It is the flow of resources that matters, for unlike in the United States — where studies have shown that elites are interlocking — in Israel elites are often in conflict with each other. The author's analysis is based on the theory that a crucial feature of any democratic system is the degree of separation of its centres of power (elites) and that such separation limits the power of the elites and of the government. She traces the history of changes in Israel's government from the long period of Labour control to that of the Likud and also examines the several linkages between various elite groups — for example, the connection between the political and military leadership and that between the political and the religious elites. Labour has been more successful in forging links with the military and the Histadrut as well as with the religious leadership. But the Likud has been more successful in linking with the religious groups. She demonstrates the consequence of growing inequality in Israel. She thinks that this elite system has persisted for so long because when there have been movements for change, the leaders of these movements have been rapidly absorbed into the elites and their projects have been granted alloca-

tions from the budgets and so the movements gradually disappeared.

One of the book's most interesting chapters is by Régine Azria: 'Jewish Identities and the Diaspora — The Diaspora Paradigm Confronting Modernity'. By the 'Diaspora Paradigm' she means not just the reality in Jewish history of dispersion and exile (which are its negative aspects) but also its positive connotation — Israel's mission among the nations. It implies a return to Zion and of being 'a beacon of light to all nations'. But despite the creation of the State of Israel, most Jews continue to live in the Diaspora and those who have emigrated to Israel have 'implanted the Diaspora' there. 'Israel is thus transformed into a mosaic of Jewish Diasporas within a single country' (p. 156) since new Israelis are described as Russians, Poles, Moroccans, for example, according to their country of origin. However, this seems to me to meander from the chapter's main point, which is that 'both Israel and the Diaspora are needed to form a unique entity: Judaism' (p. 151).

It will be evident from my comments that the volume is something of a ragbag, a somewhat miscellaneous collection of pieces not all of them clearly connected to the stated main themes set out by the editors. Moreover, as mentioned above, those themes may seem to be a little outdated. The chapters were written before the September 2001 attack on the World Trade Centre and on Washington and in some cases before the Intifada. If these events had been taken into account, the viewpoints might have been slightly different.

HAROLD POLLINS

HAROLD POLLINS and VIC ROSEWARNE, *Louis Kyezor: 'The King of Whitton' c. 1796–1869*, ii + 41 pp., Paper Number 82, Borough of Twickenham Local History Society, November 2002, £5.00 inclusive of postage.

This slim book relates, with commendable clarity and some wit, the extraordinary story of Louis Kyezor. His date of birth has had to be estimated, and he is recorded in the 1861 census as having been born in Frankfurt but 'the 1851 census gives Cambridge as his place of origin' (p. 2). He was said to be illiterate, yet he made many speeches and wrote many letters and although the latter could of course have been written on his instructions, the reported speeches to many audiences were obviously his own utterances since they were not all well rehearsed. From obscure beginnings (which the authors have taken great pains to document by going through census records, *Jewish Chronicle* nineteenth-century issues, local newspapers, such as the *Surrey Comet*, the *Middlesex Chronicle*, the *West Middlesex Herald*,

etc.) he rose to become a prosperous property developer, acquiring cottages and more substantial houses; an Ordnance Survey Map of 1863 showed 'Kyezor Terrace' off the Hounslow Road.

His death was an event marked by extensive reporting and his funeral was attended by the Vicar of Whitton and by members of West Middlesex Rifle Volunteers. He had taken 'a prominent part in the social activities of the Volunteers' (p. 25) and in 1865 'a splendid piece of plate' was given to him at a ceremony, the plate bearing the inscription: 'Presented to Louis Kyezor, Esq., by the ladies connected with the 16th Rifles, as a slight token of esteem and regard' (p. 26). Four years later, in 1869, Kyezor was killed by a disreputable tenant, who was a habitual drunk and who neglected his house 'which was an eyesore to the neighbourhood' (p. 31). *The Times* reported the death as well as the proceedings of the inquest and two days after Kyezor was buried that newspaper 'printed a long letter from . . . the Vicar of Whitton . . . It was a fulsome eulogy' (p. 1). Kyezor's 'involvement in Jewish affairs' is recorded; he opposed a proposal to reduce the price of the *Jewish Chronicle* on the grounds that 'the aristocracy of the Jews' would cease buying a cheaper newspaper. His first wife died in 1839; ten years later he married a widow and the wedding ceremony was conducted by Dr N. M. Adler, the Chief Rabbi, under the auspices of the Maiden Lane Synagogue. (Kyezor was buried in that synagogue's cemetery in 1869.)

In Whitton, he had energetically worked for the building of a local church and he was chairman of the Whitton branch of the Twickenham Ratepayers Association; he attacked Twickenham for not apportioning sufficient funds from charitable bequests for the benefit of the poor of Whitton. However, his benefactions for the Christian inhabitants of Whitton were in no way a means for him to gloss over the fact of his being born a Jew since he insisted, at a Coroner's inquest in the village, on taking his oath as a juryman on the Old Testament: he had brought his own Old Testament copy and maintained that he had done so on an earlier occasion when he had been foreman of a jury.

This little publication is a delightful portrait of an extraordinary character whose achievements were recorded in the long letter from the Vicar of Whitton published in *The Times* on 16 October 1869. It stated that Louis Kyezor, a 'poor, unlettered Jew was one of the best friends to Christianity in Whitton, and . . . I should say it will be a long time before we look upon his like again. He was a capable orator, barring some amusing deviations from the recognized modes of using the Queen's English.' He had several children who sometimes caused him sorrow and the authors in a section entitled 'A Sad Postscript' record the disputes of Kyezor's heirs.

It is refreshing to read a short work of scholarship, based on a

great deal of historical research, with interesting illustrations and a family tree, telling a fascinating story of an eccentric Victorian Jew in plain language and with occasional gentle irony. For an editor, that is a welcome change from articles and books replete with sociological jargon but with little substance.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

MILTON SHAIN and RICHARD MENDELSON, eds., *Memories, Realities and Dreams. Aspects of the South African Jewish Experience*, 234 pp., Jonathan Ball Publishers, Johannesburg and Cape Town, 2002, R149.95 (paperback).

In 1994 South Africa became a democracy and six years later a colloquium was held at the Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town, in association with the new South African Jewish Museum. The papers given on that occasion, together with another one, are collected and published in this book. Its eight chapters, dealing with the Jewish experience in South Africa, follow a brief Introduction by the editors.

The Jewish community of South Africa was built up largely by Litvaks (Jews from Lithuania) who arrived in the late nineteenth century; their later immigration was severely restricted by the Quota Act of 1930. Although the history of these migrants is in many ways similar to that of Eastern Europeans who emigrated to other countries — the USA, Britain, Australia, and Canada — the South African Jewish experience was enormously influenced by the country's particular circumstances, viz the existence of non-white populations — the Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds. Inevitably, much of the book is devoted to a consideration of the relationship between the Jews and the other groups and, especially, the attitude of the whites towards the oppressed groups during the apartheid regime.

The first essay chronologically is the longest; it is the one which was not given at the colloquium and its title is 'Beyond the Pale: Jewish Immigration and the South African Left'. It occupies almost a third of the main text. The author, James T. Campbell, explores the background to migration and examines the early years of settlement in South Africa but places his discussion in a more modern setting, that of the case of Percy Yutar. He was the Jewish state attorney who at the 1963 Rivonia trial prosecuted Nelson Mandela and other leaders of the national liberation movement. It was argued by some that Yutar, acting in the traditional Jewish role of intercessor, was seeking 'to deflect Afrikaner Nationalist antisemitism through conspicuous displays of loyalty to the apartheid regime' (p. 97). At the time,

Yutar was applauded by the South African Jewish establishment and he was elected president of the United Hebrew Congregation, Johannesburg's largest Orthodox synagogue. Others, however, saw him (and continue to see him) as wrongly acting in complicity with the apartheid regime. Yutar was rewarded by being appointed Attorney General of the Orange Free State and later of Transvaal, 'unprecedented attainments for a Jew' (p. 97).

Campbell looks at the subject through an examination of four leading Jewish anti-apartheid activists and in so doing paints their various backgrounds. While he makes the point that most South African Jews, like most white South Africans, acquiesced in apartheid there is no doubt that Jews were over-represented in the South African opposition. He argues that this arose as a consequence of the peculiar background of South Africa (and also, in the case of the four whom he studied, their singular family histories.)

I suppose it is inevitable, given the history of apartheid and of the struggle against it, and the role of individual Jews in it, that so much attention should be given in this book to that topic. Two other essays are devoted to it and it surfaces in some of the other contributions. Gideon Shimoni writes on 'Accounting for Jewish Radicals in Apartheid South Africa' and Glenn Frankel's chapter is 'The Road to Rivonia: *Jewish Radicals and the Cost of Conscience in White South Africa*'. Both of these are similar to Campbell's in being largely biographical accounts of some of the leading opponents of apartheid but most of the essays touch on it. Another theme in several of the essays is the neutrality of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies. One explanation of the Board's stance is described in this way: 'as the community contained many differing political opinions, it, as the representative body, could not be seen to prefer one political stance over another' (p. 201). This was buttressed by another justification by the Board that it was non-political and did not enter that area except for matters which specifically affected the Jewish community.

Other essays deal with different aspects of the South African Jewish experience. Richard Mendelsohn writes on 'The Boer War, The Great War, and the Shaping of South African Jewish Loyalties'. In the first of these wars, most of South Africa's Jews, in the larger urban centres of the infant community, were not greatly affected; but those in the rural areas suffered considerably, along with their Boer and black neighbours, for it was in the countryside that the war was fought. But since for the most part they were foreign subjects, they were not sent to the concentration camps which the British created to house those displaced by the clearing of the countryside. Instead, Jews who were forced off the land went to the towns and as a result did not share the resultant anti-British bitterness of Afrikaner nationalism. It is true that some Jews fought on the side of the Boers and many more on the

British side, but the majority who abstained did not attract adverse comment. The Jews welcomed the British victory and the imposition of British authority over the whole country because they valued the religious tolerance that accompanied it compared with the restrictiveness of the Calvinistic Boers. In the First World War, the Jewish experience was different. For one thing, there was their anxiety about the fate of those left behind in Eastern Europe where fighting was taking place. Much money was raised for relief, although there were differences in the response to these efforts between the Russian and the older-established English Jews. Such differences were reflected over the question of recruitment. The English Jews volunteered in great numbers for the army whereas the immigrants, it was alleged, were much less enthusiastic. The author mentions the absence of reliable statistics on the subject of immigrant recruitment but thinks that any reluctance can be readily explained. At least in part this was due to Britain's alliance with Tsarist Russia — this was also said to be the reason why Russian immigrants in Britain failed to join the army. There were divisions within the Jewish community between those who agreed that Russian Jews were failing in their duty and those who denied it and said that Jews were volunteering at least as much as the general population. The point is that 'the First World War taught South African Jewry the necessity of embracing [public loyalty] enthusiastically and unconditionally, lest the Jewish community be singled out for unflattering and uncomfortable public attention' (p. 58). Mendelsohn adds (p. 59):

Thus the alarming Jewish communal experience of the Great War was responsible to a significant degree for the enthusiastic embrace by South African Jewry during the interwar period of new local loyalties which were so manifest by the outbreak of the next war in 1939; that the intense South African patriotism that became so much part of the South African Jewish identity in the mid-twentieth century was at least in part a defensive reaction to the agonising hostility that Jews had experienced during the First World War.

This conclusion is agreeably consonant with the notion of Jewish acceptance of apartheid. A different aspect of South African Jewish history is examined by Joseph Sherman. In 'Between Ideology and Indifference: *The Destruction of Yiddish in South Africa*', he angrily examines the second part of his title. The 'ideology' refers to two developments. The first was the emphasis given by upwardly-mobile immigrants to learning the English language and the second was the great importance which Zionism occupied with the resulting emphasis on Modern Hebrew and the opposition to Yiddish. By 'indifference' he means the lack of interest in supporting Yiddish from among Yiddish-speakers. He refers, *inter alia*, to the rich Yiddish literature which was produced in South Africa.

The relations between the Jews and the majority whites are explored in several of the chapters. The novelist Dan Jacobson, in an autobiographical piece, 'Growing Up Jewish', describes his childhood mainly in the 1930s in the small Jewish community of Kimberley. He prepares a balance sheet of advantages and disadvantages; the former includes such matters as the importance of family, and the involvement in world events — kinship with Jews worldwide, for example, as well as, surprisingly, membership of the British Empire and Commonwealth. The disadvantages were antisemitism and the fact that the Jews were only one rung higher than the lowest in society, the poor whites. The essay by Marcia Leveson is mainly concerned with South African writers. She states that 'in the writing of both Jews and gentiles, both whites and blacks, the Jew has been portrayed, either positively, but more often negatively, as an outsider' (p. 61). She also considers the effect of the changed circumstances of the new South Africa, whether or not the ways in which Jews are portrayed will henceforth alter owing to 'the taboo on too-explicit treatment of racial difference . . . [for] legislation bans South African citizens of whatever race, colour or creed from being perceived as outsider or other' (p. 75).

Inevitably she touches on antisemitism, which is the subject of Milton Shain's essay: '“If It Was So Good, Why Was It So Bad?” *The Memories and Realities of Antisemitism in South Africa, Past and Present*'. The significance of the title arises from discussions with various audiences about his book, *The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa*. The 'thrust of my lecture would be undermined by personal reminiscences in which members of the audience would recall nothing but the warmth of the host population' (p. 77). He also includes references to earlier published histories of South African Jewry which ignored evidences of antisemitism. The essay counters these views by means of a run-through of the changing images of antisemitism in South Africa from the earliest times — from the poor, Yiddish-speaking immigrant as well as the rich capitalist at the time of the Boer War, to accusations of lack of patriotism in the First World War, to the growth of indigenous fascist groups in the 1930s and 1940s and to the improvement as a result of Israeli-South African co-operation. It includes also negative attitudes of some black writers as well as those in very recent Muslim writings.

This collection of essays, although apparently disparate, is an excellent discussion of South African Jewish life and includes important correctives to some earlier views on the community's history. The descriptions are clear and the analyses are well founded. The book is well printed and well produced, but there is no index.

HAROLD POLLINS

RENEE ROSE SHIELD, *Diamond Stories. Enduring change on 47th street*, xiii + 233 pp., Cornell University Press, Ithaca & London, 2002, £19.95 (hardback).

Diamond Stories is an excellent study, by an anthropologist, of the diamond industry in New York. Since I myself had been involved in the diamond trade in Antwerp, before deciding to become an anthropologist, I was able to appreciate the author's insight. She tells us in her Preface (p. ix) that she observed the Jewish milieu of New York's manufacturers and dealers 'through the lens of a person linked to and separated from this world'. She adds:

As a cultural anthropologist and the niece and cousin of several New York diamond manufacturers and dealers, I asked them to allow me entrée and they graciously agreed.

She was thus able to penetrate that small secretive world; to watch the various procedures; and to listen to the serious conversations as well as to the light-hearted and witty jokes and repartees.

The result is a remarkably detailed description of Manhattan's diamond world, centred in the Diamond Dealers Club of Manhattan's 47th Street. She acknowledges the great help she received from numerous relatives and others, and emerges as a sensitive researcher who clearly won the confidence of both family members and strangers. She gives us a wealth of information on the history of the diamond enterprises which expanded (mainly after the Second World War in New York) as well as on the crucial role of De Beers, which for more than a century has controlled to a large extent the production of rough diamonds.

There are several pages, in the chapter following the Introduction, about the structure and variety of rough diamonds, the mining, the manufacture, and the valuation of the gems, as well as 'the role of the Jews in the diamond trade, and the role of diamonds in conflicts, particularly in recent decades' (p. 6). A diamond bourse — such as the one in New York or in Antwerp — is at the crossroad; it is an essential link between the start of the journey at the mines (mainly in Africa) and the end at the place of manufacture of the cut and polished diamond. That place may be Antwerp, or New York, or a town in India or Israel, or elsewhere. The diamonds will then be sold to a vast number of individuals scattered throughout the globe.

Jews have been active for centuries in the trade and manufacture of diamonds. Some may not be aware that Spinoza had been once a lens grinder and polisher in Amsterdam, using diamonds for his tools (Rose Shield does not refer to that). After the Second World War, the New York diamond industry, in which a large proportion were Jews (as had been the case earlier in Amsterdam and in Antwerp)

grew in importance. The author tells us that in the 1930s some Antwerp Jewish families (including her own) emigrated to New York and continued their diamond trade there. The Diamond Dealers Club, founded in the downtown area of the Bowery in 1931, moved in the mid-1940s to 47th Street, where it became 'the central marketplace for wholesale diamond dealings in New York' (p. 2) and the author was able to witness transactions when few words were spoken as diamonds were sold or bought — or returned by brokers who had failed to make the expected sale. She describes vividly the patterns of trade, of bargaining, and of the light banter which is in many ways reminiscent of Oriental bazaars.

After the Second World War, hassidim became very active in New York (as in Antwerp), mainly as diamond cutters and brokers. I would have welcomed more details about the hassidic presence in the market place. However, that of course would warrant a separate piece of research and it is to be hoped that Rose Shield will consider such a project and publish the results.

The Antwerp immigrants of the thirties helped to establish the 47th Street Diamond Dealers Club and some of these pioneers were still active in that centre when in their eighties and even occasionally in their nineties — not because of the necessity of earning a living but because they were wedded to their routine in which their identity was founded. There are excellent photographs, some of which well illustrate the historical aspects of the diamond industry. Rose Shield also deals with the presence of women in that milieu: it was only in 1980 that the misogynous diamond bourse was compelled by American anti-discrimination legislation to grant full access to female traders and brokers. Only a few women had been exceptionally granted that privilege before.

Other changes occurred in the 1970s: the G.I.A. (the Gemological Institute of America) had been founded in 1931; henceforth it graded large diamonds and issued certificates about their fluorescence, any imperfections deep within the stone, deficiencies in the cut, and artificial embellishments. It also confirmed authenticity. These certificates especially examined 'solitaire' diamonds of a larger size. Thus the GIA in effect identified the gems somewhat as standardized shares which could be priced and quoted on the stock exchange. However, some other institutes of gemology did not always agree with the GIA's valuations. The author shows that there are varying references in different countries and quotes the president of the GIA: 'It's not an easy process because there are different (aesthetic) standards in different parts of the world . . .' (p. 126). The 1981 diamond market crash caused a drastic reassessment of the value of 'certificates'. One dealer also produced 'price lists' for diamonds which were available on the Internet. Nevertheless subjective judge-

ments continue to have an important role in assessing the merit and value of diamond parcels and stones. Different laboratories produce differing assessments while the practised eye and experience of a dealer might well be more reliable about the worth of diamonds.

The author stresses that all modern techniques of communication are used in diamond transactions; but she does no more than hint about new techniques in the transformation of diamonds by the use of lasers to divide the stones and about other new devices for cutting and polishing. These innovations have had their repercussions on labour costs and on pricing. There are two chapters on the role of kinship in diamond enterprises and on the system of arbitration when there are serious conflicts which might lead to appeal to the civil courts. The procedures of arbitration courts are somewhat inspired by the ones prevailing in a rabbinical court, a Beth Din.

In spite of globalization and of the recent developments outlined above, many old attitudes persist: not only the subjective judgement concerning the merits of a diamond but also the confidentiality of the dealings and the reliance on personal trust. Since diamonds can be enormously valuable and are easily transportable, there is a great potential for smuggling and other illicit transactions, and modern means of communication facilitate such activities. Certainly in Africa diamonds have financed civil wars and international conflicts.

As for the diamond world of New York's 47th Street, with its enduring traditional patterns of trade, it is likely that it will still be able to look forward to a rosy future.

JACQUES GUTWIRTH

LISA TESSMAN and BAT-AMI BAR ON, eds., *Jewish Locations. Traversing Racialized Landscapes*, iv + 251 pp., Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford, 2001, paperback, £17.95.

Here is another book on Jewish identity but this one is different; 11 of the 13 authors of the chapters in this collection are women. This is important because while the title of the book suggests a general study of some features of Jewish sociology, with particular reference to race, many of the chapters centre on women. Moreover, they tend to be written from a feminist perspective and in the case of at least one from a lesbian aspect. It is equally important that, apart from two chapters dealing with Ethiopian Jews in Israel and with Tunisian Jews, the book is mainly about America. As a result, the authors' discussions of race are dominated by the particular circumstances of

the United States, namely the binary division between whites and blacks.

Thus there is some agonizing whether Jews are 'white' or are to be categorized differently and the topic surfaces in several of the chapters. One author states unequivocally, 'Before World War II, Jews were widely thought to be a distinct nonwhite race' (p. 205): An extreme example is that of Katya Gibel Azoulay who is both Jewish and Black and, moreover, has dual Israeli and American citizenship. She argues that the case of people in America who are Black and yet halakhically Jewish provides 'an opportunity for Jews to challenge census categories in general and the multiracial category in particular' (p. 101). She tells the story of her white-featured daughter who was described on a medical form as 'white' whereas she, and her daughter, both insisted on being described as Black. In addition to the notion of Jews being or not being white there is much talk of racialization and reracialization, the meaning of which terms is not readily apparent. One of the editors, Lisa Tessman, in 'Jewish Racializations: Revealing the Contingency of Whiteness' explicitly talks about the terms. Thus a 'racialized group' is 'a group that has been or is being constituted as such through a social and political process' (p. 132) — an obvious point compared to the outdated idea, which she refers to, of race being based on biology. She argues that the two words, racialization and whiteness, are related. Thus Jews in America became 'white' after the Second World War as a result of a transformation in 'racial assignment' because of the removal of 'social and economic barriers to inclusion in white society' (p. 136).

The sub-title of the book — 'Traversing Racialized Landscapes' — is exemplified in the chapter 'Passing Through: Jew as Black in the International Sweethearts of Rhythm'. It is by Laurie Zoloth and focuses on her cousin Roz Cron — who, in the 1940s, was the only white (and Jewish) member of what was otherwise a very popular and well-known all-Black girls' jazz band, 'The International Sweethearts of Rhythm'. In those days of segregation it was a problem for her when the band played in the Southern states and she found it convenient to describe herself as black, the product of a mixed marriage (she said that in fact she was darker than some of the 'Black' girls in the band). She was introduced usually as 'part-Russian', the implication being that the other part was black.

A similar personal story is by Victor Silverman, writing about Rosa Cohen; she published, inter alia, *Out of the Shadow* (1918), a popular autobiography about being an immigrant Jew in America. Her life, which ended in 1925, probably as a result of suicide, illustrated the problems involved for an immigrant who tries to adjust to a different society. This chapter, like three autobiographical ones, provides a welcome change from the rather strident and polemical tone of many

BOOK REVIEWS

of the other essays. It is, indeed, a pity that the language is often obscure, not assisted by being replete with too many neologisms and some unusual phraseology. The lesbian essay, for example, starts, 'The project of racing queer studies and queering race studies ...' (p. 213); and, later, 'The personal and social constructions of one's life as a Jewish lesbian feminist is a Jewishly and gendered sexing, a sexed and gendered Jewing, and simultaneously a sexed and Jewed gendering' (p. 214).

HAROLD POLLINS

CHRONICLE

The Jewish Year Book for 2003 (5763-64) is published by Vallentine Mitchell in association with London's *Jewish Chronicle* (£29.50) and has a section (pp. 195-200) on Jewish statistics. It states that the present world Jewish population is estimated at a total of about 13 million. 'Some 1,600,000 are in Europe, about 6,483,900 in North and South America, some 4,932,900 in Asia, including 5,847,000 in Israel, about 89,800 in Africa and about 101,900 in Oceania' (p. 195). There are several population tables; and a list of principal countries, starting with Afghanistan and Albania (with 50 Jews in each of these) and ending with Zambia and Zimbabwe (35 in the former and 700 in the latter). The total for Israeli Jews is as above and a footnote to Table 1 states that the figure is taken from Israel Statistical Abstract for 1999; it adds that the total population of Israel (including Eastern Jerusalem and the West Bank Settlements) is 6,145,000.

Table 2 gives the major centres of Jewish population. In Europe, from Amsterdam and Antwerp (15,000 in each city) to Zagreb (1,500), Zhitomir (20,000), and Zurich (6,252). In Asia, there are 100 Jews in Ankara, 4,354 in Bombay, 1,000 in Damascus, 3,000 in Hong Kong, 1,000 in Sa'ana (North Yemen), 3,000 in Shiraz, 50,000 in Tashkent, 20,000 in Teheran, and 750 in Tokyo. That table then gives the Jewish population of cities and towns in Israel: the largest number are in Jerusalem (346,100), followed by Tel Aviv-Jaffa (308,700), Haifa (203,400), Holon (143,600), Petah Tikva (132,100), Bat Yam (132,800), Beersheba (114,400), and Netanya (114,000).

The major centres of Jewish population in the Americas, in Africa, and in Oceania are then listed. In the Americas, Greater New York leads with 1,750,000; it is followed, in order of magnitude of Jewish population, by Miami (535,000), Los Angeles (490,000), Fort Lauderdale (Florida), 284,000, Philadelphia (254,000), Chicago (248,000), Boston and San Francisco (210,000 each), Buenos Aires (180,000), Toronto (175,000), Washington, D.C. (165,000), Montreal (100,000), Sao Paulo (90,000), and Rio de Janeiro (80,000).

In African cities, the highest number of Jews are in Johannesburg (63,620) and in Cape Town (28,600) while in other South African cities there are 6,420 in Durban, 3,750 in Pretoria, and 2,740 in Port Elizabeth. Elsewhere in Africa, Tunis leads with 2,200, followed by Rabat and Fez in Morocco (1,500 each), and Tangier with 1,000. The smallest number in Africa are one hundred Jews in Alexandria (Table 2). (However, it is worth noting here that on p. 154 of this *Year Book 2003*, under the heading 'EGYPT (240)', there is the following statement: 'only about 200 Jews remain, about 150 in Cairo and 50 in Alexandria'; but Cairo is not cited in the section for African cities, only Alexandria.)

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

The last column of Table 2 gives population totals for cities in Oceania. The largest numbers are in Australia: 50,000 in Melbourne, 40,000 in Sydney, 4,800 in Perth, and 1,500 in Brisbane. In New Zealand, Auckland leads with 3,100, followed by Wellington with 1,200. (However, under New Zealand (pp. 180–181), there is the heading: 'AUCKLAND (1,600)').

The last Table in the section on Jewish Statistics, Table 3, gives the numbers of Jews in the main cities and towns of Britain and Northern Ireland. The Greater London area has almost 200,000 Jews (196,000), followed by Manchester and Salford with 30,000; Leeds with 9,000; 8,000 in Brighton and Hove; 6,700 in Glasgow; 4,500 in Southend and Westcliff; and Birmingham and Bournemouth (3,000 each). In Wales, Cardiff leads with 1,200 while in Northern Ireland, Belfast has 550.

After an informative Preface — which summarizes the main events of 2002 that have affected Anglo-Jewry — there are five essays. Ruth Sontag recalls Jacob Sontag's efforts and achievements in founding *The Jewish Quarterly*; the first issue appeared in 1953 and its front cover is reproduced at the end of her essay. The author of the second essay is Sally Berkovic; she records the changes which have affected Orthodox Jewish women in Britain. The most noteworthy is that at last Jewish women, after a civil divorce, need no longer be held to ransom by their former husbands who may refuse to grant them a *get* (bill of divorcement) unless handsomely paid to do so. Such a woman, who was unable or unwilling to find the large sum demanded of her, had until now remained 'chained' to her spiteful or greedy husband since she could not remarry under Orthodox auspices until he freed her with a religious divorce. He, meanwhile, was free to enter a new religious union since in biblical principle (if not in practice) a Jewish man need not be monogamous. 'In July 2002, the Divorce (Religious Marriages) Bill passed its final reading in the House of Lords and received the Royal Assent.' The Bill provides that a court may 'order that a decree of divorce is not to be made absolute until a declaration is made by both parties that they have taken the necessary steps to obtain a religious divorce'.

The third essay is by Cecil Bloom and is entitled 'Leonard Bernstein: A Jewish Composer'. The next essay, by Diana Rau, is on the 1901 Census as a source for demographic research. Details recorded in decennial censuses of population about individuals and about households are available only after one hundred years in order to guarantee privacy. The censuses for 1881, 1891, and 1901 provide valuable information on the households of Jewish immigrants who had come in large numbers during that period. There was no question about religion; but in 1901 foreigners had to give their country of birth 'and in both 1891 and 1901 there was an explanatory version of the census form in Yiddish and in German'.

The last essay is a brief history of the Institute of Jewish Studies of University College London (UCL), by Mark Geller. That Institute had been founded in Manchester by Alexander Altmann; but five years later he accepted an invitation to a professorship in Brandeis University and in 1959 the Institute moved to UCL's Hebrew and Jewish Studies Department. Since 1983, the Institute has been sponsoring international conferences; it also has sponsored public lectures and seminars. All are 'free and open to the public' (p. xxxvii). Mark Geller comments that lectures on Yiddish sub-

jects 'often have the most excitable audiences, and on several occasions listeners did not let the speaker finish the lecture before beginning to ask questions' (p. xxxviii).

*

In 2002, the Board of Deputies of British Jews published a report entitled *British Synagogue Membership in 2001* by Marlena Schmool and Frances Cohen. The Introduction states that the 'report covers the whole religious spectrum of British Jewry . . . It does *not* cover all the British Jewish population; some 30% are not linked directly or indirectly to a synagogue'.

Six synagogal groupings are listed: Liberal ('congregations of the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues (ULPS) and . . . the now-independent Belsize Square Synagogue'); Mainstream Orthodox which 'covers the London-based United Synagogue (US) and Federation of Synagogues (Fed) together with those regional synagogues which recognise the authority of the Chief Rabbi and a small number of London and regional independent Ashkenazi orthodox congregations'; Masorti (Conservative) congregations, mainly in Greater London, whose 'theological position is between Orthodox and Reform'; Reform 'includes constituents of the umbrella-organisation Reform Synagogues of Great Britain (RSGB) and the independent Westminster Synagogue'; Sephardi synagogues of the congregation of Spanish and Portuguese Jews, 'the longest settled section of British Jewry, found in London and Manchester'; and finally, the Union of Orthodox (UO) congregations which expect strict adherence to the halakha from all their members; their synagogues 'are mostly under the umbrella of the Union of Hebrew Congregations, established in 1926' (pp. 3-4).

Before proceeding to set out the data in Tables, the authors rightly remind us that since they stated in the Introduction that 30 per cent of the estimated core Jewish population of the United Kingdom are not affiliated to a synagogue, the data in their report 'relate to the remaining 70%' (p. 5). The first Table lists congregations by region and membership of synagogues. A total of 362 congregations have a membership of 87,790. The large majority are in London and the South East: Greater London has 192 congregations, a membership of 57,835, and accounts for 65.9 per cent of the total while the comparative figures for the South East are 49 congregations and a membership of 9,190, accounting for a further 10.4 per cent of the total. The next largest numbers are in Greater Manchester, with 40 congregations and a membership of 7,256, accounting for 8.3 per cent of the total. Scotland has 11 congregations with a membership of 1952 and accounts for 2.2 per cent of the total. Wales has five congregations with a membership of 561 accounting for 0.6 per cent of the total while Northern Ireland has only one congregation with 128 members and the percentage of the total is the lowest in the Table: 0.15. The authors point out that in addition to the total membership of 87,790, there were 14,848 married women who were recorded as having membership in their own right but who have not been included in the analysis. The last report on synagogue statistics had been compiled in 1996 and by 2001 the 'number of married women with individual membership rose by approximately 4,300 . . . with the increase being confined to Greater London'. As for the number of syn-

CHRONICLE

agogues in the U.K., there has been a net decrease of three since 1996 (p. 6).

It is noted that there is 'continual change in the number of congregations with new groups being established and others closing' and two closures were notified after the compilation of the statistics was completed.

There is a Table showing synagogue membership in the Extended London Area in 1977, 1983, 1990, 1996, and 2001. The Extended London Area covers Inner London, Greater London, and the Contiguous Areas of 'Southwest Essex, South Hertfordshire and North Surrey'. The figures show that 'taking the area as a whole, membership has fallen by 18% over the period. Inner London has fallen by 38% and Outer London, after increasing a little in the early 1980s, has lost 8.5% of its synagogue membership. In contrast, synagogue affiliation in the contiguous areas has almost tripled. Nevertheless, the declining numbers in Inner and Outer London are not compensated for by this increase. These data strongly illustrate the movement of London Jewry from urban areas through to suburban, and more recently, dormitory locations' (pp. 7-8).

The section of the report dealing with synagogue groupings has the following Table about membership by synagogal grouping in 2001:

Membership by Synagogal Grouping, 2001

	Congregations	Membership	
		No.	%
UNITED KINGDOM			
Mainstream Orthodox	182	50,043	57.0
Reform	41	17,745	20.2
Liberal	30	7,941	9.0
Union of Orthodox	86	7,509	8.6
Sephardi	15	3,096	3.5
Masorti	8	1,456	1.7
Total	362	87,790	100
GREATER LONDON			
Mainstream Orthodox	77	29,407	50.8
Reform	16	12,032	20.8
Liberal	13	6,535	11.3
Union of Orthodox	68	5,828	10.0
Sephardi	12	2,646	4.6
Masorti	6	1,387	2.4
Total	192	57,835	100
REGIONS			
Mainstream Orthodox	105	20,636	68.8
Reform	25	5,713	19.1
Liberal	17	1,406	4.7
Union of Orthodox	18	1,681	5.6
Sephardi	3	450	1.5
Masorti	2	69	0.2
Total	170	29,955	100

*

CHRONICLE

The Community Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews reported on 17 February 2003 on data on the religious structure of Britain which were released on 13 February by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) and by the Registrar General of Scotland. A voluntary section on religion was included in the census of population conducted on 29 April 2001; only 7.7 per cent of all those enumerated chose not to reply to that question. The press release of the Board of Deputies commented that the 2001 census may therefore 'be viewed as the most extensive sample survey of British Jewry ever undertaken'. The official data give a total of 266,800 identifying as Jewish: 258,000 in England; 2,200 in Wales; and 6,600 in Scotland; but the press release comments that there are 'some undercounts in areas known to be strongly Jewish. It seems probable therefore that the overall size of the Jewish population numbers around 300,000'.

Mrs Marlena Schmool, the Director of Community Issues of the Board of Deputies, 'has worked closely with the census authorities' for more than seven years about the religious question in the census and her comments are quoted:

It has been clear throughout the whole census exercise that the voluntary nature of the question would mean that some Jews ignored it. But the main importance of the question is that the community over time will be able to draw a more in-depth picture of the broad socio-demographic structure of British Jewry, concentrating on issues such as marriage and partnership patterns, educational attainment and welfare needs. We look forward to doing this as more data comes on line over the next year.

The census data now available show that a total of 49,199 Jews live in inner London and a total of 168,784 in the Extended London area, accounting for 63 per cent of the census Jewish population. 'Greater Manchester, Leeds and Glasgow together have 13%, although in parallel with the London community these populations are also spreading geographically beyond the boundaries of their local unitary authority areas.' The census has recorded 21,730 Jews in Greater Manchester; 8,270 in Leeds; and 4,330 in Glasgow. In Brighton and Hove there are 3,360; in Southend, 2,720; in Liverpool, 2,700; in Birmingham, 2,340; in Bournemouth, 2,110; and in Gateshead, 1,560. Other English cities have fewer than a thousand each while Cardiff in Wales has 940 and Edinburgh, 760. (These figures are 'rounded to nearest ten'.)

*

JPR News, Winter 2002 issue, a publication of the Institute for Jewish Policy Research in London, records some 'selected findings' of JPR's *A Portrait of Jews in London and the South-east: a community study*. That study was prepared in conjunction with the National Centre for Social Research and is based 'on 2,965 completed questionnaires from across a broad social spectrum'. Some of the findings are as follows:

London Jews are located high on the socio-economic scale. Of those respondents currently in work, two-thirds were employers in large organ-

izations, or in managerial or professional positions, or in higher technical and supervisory jobs.

The Jewish population is health-conscious. 48% of the respondents exercise regularly. Jews are much less likely to smoke or drink alcohol than the average Briton.

Most people donate some money to charity, mostly in small amounts. . . . Jewish causes in the UK were accorded highest priority by 41% of the sample.

There is a propensity to make a will and make bequests. 78% have made a will and 24% of these included gifts or legacies to charities.

A majority of the sample expressed a secular rather than a religious outlook, despite the fact that traditional Jews and mainstream Orthodox synagogue members are over-represented in this sample.

*

The Institute for Jewish Policy Research published in the first months of 2003 two reports in its Planning for Jewish Communities series. No. 1, 2003, by Oliver Valins and Barry Kosmin, is entitled 'The Jewish day school marketplace. The attitudes of Jewish parents in Greater London and the South-east towards formal education'. The authors state in the Preface that the report draws on data collected by the Institute as part of its survey carried out in 2002 (the survey cited above, in the previous item of this Chronicle).

The Jewish Day School Marketplace . . . focuses on the views of respondents with children aged 16 or under, both those who have chosen to educate at least one of their children at a Jewish day school and those who have opted for general (non-Jewish) schools.

The Preface is followed by a Summary (pp. 5-7), which begins by stating that the report 'provides a detailed analysis of the characteristics of 840 Jewish parents living in Greater London and the Southeast and their attitudes towards the education of their children'. It adds:

This survey was not designed to be representative of the whole of British (or indeed Greater London) Jewry, but instead concentrated on 'middle-of-the-road' Jews, who are the most likely to use mainstream community education resources and facilities (and so under-represented both strictly Orthodox (Haredi) and unaffiliated Jews).

At primary level, most Jewish parents . . . opted for general independent schools. The second most popular option was Jewish state-sector schools. The third choice was general (non-Jewish) state-sector schools. . . . At secondary level, the overall pattern of current school choices was the same as for primary schools. . . . Parents typically had above-average income levels and a high level of general education. . . . The Jewish upbringing of both Jewish and general school parents was similar, but there were differences in patterns of current religious practices. . . . Eighty-seven per cent of parents wanted their children to have some formal Jewish education, while 92 per cent thought it important that their children mixed in Jewish social groups.

The JPR's No. 2, 2003, report in the same series, by Ernest Schlesinger, is entitled 'Creating community and accumulating social capital: Jews associating with other Jews in Manchester'. After a Preface by Stanley Waterman (pages 1-5), the first section of the Report ('Jews associating with other Jews in Manchester') has a page on 'Leisure and the voluntary sector'. It is followed by this statement:

This report presents the results of a study of several Jewish voluntary associations in Greater Manchester. . . . The Jewish community in the Greater Manchester area was chosen because it satisfied three criteria necessary for the study of the benefits of voluntary leisure associations: first, that the community be of a reasonable size; second, that it be located within a defined geographical area; and, third, that it includes a comprehensive range of Jewish voluntary, religious, welfare, educational and social institutions.

The author notes that Manchester Jewry is the largest Jewish community in Britain after Greater London Jewry and that, moreover, 'It is the only significant community whose numbers are currently holding steady, if not actually increasing' (p. 8). From the many voluntary recreational associations which are Jewish, 'a small representative sample was selected'.

The criteria for selection were as follows: Recreational activity must be the main reason for the existence of the association.

The association must be an independent body, not dependent on any national or international Jewish religious, Zionist or charitable organization.

The activity must be one that Jews choose to carry out with other Jews by preference.

The association must be based within the boundaries of Greater Manchester.

A Table sets out 13 voluntary such associations selected as sample groups. The oldest-established in that Table is a Golf Club which has been in existence since 1932, with a present membership of 600 — which includes '340 social members, a significant number female and 7% not Jewish'. One other golf club is listed in the Table; it was founded in 1959, has a membership of about 700, and includes '300 primarily social members: majority aged 40+, about 15% not Jewish'. The largest membership, '1,000+', is to be found in Manchester Jewish Soccer League, established in 1948 while the smallest (with 60 members each) are the Jewish Adult Cultural Society, founded in 1955, and the Jewish Caravan Club which was established in 1970 and consists mainly of couples and families.

The author of the Report comments in the first paragraph of his conclusion (p. 23):

. . . the centripetal forces that pull Jews towards each other . . . mostly have to do with a shared history, background, location and attitudes to life. These are powerful forces: they can embrace even the most secular of Jews. However, many of these 'associational' Jews may well be Jews

CHRONICLE

whose links with the more formally organized community are somewhat tenuous and whose Jewishness is based on emotion more than belief or practice.

*

An October press release from Bar-Ilan University stated that 1,250 Ph.D. candidates had registered for the academic year 2002–03, to study in a wide range of fields; they were to be joined by 5,300 M.A. and about 10,500 B.A. students. The university's central campus is in Ramat Gan but there are also five regional colleges (in Safed, Ariel, Ashkelon, Tzemah, and Acre) which would cater for approximately 5,000 students. A further 11,000 were to work for diplomas. 'Bar-Ilan University consists of the largest academic community in Israel: approximately 33,000 students overall. . . . Women comprise 65% of the University's students body.'

In February 2003, the university announced that it had established a new programme: an M.A. in Creative Writing 'designed to help serious creative writers develop professional excellence in prose or in poetry'. Bar-Ilan has 15 libraries with more than 875,000 books; 64 endowed chairs; 66 research centres; 38 academic departments; and 101 laboratories. There are 28 nationalities in the student body.

*

The Fall 2002 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that an exhibition on Sigmund Freud was mounted by the Museum of the Jewish Diaspora (Beth Hatefutsoth) on the Tel Aviv University Campus. It featured books and vintage photographs as well as more than 200 items 'from the collections of the US Library of Congress, . . . the Freud Museum, London, and the Freud Museum, Vienna. Three academic conferences were held in connection with the exhibition: "Freud — the Jewish Aspect"; "Psychoanalysis and the Arts"; and "Psychoanalysis and Modern Society"'.

*

Tel Aviv University inaugurated for the academic year 2002–2003 'a new interdisciplinary master's program in Jewish Studies. . . . The program is the first of its kind in Israel to include other disciplines such as art, sociology and law in the study of Judaism.' Another new master's program 'is aimed at honing the skills of experienced managers in the public sector in shaping policy. The program is unique in that it focuses on the legal, economic, political and social aspects of public policy planning in Israel'.

*

Tel Aviv University's Institute for Diplomacy and Regional Co-operation and the Center for Peace at Al-Quds University in Jerusalem initiated a conference dealing with the emotional aspects of conflict resolution. The conference was held in Brussels 'and attended by 30 European, Israeli and Palestinian social scientists. . . . The meeting dealt with the impact of emotional processes — such as the drive for revenge or the willingness to forgive — on the prospects for resolving conflicts and promote coexistence. This approach departs from the more traditional view which suggests that

CHRONICLE

the resolution of conflicts is predicated on the parties' agreement on how to divide contested resources such as land or water. Discussions focused simultaneously on areas of conflict in Europe (such as Northern Ireland and the former Yugoslavia) and in the Middle East, enabling comparative and cross-region dialogue.'

*

Tel Aviv University and the city of Tel Aviv-Jaffa have established a new scholarship fund 'for residents studying at TAU. Thirty scholarships were awarded at the inauguration ceremony . . . Most of the students are in education, social work and nursing — fields that are related to involvement in educational and social services. . . . Among the recipients were new immigrants and residents of the city's disadvantaged neighborhoods.'

*

The same issue of *Tel Aviv University News* summarizes a lecture given by Professor Ariel Merari of the Department of Psychology at a ceremony inaugurating the expansion of that department. Professor Merari 'sketched the psychological profile of the suicide bomber . . . Terrorist suicides tend to be young, male, and unmarried, but apart from this they have no common psychological or demographic profile. . . . Religion is neither a prerequisite nor a major factor in suicide terrorism. . . . terrorist suicide is "an organizational rather than a personal phenomenon and the product of manipulative group influences, rather than the result of individual characteristics". The three main elements in the preparation of a suicide bomber by an organization are: indoctrination; social pressure; and inducing the suicide candidate to make a personal pledge to carry out the suicide attack. Merrari added that the magnitude of public support for suicide operations affects both the terrorist groups' willingness to use this tactic and the number of volunteers for suicide missions.

*

A research team from the Department of Psychology of Tel Aviv University has been examining the influence of media coverage of terrorist attacks on the mental health of the Israeli public. Questions were put to '534 participants representing a cross section of the Israeli population. The researchers examined two areas. First, they surveyed attitudes and reactions to media coverage of terrorist acts. Second, they assessed factors such as gender and political orientation in relation to an individual's willingness to expose him or herself to highly distressing news broadcasts.' They 'found that exposure to broadcasts covering terrorist acts led viewers to become "secondary victims" because they strongly identified with the terror victims. After watching TV coverage of a terrorist attack, 43% of the participants admitted experiencing flashbacks of the most troubling images. While 7.5% reported having nightmares associated with the event, 10.9% were plagued with insomnia or other sleep disturbances. Close to 23% said they found it difficult to concentrate on matters unrelated to the terrorist act, and whereas 31% reported attempts to block out thoughts of the event, as many as 26% reported irritability and outbursts of anger.' Nearly 60 per cent

CHRONICLE

nevertheless supported 'detailed coverage, including painful and difficult details, as opposed to 41.6 per cent who preferred restricted broadcasts.' The head of the research team commented:

People want to see the events because it provides them with a feeling of control. If they see what is happening it eases their uncertainty, which is the most terrifying and threatening feeling.

The team found that women 'exhibited far more sensitivity than men, complaining that news material contained excessively disturbing detail. They tended to switch to channels with less explicit coverage and even preferred to listen to radio coverage of the event. . . . The participants were also asked to report on the behavior pattern of their children following exposure to distressing news coverage. Over 50% reported that their children displayed an overt preoccupation demonstrated in their speed, play and artwork. They also manifested similar behavioral symptoms as their parents, such as difficulty falling asleep, nightmares, concentration problems, irritability and outbreaks of anger and violence.' The research team advised that 'TV networks should warn parents prior to a news bulletin should it contain material inappropriate for young children. . . . It is not an issue of censorship, but rather of mental health. We also believe that the extent to which parents attribute symptoms of anxiety to their children is related to their own level of apprehension'.

*

The Winter 2002-2003 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that its School of Economics 'has been ranked number one out of 200 leading economics schools'. The ranking was based on an analysis by three members of research institutes in France, Germany, and Italy. They examined the number of articles published in the world's top ten leading economic journals. Tel Aviv University's School of Economics 'leads over prestigious institutions such as the London School of Economics, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, London City College and INSEAD. The Hebrew University came second in the ranking'.

*

The Jewish Federation of Greater Los Angeles is supporting a new joint programme for students in humanities at Tel Aviv University and students in political science at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). The programme 'aims to teach the American students about Israeli society and the State of Israel on the one hand, and to expose Israeli students to the unique American reality and the role and place of US Jewry in this reality, on the other'. Participants will discuss shared topics via satellite and a website has been established for students to interact and share information.

*

The Moshe Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies has launched a new project on Women in Middle Eastern Politics. Its aim 'is to integrate gender studies into the research agenda of the center, and to

CHRONICLE

attract young researchers whose main field of interest is women and gender in the Middle East'. The first workshop featured, among other topics, 'presentations on gender and the judicial system in Islamic Africa and the history of sexuality in the Middle East'.

*

Tel Aviv University organized an international conference on 'Protection of Children in Times of Conflict'; it was attended by experts in law, human rights, social sciences, psychology, medicine, and technology. Participants included 'representatives of major international humanitarian and human rights organizations: UNICEF, Amnesty International, and the International Committee of the Red Cross. Israeli human rights organizations included B'Tselem, Association for All the Civil Rights in Israel, Public Committee against Torture in Israel and Adalah — Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel. Also attending were representatives of the Israeli Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.' Keynote speakers included the Swedish ambassador to Israel, a senior officer in the police force of Quebec, and a director of the Association for Middle East Nonviolence and Democracy.

The goal of the conference was to address problems arising from violent engagement between armed forces and young demonstrators, and to explore if new approaches for riot control that could prevent injury to children could be applied to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and similar conflicts worldwide. . . . The conference also covered . . . the role of the media in increasing or decreasing the motivation of demonstrators.

*

More than 200 Italian and Israeli scientists, public administrators, and entrepreneurs attended the first Italian-Israeli Forum on Environmental Technologies at Tel Aviv University. The forum was the first step in implementing the recent Italian-Israeli Agreement on Industrial, Scientific and Technological co-operation. A scientific platform has been provided for the private sector in broad-reaching environmental fields. 'In this spirit, Italian and Israeli businessmen exchanged know-how and discussed co-operation projects.'

*

The third International Conference on 'China, Israel and the Jews' was held in Hong Kong with the support of the Hong Kong Jewish community, the Consulate General of Israel, and the Centre for Cross-Cultural Studies at the City University of Hong Kong. Senior members of the Department of East Asian Studies of Tel Aviv University delivered lectures at the Conference.

*

Tel Aviv University has established a new Environmental Justice Clinic. Its aim 'is to advance the rights of citizens to a healthy environment through the prevention of pollution and the preservation of Israel's natural resources. . . . Students gain hands-on experience both in legal cases regard-

ing environmental issues and in pro bono legal representation for underprivileged sectors of Israeli society, as well as an opportunity for academic investigation. . . . The program is unique in that it allows students from outside the law faculty to gain insights into legal aspects related to the environment.'

*

The July 2002 issue of *Les Cahiers de l'Alliance israélite universelle* states that the Commission française des archives juives (CFAJ) was established in 1963. It does not possess a single document, but it carries out research in national, municipal, or private archives to discover any references which might give an indication on the history and settlement of the Jews of France. Professor Bernhard Blumenkranz, who was appointed 'directeur de recherches au Centre national de la recherche scientifique' (CNRS), had carried out before the Second World War a study on Jews and Christians from the fall of the Roman Empire until the Crusades and another study on Jews and Judaism as recorded in Latin texts. He was to become the pivot of the Commission française des archives juives and with colleagues at the CNRS and other scholars enabled that Commission to publish 14 volumes in a series entitled *Nouvelle Gallia Judaica. Histoire générale des Juifs en France* was published in 1974 and another important source for present historians of French Jewry was the Commission's volume entitled *Documents modernes sur les juifs*, which consists of all references to Jews or Judaism in the National Archives of France. These references are usually very brief, about three lines; rarely, a full paragraph, and exceptionally a whole page; but they throw light on such cases as the taxes paid by Jews in one or other French town.

Blumenkranz died in 1989, but the Commission continues to be very active. The *Archives Juives* progressed to become a prestigious academic journal which appears twice yearly and the Commission is sponsoring a study of the French rabbinate since the creation of the French consistoires under Napoleon the First until 1945; it is projected for publication in 2004. In March 2002, archivists from all regions in France held a meeting to establish the present holdings of the country's Jewish archives and their state of preservation; some of them are in a very poor condition or are kept in unsuitable premises — while sometimes, when a new president of a Jewish community has been elected, the files of the previous president are simply thrown away. The Commission had been aware of this situation and has fought hard to preserve communal archives.

*

In March 2003, to coincide with the festival of Purim, the Jewish Music Institute Library was inaugurated at SOAS, the School of Oriental and African Studies (of the University of London). The entry on 'Jewish music' in the *Oxford Companion to Music* notes that 'we find music mentioned with a frequency that perhaps exceeds that of its mention in the history of any other people'. The director of the Jewish Music Institute (JMI) was quoted as saying that Jewish music was 'a red hot cable that's been going from Bible times and is going into infinity'. The Heritage Lottery Fund provided

a grant for the establishment of the Library, which will be the first repository in the United Kingdom for manuscripts, scores, recordings, and books of Jewish music. The collection will be comprehensive (from liturgical to pop); the music has been greatly influenced by the countries in which Jews lived for long periods. The Jewish Music Institute is cataloguing its recordings, scores, and songbooks on a new data base, Keynote, available on the internet. The Institute is an independent organization but it is based in SOAS and co-operates with that college's music department, which has a full-time lectureship in Jewish music.

The JMI has established the International Forum for Suppressed Music, whose president is Sir Simon Rattle, and a Forum for Promotion of Israeli-Arab Dialogue Through Music. The forum has organized workshops for Israeli and Palestinian children. The director of the JMI has been quoted as saying: 'What we do is not for Jews, it's from Jews. We welcome everybody'.

*

The School of Oriental and African Studies of London University decided to end its Yiddish M.A. programme after it had been in existence for four years. It was the United Kingdom's only Yiddish Master's degree. The SOAS pro-director of academic affairs was quoted as saying that Yiddish had 'never been a central part of the School's provision'; he rejected 'any suggestion that Jewish studies were being down-played in favour of a greater emphasis on Islamic studies'. One of SOAS's Yiddish tutors, whose three-year contract was not renewed, commented that the graduates from the course compared favourably with those in other 'smaller languages. It's a big blow . . . for Yiddish'.

*

It was reported last February that the first international conference of the Women's Rabbinic Network (WRN) was held at a Liberal Jewish synagogue in London. More than one hundred women rabbis and rabbinical students attended the four-day conference; 35 were British-based while the other participants came from the United States, the former USSR, Western Europe, and Israel. A spokeswoman for WRN was quoted as saying: 'The group prayed together in 10 languages, studied sacred texts and shared stories of success and difficulties'. In North America, women rabbis had '31 years of ordination, growing numbers and strong collegial support. . . . In Europe, few female rabbis have so far been appointed as senior rabbis of large congregations. . . . They are not totally accepted as equals'. She added that the conference had provided an opportunity for women rabbis to support each other 'as women rabbis in a male-dominated field'.

*

It was reported last year that a Gallup poll in nine predominantly Muslim countries found that only Turkey did not have a majority of those questioned who said that they believed that the destruction of the World Trade Centre's two towers on 11 September 2001 was carried out by the Israeli secret service. In the other eight countries — Pakistan, Iran, Indonesia, Lebanon, Morocco, Kuwait, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia — the majority

replied that neither Al-Qaeda nor Arabs were responsible. 'The majorities are over-whelmingly in Pakistan, Kuwait, Iran, and Indonesia — in Pakistan only four per cent accept that the killers were Arabs'. A *New York Times* reporter in Indonesia stated that in that country (which is the world's largest Muslim state) 'nobody has any doubt about the Mossad conspiracy'. In an article in *The Times* of London, Harold Evans (a former editor of *The Sunday Times* and of *The Times* and recently the editorial director of the *Daily News*, *Atlantic monthly*, and *US News & World Report*) stated that an editor of a publication in Islamabad commented that modern technology had helped to spread the Jewish conspiracy theory. Internet users may be only five per cent of the population in a Muslim country, but these five per cent spread rumours and people say "He got it from the internet"; they think it's the Bible.'

*

The Community Security Trust of the Board of Deputies of British Jews reported in February 2003 that there had been an increase in 2002 of attacks against Jews in the United Kingdom and of antisemitic incidents. There had been 236 incidents of violence or hostility in 1998; 310 in 2001; and 350 in 2002. Nearly a third of the attacks (94) occurred in April and May 2002; there were 17 assaults on Jews and a North London synagogue was extensively desecrated. *The Times* of 3 May 2002 had a cover story in its Times 2 section entitled 'Britain has become a cold house for the Jews' by Michael Gove. He had been invited to take part in a panel discussion on antisemitism at the Jewish Book Festival and commented in that article that the bags of visitors to the Festival were searched 'on the way in. But, then, there aren't many literary events where the participants, and spectators run the risk of a racist attack'. Michael Gove added:

As the only non-Jewish participant in the debate, I could afford a certain detachment. But the level of security for the event meant that, for all of us, the matter was far from academic.

Since that March evening, he commented, the growth in antisemitic argument had been chilling:

... a tenured Oxford academic and a regular on the BBC's *Newsnight Late Review*, has argued that Jews on the West Bank of the River Jordan should be shot. The Saudi Ambassador to the Court of St James's ... has published a poem praising the terrorist bombers who have massacred Israeli civilians. Every Saturday the street opposite the Israeli Embassy is blocked by protesters supporting the terrorist campaign against the Jewish state and carrying placards that equate Israel with Nazi Germany, and the Star of David with the swastika. Actions have consequences.

He notes that Orthodox Jews are easily marked by their dress and have been attacked in broad daylight across London. The synagogue that had been desecrated a few days earlier was only streets away from the mosque where a militant Muslim cleric was preaching hate against Jews; in the wrecked interior of the synagogue, the front of the rabbi's lectern was daubed with a swastika.

Britain's Jewish community has traditionally been reluctant to draw attention to itself. . . . But the Jewish community now, whatever the background of individuals, feels the need to assert itself. The reason is simple: the security of the Jewish people has not been so comprehensively threatened for half a century. . . .

Among many in the left-wing media, political and cultural Establishments there is already a prejudice — personal, ideological, or structural — against the Jewish people and their State. . . .

The "apartheid" comparison seeks to reduce Israel to the position of pre-Mandela South Africa — a racist, pariah state whose inhabitants can be demonised and whose legitimacy constantly called into question. . . . These arguments are not made in a vacuum. Islamic societies on British campuses have won student support for boycotts of "apartheid" Israel. Indeed many academics have lent their support to boycott campaigns. And the level of intimidation and harassment felt by Jewish students rises.

Michael Gove comments that the 'fact that Israel is a multi-party democracy, . . . whose Parliament and Supreme Court are graced by Arab citizens' did not prevent the Editor of *The Guardian* from saying that he found in modern Israel 'so many echoes of the *worst* days of South Africa' and a *Guardian* journalist from arguing for the dissolution of Israel's Jewish identity. He concludes:

The historic test of a society's freedom, from Renaissance Italy to 17th-century Holland, Edwardian Britain and modern America, has been its attitude to the Jewish people in its midst. The greater its security, the freer, richer and more advanced the nation. The more tenuous and contingent the freedom of Jews in a society, the more certain, from the Spain of the Inquisition to Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, that darkness is encroaching.

It is growing darker across Europe this spring. . . .

*

France has been experiencing the worst wave of antisemitic violence since the end of the Second World War. In dozens of attacks in 2002, according to the correspondent of *The Times* in France, 'synagogues were burnt and damaged and Jews were subjected to violence, mainly at the hands of young men of Arab origin. The strong showing by Jean-Marie Le Pen . . . in last April's presidential elections also seemed a throwback to the intolerance of the wartime Vichy state'. The reporter, writing in *The Times* of 8 January 2003, added:

The issue was exacerbated this week with a call by a section of Paris University to halt European Union contacts with Israeli universities, and by news that immigration from France to Israel had doubled last year.

The departure of 2,566 people to Israel, mainly members of France's 575,000-strong Jewish community, is seen as a consequence of the hostility.

CHRONICLE

There was a demonstration on 6 January by 500 people, joined by some celebrity writers, against the decision of the governing board of Paris VI University at Jussieu to urge an end to the European Union's academic links and subsidies with Israeli universities as a sign of disapproval of Israeli government policies. 'The protesters said that the university was calling an 'anti-Jewish boycott' similar to that advocated by Nazis.

The director of the Jewish Agency in Paris said that the 2002 exodus to Israel reflected more than distress over antisemitism in France: 'The decision to emigrate stems from something deeper. It reflects above all a desire to ensure the future of Israel.'

*

The Times of 11 January 2003 referred to the stabbing of a Paris rabbi as he was walking to his synagogue. The rabbi had received a note on the morning of the assault, stating that the authors of the note would have his skin and the man who stabbed him cried out '*Allahu Akbar*' as he fled. A few days later, French government ministers attended a synagogue service conducted by the rabbi who had been stabbed.

*

It was reported last December that a French-language book, entitled *Dreaming of Palestine*, and praising Palestinian suicide bombers, had become a best-seller in Italy, where the author now lives. She is said to be 15 years old and to have been born in Egypt. The book describes Jews as 'blood-thirsty people who assassinate children and old people, desecrate mosques, and rape Arab women'. After growing protests from the French Jewish community, the leading on-line bookseller in France has withdrawn it from sale; so have the publisher's distributors in Canada. However, the book has remained on sale in bookshops in France as well as in Italy and Germany and in some other European countries.

*

Jews were expelled in 1515 from the city of Ljubljana, in Slovenia, but other Jews had lived elsewhere in the country until the Holocaust. The Jewish Year Book for 2003 gives the total number of Jews in the country as 78 and lists the telephone number of a new synagogue in Ljubljana. It was reported in March 2003 that the first synagogue in Slovenia (and the first in Ljubljana since 1515) welcomed a new rabbi in a formal investiture ceremony. A Sefer Torah was presented to the congregation; an American lawyer and a British businessman had helped to acquire the Sefer Torah. The British donor is the first chairman of the British-Slovene Society. Slovenian government officials, diplomats, and local Christian and Muslim leaders attended the ceremony.

*

The Report of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies for the academic year 2001–2002 states that 14 students at the Centre were awarded the Diploma in Jewish Studies of the University of Oxford. They

came from Canada, the Czech Republic, Germany, Lebanon, Macedonia, Poland, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

*

The Jewish Museum, London's Museum of Jewish life (129-131 Albert Street, Camden Town, London NW1 7NB) is holding an exhibition until 21 September 2003 entitled 'A Time to be born. Beginning life in Jewish tradition'. The Press Release states:

The exhibition looks at the ethics, emotions and economics of bringing a child into the world. . . . it covers themes ranging from sex and marriage, fertility and contraception and abortion, through to the rituals following the birth of a child and the early years of childhood. Particular attention is given to Jewish midwives . . . New scientific developments in fertility treatment and genetics pose challenges to Jewish law and raise ethical and religious dilemmas.

*

The Spring 2003 issue of *JPR News* states that the Institute of Jewish Policy Research is publishing in May 2003 a book of essays entitled *A New Antisemitism? Debating Judeophobia in 21st-century Britain*, edited by Paul Igan-ski and Barry Kosmin. The book, which is divided into three sections,

examines the manifestations of antisemitism, analyses the role of the media with regard to contemporary antisemitism, and explores the relationship between antisemitism and politics and religion. . . . The phenomenon in evidence is more accurately described as 'Judeophobia', as it involves a manifest hostility towards Jews and Israel, rather than the propagation of the racial ideologies of the old antisemitism.

That same issue of *JPR News* states that the JPR in London and the Alliance israélite universelle in Paris established in 2001 The European Association for Jewish Culture, an independent grant-making foundation. The foundation awards annual grants 'to promote Jewish creativity'; 26 new grants have been awarded to artists, playwrights, and film makers for new projects in 13 countries: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia.

On editing The Jewish Journal of Sociology. Some reminiscences and reflections

I have often been told by some contributors and subscribers to this Journal that it would be interesting for readers to know what particular considerations arise for an editor of a Jewish academic publication with mainly Jewish contributors and mainly Jewish reviewers. In this forty-fifth volume, perhaps it might be at least entertaining for readers to know some of the trials and tribulations of editing and managing the *JJS* over the last four decades.

The Journal came into being as a result of the initiative of Dr Aaron Steinberg in 1957; he was the head of the Cultural Department of the

World Jewish Congress. Morris Ginsberg, who was Emeritus Professor of Sociology (London School of Economics), agreed to become Editor and Maurice Freedman, who taught in the Department of Social Anthropology at the LSE, agreed to become the Managing Editor. Maurice Freedman had edited *A Minority in Britain. Social Studies of the Anglo-Jewish Community*, published in 1955. The first issue of the *JJS* appeared in 1959.

Paul Glikson (who had been a student at the L.S.E.) was a full-time employee of the Cultural Department; he compiled a short Chronicle from the first 1959 issue until the 1963 volume; in Volume 3, 1961, he was listed as 'Secretary, Editorial Office'. At the end of 1963, he resigned and took up a position in the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. While Paul's absence in Jerusalem during the summer of 1963 lengthened, the preparation of the last issue of 1963 was being inevitably delayed and Dr Steinberg telephoned me, saying that he knew that I did not want to be involved directly with the affairs of the Journal and that I was busy with the writing of a book on my fieldwork on Singapore's Muslims; but he had to appeal to my Jewish heart, without consultation with my husband: Paul's post could not be indefinitely left vacant while he remained in Jerusalem without being able to give a definite undertaking that he would soon return to London. But if I agreed to work temporarily in his place, then he would not find himself jobless if his Jerusalem negotiations failed to have a positive outcome. Surely I would not refuse to help when I was asked to perform such a *mitzvah*?? Ensuring the future of an honourable man who had shown devotion to the Journal? It would be only for a few weeks, perhaps just a few months; and the advantage to the Journal (and of course to its Managing Editor, who was my husband) would be that I could then train a new editorial secretary if Paul Glikson formally resigned from the World Jewish Congress.

I found it difficult to refuse such an appeal and I have since wondered whether, if all those concerned had not been Jewish, there would have been another type of emotional blackmail, in Christian or secular terms, based on the Jewish concept of a *mitzvah*.

Morris Ginsberg almost never came into the office; I saw him there only once. He lived in north London, in Highgate, but he had a housekeeper who also acted as his driver on the few occasions that he went out. Maurice Freedman generally came to the office on Mondays, when he had no lectures or tutorials to give, and no seminars to attend. But in the 1960s and 1970s, the mail was fairly reliable and one could expect items posted in London to be delivered the next day to an address in London. All articles were sent to him for his opinion. I had been Morris Ginsberg's graduate student in the sociology department of the LSE before and after my marriage to Maurice Freedman; some colleagues used to comment that the Journal seemed to be an offshoot of the London School of Economics rather than of the World Jewish Congress.

When Paul Glikson formally resigned, we set about finding a replacement. One day, I was introduced to a young man who had finished a science degree; he had come into the office to enquire about a book published by the Cultural Department, Dr Steinberg had happened to be in the office at the time, had taken a liking to him, and later accepted an invitation for the

man to drive him home. He had decided to offer him Paul Glikson's post, if he proved capable while I was training him. Alas, that temporary appointment was a disaster: the man used to disappear into the men's cloakroom for lengthy periods every day and return into the office looking vague. Eventually the office housekeeper told me that she suspected that he was addicted to drugs, but I could not act on that suspicion. However, when he showed himself quite incapable of carrying out the simplest tasks — he sent the printing proofs of a book review to the author of the book instead of to the reviewer, or sent to the author of an article submitted to us for publication the scathing comments of an expert reader on the merits of the article (instead of the usual polite form of refusal 'We found your article interesting but regret that we cannot accept it for publication in this Journal') — month after month, Dr Steinberg very reluctantly agreed that his employment had to be terminated. He had already persuaded us twice to give the man 'another chance' because he found him to be a pleasant person.

TYPISTS

There was the problem of the Cultural Department's typist. Her duties included the typing of correspondence of the Journal and sometimes the typing of the articles which we had heavily edited or which I had translated. She regularly came at least an hour late, just in time for mid-morning coffee. Her typewriter was on the top floor in a room she shared with another typist who worked for another department of the World Jewish Congress. The Journal did not have its own office, only a desk and a filing cabinet in the large ground-floor room used as a conference room for the WJC on special occasions, and with two large desks: one for Dr Steinberg and one for his Personal Assistant. This meant that Journal work had to be carried out in that room, while Dr Steinberg received visitors or had loud arguments in Russian with his P.A. — who would periodically lose patience with him and exclaim indignantly, 'Aaron Zakharowitz!' in rising tones and then continue indignantly until he replied less loudly but also heatedly.

The secretary had to bring down to the ground floor any letters for signature or any typing for the Journal. She was fairly prompt in dealing with Dr Steinberg's limited correspondence, but less diligent about typing for his P.A. or for the Journal. I had regularly to climb to the top of the house (there was no lift) and quite often she was not to be found at her typewriter but in some other part of the building. Dr Steinberg had confided to me with approval that she wrote poetry, and that allowances had to be made for that. He did not claim that he had ever seen her poetic verses, and to the best of my knowledge neither had any one else in the building. When she repeatedly failed to retype an article and I had to do it myself to meet the deadline of the printers, and the poetical argument was again invoked, I said to him exasperatedly: 'She is paid to type during office hours, not to write poetry!'

He looked suddenly startled, and slowly nodded again and again. But it was only after he had come into the office while she was throwing a tantrum

and sending her typed pages flying to the floor, that he said firmly after she had flounced out of the room, 'She must go'. She did go, but it was not so easy to find a satisfactory replacement at the salary which the World Jewish Congress was prepared to pay.

The woman in charge of personnel did not believe in taking up references, which required some time and effort. Instead, she engaged typists on a month's trial. That policy was not often a wise one. Again and again, typists would start work — only to be proved hopelessly incompetent and to be dismissed. The post would remain vacant for several weeks, with agency typists employed as an emergency measure, until another girl or elderly woman would be engaged and then leave, sometimes of her own accord because she found conditions uncongenial. In other cases, a girl would be employed on the recommendation of a friend of one of the senior staff of the WJC or of some prominent member of the Anglo-Jewish establishment. Girls liked to work for Jewish organizations because the office would be closed on Jewish festivals and very early on Friday afternoons during the winter months to allow the staff to travel home in time to get ready for the Sabbath. It was amusing to see a girl hastily eating a ham sandwich before rushing away 'to get home before Shabbat'.

A Jewish office clearly had to show tolerance and compassion. A typist who succeeded her poetical predecessor one day said that her mother had broken her wrist and that she had to come late to the office because she had to help her mother to dress in the mornings, and her mother woke up late in the mornings; this was tolerated for several weeks. Another secretary refused to type the word 'God' because she believed that meant taking the name of the Lord in vain; but she would agree to type 'G-d'. In the event, every time the word occurred in a particular article or quotation, she would get up, I would sit at her typewriter, type the word in full, and then get up and let her carry on.

Typists eventually found better-paid jobs, or left when they were within weeks of giving birth to their first baby, or when they moved out of London. When there was once a vacancy on such an occasion, a woman in her late twenties was introduced to me and I was asked to explain to her what the job entailed. She had immigrated with her family some years earlier and spoke good English. I showed her copies of the Journal and she said confidently: 'Yes, I could write these articles after you show me how to do it'. I thought that she meant typing them; but no, she really did mean that she would be competent enough to prepare such articles shortly after she started work for us. I went up to see the woman in charge of personnel and told her what I had just heard and asked what references the applicant had. Apparently, she had not brought any references, had not been asked for any, but had been recommended by a Jewish office whose sole duty was to enable practising Jews to find paid employment in a Jewish office that was closed during Jewish festivals and after lunch on winter Fridays. I was strongly advised to try again the practice of 'one month's trial either way' because that was the most reliable test. But that secretary behaved very erratically and one day I came to the office to find her in the hallway throwing her hat and bag around and alarming people in the ground-floor offices. She had apparently left a psychiatric hospital only a few days before

applying for her present post and her brother came to collect her. She was later to telephone me at my house at dawn on various occasions.

As for pregnant typists, one of them was interviewed just before she was to be married, and came to work a few weeks after her wedding. Within three months she began suffering from morning sickness and she claimed that she craved only garlic salami and potato crisps. Her desk was littered with these snacks; the letters sometimes were stained and had to be retyped after she had gone to wash her hands. But she was fairly competent and quite pleasant and liked working for the Journal. After the baby was born, she asked me to consider running the *JJS* from my house, so that she could continue her work in my large sitting-room and feed and look after the baby, and all would be well. Again, I wondered whether in similar circumstances — but when all the parties were not Jewish — such a suggestion would be seriously proposed or accepted.

I had by then given an ultimatum to the WJC: I wanted an office, however, small, for the exclusive use of the Journal and I wanted to find and interview the *JJS*'s typist. I also could no longer tolerate leaving my desk and the conference room whenever that room was wanted, even at short notice, for some meeting or for receiving Jewish dignitaries from the provinces or from abroad. I certainly was no longer prepared to take on for a month's trial a person chosen by the 'experienced' senior secretary who was in charge of junior personnel. I had discovered that before I ever saw the prospective candidates she used to warn them: 'You will have to work for several people and Professor Freedman and Mrs Freedman are very fussy about spelling and then you will also have to cope with Dr Steinberg and with his personal assistant' — or words to that effect. On one occasion, the young girl had decided for herself that since she was already in the building, she might as well see this Mrs. Freedman. In the event, she decided to take on the challenge and later told me that she liked the work and would be happy to take up the position permanently. After a few months, she announced that she was getting married and invited us to her engagement party; she continued working until well into her pregnancy and then left.

I now approached an office specializing in finding work for graduates, without charging any commission from the employers. One young graduate came; she had been a refugee from a Communist European government, had learnt English, was befriended in England by both Jewish and non-Jewish students and their families, and had obtained a bachelor's degree. I gave her a typing test, and she did fairly well; but she never again produced such neat lines of typing. She was obviously a good examinee. She had discovered that both her parents were Jewish only after the Six-Day War of 1967. They had both been ardent communists. One day her father came home with a bottle of wine — a very rare occurrence; later she found out that it was in order to celebrate Israel's victory and that many of her parents' friends were also of Jewish origin. Indeed, she had a grandmother living in Israel.

A few weeks after she had started work, I gave her a short urgent letter to type and went out for a quick lunch. When I came back I saw that the letter was in her typewriter with the word 'Yours' at the end. When she returned after her own lunch she explained to me that when it was precisely

one o'clock, she had got up; she would now add 'sincerely' and type the envelope. The following week, the editor of the Journal and I had come to the office in the early afternoon to attend to several matters and to give the secretary an edited article to retype. An hour and a half after she was due back from lunch, she opened the door and gasped when she saw both of us at work. To her surprise, she was not rebuked. I was greatly relieved when she told me that she had applied for a scholarship and asked me to give her a reference. I wrote that she was capable of great concentration in subjects which interested her and she told me shortly afterwards that she had obtained the scholarship (to a university on another continent) and booked her passage. I was pleased that her departure was proceeding smoothly, because only a few days earlier I had come across a cheque made out to the Journal for a subscription, which she had punched and inserted in the subscriber's file — instead of putting it together with other cheques to be banked. Some years later, she came to England on holiday and told me proudly that she had secured a teaching post in the distant university which had granted her a scholarship.

We then had a most competent and pleasant typist who had just graduated from a provincial college in the north of England, where she had acquired many friends and enjoyed drinking beer with them. She had come to work for the Journal because, like the other graduates whom we had employed, she believed that would be useful as a stepping stone to a career in publishing. She was very intelligent, good tempered, and familiar with sociological terms; she also knew how to spell. Indeed, she was a treasure. She had returned to London to live with her parents and was exasperated with their crude attempts to find her a suitable Jewish husband. If any non-Jewish boy friend left a message, it was not transmitted to her whereas even a casual Jewish male acquaintance was warmly invited to stay to dinner. Moreover, when they took her out to lunch and she ordered another glass of beer, they looked alarmed as if she was well on her way to becoming not only the wife of a Christian, but also to sink into alcoholism. She had regretfully decided that her only way out was to leave London again. She applied for a job in the provinces and I gave her the excellent reference she well deserved and she was given the post.

The next graduate we employed said that she had taken a typing course. She typed fairly competently, though very slowly, but she used to disappear at regular intervals. I was told by a colleague that the girl was often seen struggling in the photocopying room with the primitive equipment available: apparently, the typing school had not taught her how to insert carbons and she was reluctant to confess to that. It took only a few minutes to show her how to do it.

Authors and Reviewers

The quality of papers submitted for publication is of a very broad range: from studies based on scholarly research or setting out stimulating arguments in favour or against specific sociological theories to articles consisting almost entirely of quotations and linked with one or two sentences. Until

recently, we also frequently received articles consisting mainly of several tables setting out the results of a postal questionnaire, without giving the actual numbers of respondents, simply giving percentages. I am always wary when no numbers are given, only percentages: many years ago, at an LSE graduate seminar, I had heard of a recent case when only percentages had been given; when the author of the study had been asked to specify the number of respondents, he had replied that there had been 10 respondents — so that when he had commented on ten per cent of his sample, he had referred to just one individual. Other authors whose articles are based solely on replies to questionnaires fail to specify the response rate or to explain how the sample was selected.

Every article is read from start to finish — even if the first few pages consist only of quotations — because sometimes, after the very long preamble quoting the various specialists in the subject, the author will eventually describe a scholarly piece of research and then refer back to some of the theories quoted at the outset. After suitable trimming and then elaboration of the original research and its results, an interesting article may come to life. In a few cases, an author will send us a copy of his or her thesis for us to suggest which chapters might form the basis of an article suitable for publication.

Articles which appear to have some merit are sent to two expert readers to evaluate, and the name of the inexperienced author is cut out of the title page; experienced authors wisely omit to put their name under the title of the paper, so that expert readers may give an unbiased opinion. However, in some cases, it is obvious who the author is: the end notes may give references to the writer's past publications, citing of course the author's name.

The importance of removing the author's name was strongly revealed on an occasion in 1980 when we had received an article by an established scholar who had published solid work and was rightly esteemed by his peers. But on that particular occasion, he might have been well paid to deliver a lecture to a lay audience and later decided to have it published, since it had been well received. It so happened that a member of our Advisory Board was on sabbatical leave in London and that after he had read the paper and written out his advice that it was certainly not worthy of publication in the *JJS*, he had decided to drop in and return the article to us instead of posting it. He handed it to me and I opened a drawer and took out the relevant file. I asked him to sit down; but he bent forward, saw the name on the file cover and said: 'Good God, let me have a look at that paper again!'. I refused, told him that another reader had also advised rejection of the paper, and that this sort of thing occasionally happened when established university teachers decided to publish the text of a talk they had prepared for a lay audience. Unfortunately, in that case, in spite of our very politely-phrased letter of rejection, the distinguished author took offence, sent us an indignant letter, and cancelled his subscription to the *Journal*.

On another occasion, an author sent us a paper on a subject which had been well-researched and documented by many writers; but he did not refer to any of the literature, published in English, and when he was asked to compare his experiences with those of others who had been similarly affec-

ted and to resubmit the paper, he wrote back indignantly that he was shocked at our not accepting his paper without reservations and that he was going to ask his university library to cancel its subscription to the *JJS* unless we changed our mind and let him know within two weeks that we would publish his article. We did not and his university also did not cancel its subscription.

This linking of a paper's acceptance with a subscription to the *JJS* occurs from time to time. In a letter enclosing a paper, the author will make flattering comments about the high standard of the Journal, will ask for a subscription form, and add that he was looking forward to a favourable reply. In nearly every case, when there is such a linking, it happens that the expert readers recommend rejection. (So far, in these cases, all the authors have been men.)

In several cases, an article shows promise but requires a little extra work or additional data and we write to the author, with copies of the recommendations of the expert readers. The author replies, promises to amend the article and resubmit it, and we reserve space — only to find out some months later that another publication has accepted the paper in its original form — but the author had not had the courtesy to inform us of the change of plans. Once, a year after we had waited in vain for the promised amended article, the author wrote to state that she was enclosing another article, the one she had promised to amend had been accepted elsewhere and she hoped that another paper she was now enclosing would be suitable for the *JJS*. It was not suitable.

Then there is the problem of joint authorship. As a rule, the senior author signs the letter which encloses the paper and we naturally reply to that author. On one occasion, we replied to state that we would be glad to publish the article in our next issue — only to receive a most apologetic letter saying that the co-author meanwhile, without consultation, had sent the article to another publication, which had accepted it. Or the senior author leaves it to the junior to have the paper photocopied and despatched; but the pages are not checked and we have to ask for the missing pages to be sent. A slight variation on this apportioning of blame is when the author explains that it was an inefficient secretary who enclosed the wrong paper with the author's letter or who forgot to type the end notes, or who stupidly sent the revised article by surface mail.

Then there is the problem of authors whose native language is not English and who have not had the benefit of being taught English by competent teachers, or who were simply poor linguists. The serious problem arises when they are convinced that they do know English grammar, English vocabulary, and English spelling perfectly well. One author wrote about 'the right to privation' when he meant clearly in the context, 'the right to privacy'. But he persisted in his error, and even amended the proof to reinstate 'privation'. Another author, a statistician, did not know the word 'borne' in the context of the children which a woman had borne. He ignored our editorial amendment from his 'she had born several children' to 'she had borne' and this persisted again even when it came to the proofs: he wanted to reinstate 'born'. Another author found it distasteful in the 1960s to use the word 'illegitimate' in an article dealing with children born out

of marriage in Israel. He wished to put instead 'children of anticipated marriages'.

There is also the problem of translation: we sometimes translate articles or book reviews from the French because in the long run it is quicker to do so than to 'English' a paper written in imperfect English by a French author. Such an author referred to somebody being 'in pension' or having retreated, when intending to say that the person had retired. Or they might refer to a native person's ablutions and describe the use of a handkerchief as a towel: translating the French word 'mouchoir' which can refer to a square scarf as well as to a handkerchief; in that case, a large cloth in the shape of a square had been used.

Finding competent and reliable reviewers is a major problem for most academic journals which do not pay reviewers: the latter only obtain the book. Unfortunately, many university teachers want to acquire books but they do not always find the time to prepare the review; so they keep the book and the editor of the journal does not receive a review, even after several reminders. But what is absolutely unforgivable is when an author approaches us, stating that an important book has just been published (in such cases, it is almost always a very expensive book) and he would be very happy to review it for us because he has already looked at it in a bookshop and it would not take him long to produce the review. We write to the publishers, we receive the heavy tome which costs a great deal to post, and then we wait and wait and wait — in vain. In more than one case, we have had to pay for another copy of the book and to find a rare reviewer whom we know to be most competent and honourable, as well as prompt.

On one occasion, a well-known historian had offered to review a four-volume work. We obtained it and he sent us a one-page review which consisted mainly of some of the chapter-headings in the volumes. We had to convince him that what he had sent us was not adequate. Under the circumstances, since even reputable scholars can be occasionally irresponsible, there is some apprehension in approaching new potential reviewers. Sometimes, we are most agreeably surprised but at other times we are greatly disappointed. Once, one of our regular reviewers was very busy finishing a book which should have been delivered to the printers several months earlier; and he recommended a colleague in his department. We approached that colleague, who replied that he would be pleased to review the book, but only on condition that we promised in writing that we would publish the text of his review, since in the past he had delivered reviews which had not been published. It sounded ominous; and it was. When we received his text, we understood perfectly well why his earlier reviews had not been published.

As a rule, editors decide which books are worth reviewing and which reviewer to approach. However, when the publishers have only a limited number of review copies, they may prefer to send them only to weekly literary publications; in such cases, an author may decide to send the book direct to an academic journal for review. That is perfectly permissible, but what is doubtful is whether to follow the author's recommendation of a specified reviewer who has already been directly approached by the author.

This occurred last year, and the book was well worth reviewing; but we sent it to another reviewer, who fortunately gave it a very favourable notice.

Many years ago, an Oxford University teacher, who used to review for us regularly, wrote to say that an important book had just been published by Oxford University Press and that he would gladly review it for us. But since OUP had not sent us the book, I wrote to them to request it. They replied politely that they had exhausted their supply of books for review and we sent the would-be reviewer a copy of that letter. A publisher is very rarely told the name of the reviewer, to avoid the possibility that some pressure be exerted to produce a favourable text for the journal to print. I was unpleasantly surprised in this case, a few days later, when I received a letter from OUP about the book in question: OUP's publicity manager had been approached at an Oxford party by our reviewer, had reconsidered the matter, and had now sent the book to him. We never again approached that reviewer, who had lavished praise on the OUP book: there was the possibility that he might have promised the publishers a good review if the expensive book was sent to him.

Occasionally, some of our articles or reviews are written by rabbis who have also had secular academic qualifications (such as a Ph.D. from old-established universities in the United Kingdom or in the United States). They write well but alas many of them often do not produce the promised review, explaining that they had been particularly busy during this or that Jewish festival. They are suitably contrite, then make further promises which they seem unable to fulfil; but as a rule, they do return the book they were sent, although, by then, two or three years may have elapsed — too late to send the book to another reviewer. In one case, the eminent rabbi sent me a review five years after he had received the book; when I regretfully told him that it was too late to print it, he replied that some musicians had taken more than five years to produce a famous symphony.

I have also learnt always to check the biblical references when the reviewer is a rabbi or a Christian theologian; they are obviously convinced that they know such references by heart (much as one may know multiplication tables — which are of course not as numerous as biblical verses). I have to check also the actual wording of the chapter and verse, if it is specified that the quotation is from the Authorized Version. On more than one occasion, when I politely wrote to say that the quotation did not state what our contributor had asserted that it did, the reply was: 'but that is what is *meant* in that passage, even if this is not stated explicitly'. Once, when the biblical quotation was crucial to the author's argument, I could not find it in any line of the biblical chapter which the author had cited. He was in the United States and had not given a telephone number. I had to write to him and he replied, citing a totally different chapter and verse, and explaining: 'My Bible misled me'. I seriously considered framing that letter.

One of our regular reviewers once expressed surprise that the author of the book had not cited a very important article which was most relevant to the subject of the book; and the bulk of the review was a discourse on the tenor of that article. I was uneasy about the matter, was able to get another copy of the book, and discovered that the author had indeed cited the article

(although he had not written much about its value to the general argument of the book). I wrote to the reviewer, giving the page reference, and he telephoned me with the opening words 'You have been busy, haven't you?'. I explained that I preferred not to have to print an author's justified complaint and an editorial apology, but he said that he would now have to write a completely different review — which he did do.

Our reviewers have a great deal of latitude, but we must always be aware that vigorous criticism may be so vigorous that it borders on the libellous. Some young authors who are university teachers without tenure may worry that a damning review by an eminent social scientist would seriously damage their prospects. On the other hand, an established scholar in a secure position may take offence at being strongly criticized for producing a superficial volume, replete with facile generalizations and lacking in substance. When we once told a reviewer that we would have to amend the wording of one sentence which seemed unduly offensive, he replied indignantly that he thought that England was the land of the vigorous review. We replied that England was also the land of the vigorous libel action. On rare occasions, I was so uneasy that I had to seek the advice of a judge or a specialist lawyer before agreeing to publish an unedited text and I am deeply grateful to them for their professional advice, for which they did not charge a fee.

In this context, it may be of interest to our readers to learn of a small problem which arose many years ago with Max Beloff (Professor Lord Beloff, F.B.A.). He was a member of our Advisory Board and for many years until his death a regular contributor of review articles and of shorter notices. He usually sent a typescript replete with typing errors and did not waste time to correct misprints. I always retyped the text, which I sent for his approval; in rare cases when I had to edit a line or two very slightly, I put in the margin 'O.K.?' for him to object or approve. He was a superb reviewer, concise and witty, and often generous in his praise. On one occasion, I had qualified a comment that might easily have given very serious offence to the book's author. Lord Beloff had never objected so far to my very minor editorial revisions; but on that occasion he obviously felt fully justified in doing so and wrote indignantly, 'You have diluted my meaning'. I therefore reinstated his original phrase, published his review in full, and commented that I hoped the author would not threaten us with a libel action. But all was well and later I became aware that the other Beloff (Q.C.), who was sometimes in the news, was his son.

Lord Beloff would sometimes send me a publisher's catalogue entry, saying that he would be interested in reviewing the book for the Journal. Since it was a joy to read his text, I always tried to obtain the book. In one case, the head of the publishing house happened to be Jewish and also a member of the House of Lords; but the firm refused to send us the book and I reported that to Max Beloff. He replied that he was not surprised: he had had unsatisfactory dealings with that publishing house in the past. I was determined not to accept defeat, even if it meant letting the publisher know for whom I had asked the review copy. I wrote to the publishing lord, told him that our paid subscribers ranged from Aarhus in Denmark to the University of Zululand, and sent the letter to him at the House of Lords,

with a copy of it to Lord Beloff. The latter told me that he doubted whether my letter would have any effect. However, a few days later, he sent me one of his short notes, starting with 'I was unjust': he had just received the book in question and we published his review of it in our next issue.

Some authors are so desperate to have their articles published, that they will try every possibility to secure an official letter — on headed paper, formally accepting an article for publication at an early date — to show to an appointment committee. They will not accept a rejection philosophically, but may ask a senior colleague to plead their cause, and if that plea is refused, may write again to the editor, and telephone repeatedly — insisting that they *needed* to have the paper published, it was very important to them, and they agreed in advance to have the article completely amended in the editorial office, so please just send a letter of acceptance. In two cases, the author let us know that the very existence of children was threatened if the parent's university contract was not renewed since there would then be no money to feed the children.

It would be interesting to discover whether the editors of non-Jewish publications sometimes receive such communications. For a few authors, any means to secure publication is legitimate. Shortly after the editor of the *JJS* died, one of his former students wrote to say that an article she had sent to the *JJS* had been accepted by Maurice Freedman: he had told her so verbally, a few days before his sudden death of a heart attack, and she was sure that one of his last wishes would be honoured. We looked up her file and saw Maurice Freedman's response: 'REJECT' had been written by him on the title page of the article.

A few months ago, a man telephoned to ask whether we would be interested in publishing a recent piece of original research he had just finished writing. I asked him for the title of the paper and recognized it: he had sent it to us several years earlier, Lord Beloff had been doubtful about its merits and had recommended a specialist in the subject — who had advised us to reject it, listing the many flaws and errors of fact. I therefore now asked the author whether that was not an article he had sent us in the past and which we had rejected. He said that it was.

It is not only hospital consultants who may behave as *prima donnas*. Some distinguished professors, who have received honorary degrees from several universities and who have devoted admirers, sometimes behave in a dictatorial fashion. One American professor, for instance, objected strongly to our insisting on using British English (rather than American) spelling: he argued that since America was now the world's dominant power, and since the majority of our readers must surely be in the United States, it was incumbent on us to change to U.S. spelling. (Israeli universities had all done so, nowadays.) He failed to convince us and eventually accepted our spelling, since we would clearly otherwise not publish his article.

Another even more famous author, now dead, who used to be a fellow of All Souls in Oxford and to teach for part of the academic year in a North American university, sent us a short review and insisted that we head the text with a dedication to his lady love, followed by the words 'enfant terrible'. I replied politely that it was not our practice to dedicate either articles or book reviews. He indignantly wrote back that if we persisted in our

refusal, he would withdraw his review. It was despatched back to him by return air mail post, with a compliment slip.

A few years earlier, a well-known author had sent us a paper which was scholarly, well-researched and well written; but it required some clarifications which he eventually incorporated; but he delayed returning the proofs and our reminders by post were ignored. I lost patience and telephoned one morning and his wife answered, saying that her husband was a very busy man, extremely busy; I replied that I was a very busy editor, that her husband had offered his article for publication and that if he did not return the corrected proofs, we would incorporate only the corrections to obvious misprints and send the proofs to the printers: we could not delay production of the *Journal* until her husband was less busy with his other work. We received his corrected proofs the next day.

Unusual communications

Opening the mail addressed to the *JJS* can sometimes give rise to compassion, amazement, or puzzlement. About a dozen years ago, a man sent us a long letter asking if we could help him establish whether he was Jewish if his Austrian-born mother had been Jewish. She had died when he was an infant and his father had been a Christian Englishman who worked in a hotel and who had asked his sister to look after the boy. She had often been unpleasant to him and called him a 'Jew boy' and his father had abandoned him. He had overcome that deprived childhood, had been awarded scholarships, and eventually obtained a university degree (of which he enclosed a copy). I replied to him by return of post, making several suggestions — including discovering in what hospital his mother had died, in case they had preserved their records and might have entered her religion when she had been given a bed in that hospital. I confirmed that if she had been Jewish, he would be Jewish. I also suggested inserting notices in Jewish newspapers and he replied that he had already done that, but had obtained no response. I asked him then to discover whether there had been any surviving records of the Austrian Jewish community before the Second World War, since he knew his mother's maiden name, and made myself several enquiries without success.

Another letter enclosed several pages of a long poem; the author pleaded that if the poem was not suitable for publication in the *JJS*, 'please, do not destroy it'. I did not destroy it.

On several occasions, young schoolchildren have written, saying that they had a school project about Jews; could we please help? We always answer schoolchildren's letters in such cases and do our best to be helpful. Sometimes it is university students who approach us for help with their dissertation: could we refer them to any articles in any journal dealing with their subject, if the *JJS* had not dealt with it in any issue?

In 1980, a European student wrote to tell us that he had an important announcement for us to publish: he had just obtained his bachelor's degree and was now going to start fieldwork and he wanted our readers to know that 'fieldwork will commence on . . .', giving us the exact date. We replied

that we would be most interested in considering any paper he wished to send us after he had collected enough material in the field but we heard no more.

In that year, a subscriber in Vienna wrote to say that he was going blind and therefore regretfully had to cancel his subscription and that under separate cover, he was sending back the copies he had accumulated for us to give away as we thought fit to do. Some years ago, a resident in what he said was a 'Jewish Old Aged Home' wrote to say that he wished to subscribe. We sent him the *JJS* at a reduced rate and he wrote back and told us that other residents had found the Journal most interesting, and that even the visiting rabbi had borrowed it; later, he told us briefly in a few lines where he was born and what employment he had had. We thanked him for his letter and he replied by saying how sorry he was that we had not offered to publish his 'article' but he had found out that an editor's decision is final. In 1995, he wrote to thank us for the latest issue of the Journal, told us that at the age of 85 his eyesight was seriously impaired and that it was with great regret that he would be compelled soon to stop reading the *JJS*. He added:

May I say I have with the arrival of the bi-yearly issues, I have enjoyed and appreciate each and every contents and in particular as a mere layman I feel my knowledge has been enhanced by critiques and so well research articles . . . plus of course the splendid book reviews of the academics which you have been able to have the services of such explicit Bible criticism which to me was indeed a feast of further education of which I really enjoyed and looked forward to. . . .

Again thanking you for your kind gesture in allowing me to have the benefit of reduced subscription rates. I have every confidence that your Journal will retain a wide circle . . . reach a wide circle who have as yet not realized that is such a splendid Journal.

May I wish you and your colleagues my best wishes and congratulations for your . . . work in producing a needed Journal . . .

He also said that if we were going to send him the next issue, while he could still read in spite of the fact that his eyesight was 'impaired to the point of losing sight in one eye', he wanted to assure us that if he could not read the issue 'it will be given to a person that I hope will appreciate same'.

It is rewarding to receive such a letter, which we have carefully preserved. Sometimes the reward is very tangible. We have never appealed for funds but since 1981, when Maurice Freedman Research Trust took over the sponsorship of the *JJS*, a few subscribers have made a small donation while others have sent cheques for modest or substantial amounts. Two readers who lost their spouses made donations in memory of them; they were also the editor's close personal friends. But in 1996 we received a letter which gave immense pleasure: one of our readers had left us a thousand pounds in her will. Her husband, who had subscribed to the *JJS* for many years but that nobody connected with the Journal had met, wrote to tell us that his late wife had made the bequest because 'she wanted to reflect to a small extent the pleasure which she had from reading and browsing through the

Jewish Journal of Sociology'. He commented: 'I appreciate that it is not a substantial sum . . .'; but no donation to the *JJS* had ever exceeded that amount and when I was asked whether I could let him have some idea 'of the purpose to which' we would wish to put this bequest, I told him that we needed a good office photocopying machine and he and his son were pleased with our decision.

Some contributors have been very generous in their letters of appreciation of our editorial efforts; they write to express their warm thanks when returning their corrected proofs, or after they have received their complimentary issue of the Journal. A few also send a card of good wishes on the following Jewish festival or, if they are not Jewish, a Christmas or an Easter card. Several established academics, who rose to become heads of departments in Oxbridge or in Ivy League universities, are kind enough to remember that the *JJS* edited and printed their first publication. It is very rewarding to know that we may have been able to help competent students to enter the career of their choice; we now publish reviews of their books. We clearly also give joy in some cases to their Jewish mothers. Many years ago, an American middle-aged woman knocked on our door and introduced herself: she said that she had come to London because she was sure that the *JJS* editor would wish to meet the mother of the brilliant student who had agreed to have his scholarly article published by the *JJS*. She then sat down and told us all about his progress from nursery school to college, while drinking the cups of coffee we offered her. Again, I wonder whether non-Jewish editors receive such unexpected visitors: are Christian mothers just as forthcoming in their pride in their sons?

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Jack H. Bloom, *The Rabbi as Symbolic Exemplar. By the Power Vested in Me*, xviii + 336 pp., The Haworth Press, New York, London, and Oxford, 2002, \$29.95 (hardback, \$49.95).
- Paul Iganski, ed., *The Hate Debate: Should Hate Be Punished as a Crime?*, xi + 144 pp., Profile Books for the Institute of Jewish Policy Research (JPR), London, 2002, £9.99 (paperback).
- Felicja Karay, *Hasag-Leipzig Slave Labour Camp for Women: The Struggle for Survival told by the Women and their Poetry*, xiv + 261 pp., Vallentine Mitchell, London and Portland, Oregon, 2002, £15.00 (hardback, £35.00).
- Daniel R. Langton, *Claude Montefiore. His Life and Thought*, xii + 347 pp., Vallentine Mitchell, London and Portland, Oregon, 2002, £45.00 (paperback, £19.50).
- Jonathan Mendilow, *Ideology, Party Change, and Electoral Campaigns in Israel, 1965–2001*, ix + 300 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 2003, \$27.95 (hardback, \$81.50).
- Tudor Parfitt and Emanuela Trevisan Semi, *Judaising Movements: Studies in the Margins of Judaism*, xv + 159 pp., Routledge Curzon, London, 2002, £45.00.
- Tudor Parfitt, *The Lost Tribes of Israel. The History of a Myth*, ix + 277 pp., Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 2002, £20.00 (hardback).
- William Samelson, *Warning and Hope: The Nazi Murder of European Jewry. A Survivor's Account*, xvii + 258 pp., Vallentine Mitchell, London and Portland, Oregon, 2003, £14.95 (hardback, £30.00).
- Peter Schäfer, *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World: The Jews of Palestine from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest*, xxi + 243 pp., Routledge, London and New York, 2003 (first published in paperback), n.p.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

GEOFFREY ALDERMAN is Vice-President of Academic Affairs at American InterContinental University — London.

DORIS BENSIMON was Professor of Sociology in France; she is now retired.

ERIK H. COHEN is a lecturer at the School of Education of Bar-Ilan University.

RORY MILLER is a lecturer in Mediterranean Studies, School of Humanities, King's College London.

SHELLY TENENBAUM is Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark University.

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR: Judith Freedman

VOLUME FORTY-FIVE, 2003

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

CONTENTS

Book Reviews	64	Lubavitch Messianism by Geoffrey Alderman	46
Books Received	119	Notes on Contributors	119
Chronicle	87	Notice to Contributors	4
Community Self-Help: San Francisco Jews and the Great Depression by S. Tenenbaum	34	A Questionable Connection: Community Involvement and Attitudes to Inter-marriage of Young American Jews by E.H. Cohen	5
The Conservative Party and the Jews by R. Miller	51		
Jews in Today's Germany by Doris Bensimon	20		

BOOKS REVIEWED

D. Berger, <i>The Rebbe, the Messiah, and the Scandal of Orthodox Indifference</i>	46	E. Krausz and G. Tulea, eds., <i>Starting the Twenty-First Century</i>	70
D. Bloxham, <i>Genocide on Trial</i>	64	H. Pollins and V. Rosewarne, <i>Louis Kyezor 'The King of Whitton'</i>	76
J. Cocks, <i>Passion and Paradox: Intellectuals Confront the National Question</i>	65	M. Shain and R. Mendelsohn, eds., <i>Memories, Realities and Dreams. Aspects of the South African Jewish Experience</i>	78
H. Defries, <i>Conservative Party Attitudes to Jews, 1900-1950</i>	51	R. R. Shield, <i>Diamond Stories</i>	82
I. Finestein, <i>Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800-2000</i>	67	L. Tessman and B. Bar On, eds., <i>Jewish Locations. Traversing Radicalized Landscapes</i>	84
L. A. Jones, ed., <i>Crossing Boundaries: The Exclusion and Inclusion of Minorities</i>	69		

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

Alderman G.	46	Miller, R.	51
Bensimon D.	20	Tenenbaum, S.	34
Cohen, E. H.	5		

REVIEWERS

Alderman, G.	46	Miller, R.	51
Freedman, J.	67, 76	Pollins, H.	70, 78, 84
Gutwirth, J.	82	Rubinstein, W. D.	64, 65, 69