THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XLIV : NUMBERS 1 and 2 : 2002

CONTENTS

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 XLIV : Numbers 1 and 2 : 2002

CONTENTS

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION
INSTITUTIONS: £20.00 (U.S. $35.00)
INDIVIDUALS: £15.00 (U.S. $26.00)
SINGLE COPIES: £10.00 (U.S. $18.00)

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

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

BOOK REVIEWED

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.

THE 'CULT' OF AISH HATORAH: *BA'ALEI TESHUVA* AND THE NEW RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT PHENOMENON

Aaron Joshua Tapper

In the 1960s and 1970s, the United States was inundated by a plethora of new religious movements. Some of these groups, such as ISKCON (more commonly known as the Hare Krishna's), the Church of Scientology, and Transcendental Meditation, offered the American public religious ideas and forms of religious practice previously unknown to American society. Others, such as those generally referred to as the Jesus movement groups, served as revitalization movements within established American religious traditions, and were new in organization but not in core religious tenets.

One such revitalization movement occurred within the Jewish community: a group of Orthodox rabbis emerged with the goal of bringing secular[1] Jews towards an Orthodox practice and understanding of Judaism.[2] This contemporary process produced a unique type of born-again[3] Jew, referred to as a *ba'al teshuva* (master of repentance) or *hozer bitshuva* (returnee of repentance)[4] — an individual born into an unobservant, non-religious Jewish household who became a religiously devoted and observant Jew.[5] One of the first Jewish seminaries, or yeshivot, established in that period, specifically aimed at bringing unobservant Jews towards ultra-Orthodox Judaism,[6] was Aish Hatorah (fire of the Torah or Pentateuch), an organization which has become one of the best known Jewish outreach groups in the world since its inception in 1974.

This paper examines the behavioural patterns of the members of Aish Hatorah and compares them to the patterns of other new religious movements which arose in the 1960s and 1970s. After setting out the general history of the *ba'al teshuva* movement within the context of other emerging religious movements, I describe the charac-

teristics common to Aish Hatorah and the other new movements, with special reference to the men's yeshiva.

Throughout this paper, I have decided to use the term new religious movement, rather than cult, in referring to the alternative religious groups which emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, including groups that offered new religious ideas to American society as well as revitalization groups within pre-existent American religious traditions. This is because of the pejorative connotations of the term cult (although it is clear that the term new religious movement also has its limits) and why 'cult' in my title appears in quotation marks.[7]

History of the Ba'al Teshuva Movement

In the first three decades following the end of the Second World War, the United States witnessed the founding of more religious movements than at any other time in the nation's history. By the end of that period approximately five per cent of America's adult population had participated in one of these movements and American society had generally become aware of the emergence of the new religious movement phenomenon.[8] Although it is not my intention in this paper to discuss the numerous social changes which brought about these new religious groups,[9] it is nonetheless important to mention some specific factors: the proliferation of America's population, resulting in an increase in American youth;[10] a vast expansion in America's educational system, which not only introduced new religious ideas to American society but also created a schism between these religious ideas and those pre-existent religious ideas deemed more traditional;[11] and sharp drops in church membership,[12] charitable donations to churches,[13] and the publication of traditional religious books.[14]

These changes also affected the American Jewish community. In addition, the out-marriage rate for Jews at that time was extremely high: between 1965 and 1971, 34.8 per cent of American Jews married non-Jews.[15] This rate seems even higher when compared to the fact that between 1925 and 1934, and even the specific period of 1930 to 1935, the out-marriage rate for American Jews had been only 11 per cent and one per cent, respectively.[16] Since Jews accounted for only 2.7 per cent of the United States population in 1977, compared with 3.7 per cent in 1937, out-marriage was a major concern for the Jewish community.[17] Furthermore, and perhaps related to this trend of out-marriage, many Jews were leaving the Jewish community to explore non-Jewish new religious movements at that time, and indeed Jews were disproportionately represented in numerous non-Jewish new religious movements.[18] For example, six per cent of the members of the Unification Church (that is, The

Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity) were Jews,[19] as were 12 per cent of ISKCON devotees,[20] despite a much smaller Jewish representation within the wider society. Young Americans in their twenties, including Jews, were seeking within new religious movements to find their religious identity[21] and some of them joined Jewish Orthodox communities through this process.[22] It is this constituency who formed the core population of the contemporary *ba'alei teshuva* of the 1960s and 1970s (*ba'alei* is the plural of *ba'al*).

It must be noted that before those decades, *ba'alei teshuva* were primarily Jews who had been brought up within Jewish households, had given up the religious practice of their upbringing, and had later decided to return to the Judaism of their youth; thus, they returned to practices they already knew. However, the 1960s brought an influx of a different type of *ba'al teshuva*, one who was returning to a religion that he had never known; only his ancestors had known it. This second type of *ba'al teshuva* was rare before the 1960s; it had not emerged as a part of a large group or movement, but merely existed as scattered individuals.[23]

Many young American Jews arising out of the counterculture began travelling abroad in the 1960s, some taking their spiritual search with them to Israel.[24] In 1967, immediately after the Six-Day War, the first contemporary *ba'al teshuva* seminary, Yeshivat Hatfutzot-Har Tzion (generally referred to as the Diaspora Yeshiva) was founded by Rabbi Mordechai Goldstein on Mount Zion, outside the Old City of Jerusalem.[25] These first students were Americans who had decided to explore Judaism in the birthplace of their religion, rather than in the country of their birth. Thus, although the seeds for the *ba'al teshuva* movement might have been planted in the United States, the fundamental growth of the educational institutions which reached out to these individuals occurred in Israel. There were some *ba'alei teshuva* who 'returned' to the Orthodox Jewish fold in America,[26] but by and large this phenomenon emerged in Israel.

History of Aish Hatorah

Rabbi Noah Weinberg, an American rabbi from New York City's Lower East Side,[27] came to Israel in the 1960s[28] with the hope of establishing a yeshiva that would attract alienated Jewish youth and bring them towards Judaism.[29] He observed the new trend within American society to be open to religious ideas and believed that young Jews were ready to be brought back into the fold.[30] After founding three men's *ba'al teshuva* institutions,[31] in 1974 he established Yeshivat Aish Hatorah, in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, as an ultra-Orthodox men's yeshiva specifically geared

towards Jewish American young men. Because Weinberg was aiming at that particular constituency, the chosen language of instruction was English.

Since Aish Hatorah's beginnings, Weinberg has attempted to attract 'revolutionaries' to his yeshiva, rather than students who only want to study Jewish texts, in the hope that such students would become the next generation of missionaries to bring even more Jews towards Orthodoxy.[32] He commented: 'The only way we can survive is to go out there and get them [the atheists]. If we don't, they'll come in here and get us'.[33] Weinberg argues that Jews are committing spiritual suicide by marrying non-Jews, and believes it to be essential to train others to fight this trend. 'If 20,000 Jewish kids were being killed each year, you'd be jolted into action and launch a movement to save them. Today, we're losing 20,000 Jewish kids each year to assimilation'.[34] He stresses the seriousness of the problem by claiming that assimilation is a 'spiritual Holocaust',[35] a 'war' against Jewish continuity, and that his yeshiva students are the 'army' to be used to combat this trend.[36] Calling his educational classes 'weapons development' certainly confirms this attitude.[37] It is also clear that he firmly believes in his message and the ideologies taught in Aish Hatorah's classes, to the extent that he claims that even the brightest secular Jew could become an Aish Hatorah student: 'You give us any secular professional to learn with us for three months — and we'll turn him around to our side. If he's a university professor, so much the better. The more intellectual he is, the easier the job'![38]

Since 1974, Aish Hatorah has grown into a multi-million-dollar, international operation, with 32 full-time outreach branches in five continents. Although the men's yeshiva in Jerusalem arguably remains the centre of the massive organization, and indeed contains the main headquarters office, Aish Hatorah now offers an array of programmes in about 120 cities worldwide, each aimed at ultimately bringing Jews of all ages and backgrounds toward an ultra-Orthodox understanding of Judaism. Thus, Aish Hatorah is no longer merely the small men's yeshiva of the mid-seventies, but is now a multi-faceted, worldwide organization which engages in Jewish outreach to Jews practically everywhere.

Aish Hatorah outreach centres currently organize and offer various introductory courses in Judaism (most of which meet in the evening and are free of charge) as well as singles events, *shabbatonim*,[39] and community building projects. During the 1999–2000 academic year, the outreach centre in Brookline, Massachusetts, for example, offered a weekly programme called 'Multiplex', in which people were encouraged to commit themselves to taking courses at the centre on a specific night each week. By offering such an abundance of programmes, including those that meet on a weekly basis, Aish

Hatorah creates an atmosphere where individuals make regular visits to the centres.

Some of Aish Hatorah's best known programmes are: 1) Speed-Dating,[40] a programme providing an environment for Jewish singles in their twenties and thirties, or thirties and forties (two different programmes), to meet;[41] 2) the Jerusalem Fellowships, a co-educational programme which offers young Jews an inexpensive[42] month-long trip to visit Israel and attend Aish Hatorah classes; and 3) the Discovery Seminar, perhaps their most famous programme, a one- to three-day crash workshop in Jewish studies, offering such courses as the Biblical Codes, a class in which computer-calculated codes derived from the letters of the Torah are used to demonstrate the divine truth of the Torah's text.[43] In addition to these activities, Aish Hatorah has a programme aimed at bringing high-profile figures, including successful businessmen and famous actors, into the fold. It is called the Jerusalem Fund and has brought such personalities as Kirk Douglas and Larry King to Aish Hatorah benefits, with the hope of not only receiving public endorsements from them, but also financial assistance (as is described later in this paper).

In Aish Hatorah's men's yeshiva, existing only in Jerusalem, there are three main programmes: 1) Essentials, the beginners programme, in principle open to both men and women (although women who are serious about their desire for more Judaic studies are encouraged to enrol at either Eyhat, Aish Hatorah's college of Jewish studies for women, or the Jerusalem Jewel, a six-week programme for beginners specifically geared towards women, both situated in Jerusalem, rather than staying in the Essentials programme); 2) the Intermediate programme; and 3) the *Semikha* (rabbinic ordination) programme.

Essentials lasts for approximately one month, and is geared towards offering interested Jews an opportunity to attend introductory classes in Judaism, giving students 'a taste of what *Yiddishkeit* (Judaism and Jewish culture) is all about'.[44] At any given time there are anywhere from one to 25 students enrolled in this programme, each given the chance to take hour-long introductory courses available from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m., five days a week. Various classes offered during the 2000–01 academic year were entitled: 'Why Bad Things Happen'; 'A Taste of Talmud'; 'G-d and the Expanding Universe'; 'Anatomy of a Spiritual Experience'; 'Overview of Jewish History'; 'Adventures in Jewish Thought'; 'Genesis and the Big Bang'; 'After Life'; 'Leave Those Demons Behind'; and 'How to Get Prayers Answered'. As evidenced by the names of these courses, the Essentials programme aims to attract students and interest them in Judaism by using contemporary 'hip' titles, with the hope that they will choose to continue their studies at Aish Hatorah. At the same time,

however, teachers are particularly sensitive to these new students of Judaism and take great care to expose them only gradually to all of Aish Hatorah's views.[45]

Unlike Essentials, the Intermediate programme has more than one level, dependent upon the number of students studying at the men's yeshiva, and its aim is for those already interested in Judaism to develop a proficiency in studying Jewish texts.[46] During the 2000–01 academic year, for example, there were five different levels, with approximately 10 to 25 students in each class. In this programme students use primary sources, such as the *Tanakh* (Hebrew Bible), the Mishna, and the Talmud, and take courses in Jewish philosophy and law, in addition to being encouraged to study other traditional texts in their own time. Whereas students in the Essentials programme can attend as many or as few classes as they choose, in an attempt to create an introductory, non-coercive environment, those in the Intermediate programme are strongly encouraged to attend at least five hours of classes each day. Since many Intermediate students are given accommodation, meals, and tuition free of charge, Aish Hatorah is more selective in choosing them. In addition, any Intermediate student who regularly skips class and seems uninterested in his studies is likely to be asked to leave the yeshiva. Most of those who remain in this programme move up a level upon completion of study of each level's curriculum. In one year, a student should expect to be able to move from the first level to the fourth or fifth.

If a student completes the Intermediate programme and intends to continue his studies at Aish Hatorah, hoping one day to enter the *Semikha* programme, he will need to enrol in the *Bet Midrash* programme. This programme is geared for students who do not yet have the textual skills required for the *Semikha* programme, but who are more advanced than those in the Intermediate programme. Thus, for many students the *Bet Midrash* programme essentially serves as a feeder into the *Semikha* programme.

Aish Hatorah's *Semikha* programme is open only to long-term committed students, almost all of whom have already been studying at the yeshiva for three to five years. During the 2000–01 academic year, there were approximately 20 *Semikha* students,[47] many of whom will go on to teach for Aish Hatorah after receiving their rabbinical ordination. Part of the *Semikha* programme, in fact, is to qualify these soon-to-be rabbis to engage in Jewish outreach upon completion of their studies, working for Aish Hatorah and using its specific educational techniques. In this component of the *Semikha* programme students are taught how to solicit funds from donors, speak in public venues, interact with different constituencies of students (including those students involved in university programmes), and how to respond to students who disagree with Aish Hatorah's theology.[48] It

is crucial to point out that this *keruv* (bringing others close; here used in the context of bringing others closer to Judaism) curriculum is a remarkably unique part of Aish Hatorah's *Semikha* programme, and one not offered in most other preparations for rabbinic ordination.

Upon completion of the rabbinical degree, many of these newly-ordained rabbis are sent either to work in existing Aish Hatorah outreach centres, or to open new ones.[49] About 120 students have been granted *semikha* by Aish Hatorah.[50] There are approximately 170 students currently enrolled in Aish Hatorah's various full-time men's yeshiva programmes, including some programmes not specified in this paper. A majority of them will probably not achieve rabbinic ordination or remain connected with Aish Hatorah.[51]

Aish Hatorah as a New Religious Movement

Aish Hatorah's mode of operation, since its inception, has been similar to that of other new religious movement organizations which emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. There is not a single criterion for what constitutes a new religious movement of that period, but a general definition, as set out by Bryan Wilson in 1981, is as follows:[52]

> ... new cultural lifestyle; a level of engagement markedly different from that of a traditional church Christianity; charismatic leadership; a following predominantly young and drawn in disproportionate measure from the better-educated and middle-class sections of society; social conspicuity; international operation; and emergence within the last decade and a half.

Building on Wilson's definition, the following will serve as a list of characteristics for this present paper's working definition of a new religious movement: a charismatic leader; submission to authority; a rigid ideology, including a fundamentalist[53] approach to theology; a promotion of apocalyptic beliefs; a communal lifestyle; isolation from one's family; hate and/or fear of outsiders; active missionary work, including attempts to convert outsiders to its way of religious life; and an excessive focus on fund-raising.[54] Aish Hatorah exhibits each of these characteristics, as will be shown below.

Charismatic leadership. Rabbi Noah Weinberg, or Reb Noah, as he is referred to within the Aish Hatorah community, is a passionate, charismatic spiritual leader. Before moving to Israel in the 1960s, Weinberg had received his rabbinic ordination from Yeshivat Ner Yisrael (an Orthodox yeshiva in Pikesville, Maryland) as well as a B.A. in philosophy from Johns Hopkins University. He was therefore familiar with secular as well as with religious schools of thought. He attracted the first students to Aish Hatorah with his enthusiastic teaching style, and organized and developed his own courses for

these beginners — curricula still used in Aish Hatorah classes today. Although Weinberg currently spends a great deal of his time outside the yeshiva classrooms, and outside Israel altogether, concentrating on raising funds for the ever-growing organization, his presence is still deeply felt in Aish Hatorah environments: he is often quoted in classes by rabbis, some of whom received their rabbinic ordination under his tutelage. Indeed, Aish Hatorah's success can largely be attributed to Weinberg's passion and the manner in which this is conveyed to his students, as well as to his donors.

Submission to authority. Students in Aish Hatorah's yeshiva[55] are taught that they are commanded by God to submit to Aish Hatorah's religious authority, or to other rabbis within the Orthodox world, as prescribed by the Torah. It is clear that Aish Hatorah is rigid in this view and does not believe in a plurality of interpretations of *halakha* (Jewish law), including those from rabbis of non-Orthodox denominations, but is committed to teaching its students that the ultra-Orthodox perspective on Torah is not only the one they are to follow, but also the only one which is valid. This requirement of submission to authority is similar to that found in many new religious movements as well as in many long-established religious communities.

In other words, Aish Hatorah teachers contend that Reconstructionist, Reform, Conservative, and even some modern Orthodox rabbinical understandings of Jewish law are invalid, unless they are in agreement with Aish Hatorah's own interpretation. Although Aish Hatorah has some beliefs in common with those of many non-Aish Hatorah Orthodox rabbis, it is clear that most of the latter align themselves with ultra-Orthodoxy and not with modern Orthodoxy. Furthermore, in many Aish Hatorah yeshiva classes, teachers take the opportunity of denigrating the validity of other Jewish denominations, in addition to taking time to utterly disparage other non-Jewish religious traditions.[56]

Rigid ideology, including a fundamentalist approach to theology. As stated above, Aish Hatorah is fundamentalist in its understanding of Jewish law and is clearly rigid in terms of its theology, as evidenced by the following two positions. First, students in Aish Hatorah's yeshiva are taught that the written and oral forms of the Torah were actually given to Moses on Mount Sinai. Although this doctrine generally prevails in many Orthodox schools of thought, some Orthodox schools explain that there is also a major difference between the written law, the text of the Torah itself, and the oral law, understood by many to be rabbinical interpretations of the written law. However, Aish Hatorah takes a fundamentalist approach, teaching that the oral law was received at the same time as the written law, and stressing that this specific rabbinical understanding is the definitive one.[57]

Second, like other ultra-Orthodox schools, Aish Hatorah teaches

that there is a major chasm between the religious world, which it defines as the Torah-observant world, and the secular world, which it views as the immoral Western society from which most of its students have come. For example, Weinberg has stated: 'We have truth and meaning on our side, and we must be pro-active in exposing the secular confusion, emptiness, and contradictions. . . . Not only has secularism drawn away a major part of our people, but it has seeped into the observant community as well. Up until recently, the Jewish people never knew of juvenile delinquency or any of the horrific abuses out there today'.[58] In many of their yeshiva classes Aish Hatorah teachers echo these beliefs, depicting the world in black-and-white terms, as 'us' versus 'them', attributing the world's successes to 'us' while blaming the world's problems on 'them'. Moreover, although students are theoretically free to do as they please during their leisure hours, they are discouraged by their teachers from spending that time engaging in activities deemed to be Western, such as attending the cinema or the theatre.

Promotion of apocalyptic beliefs. Aish Hatorah rabbis often speak of *yemei haMashiah* (days of the Messiah), subscribing to the belief that the messianic age will dawn when a male Jew will appear and teach humanity to observe the Torah — Jews and non-Jews in their own respective ways.[59] Although belief in the Messiah is a basic aspect of traditional Jewish doctrine, it is important to note that Aish Hatorah rabbis teach the literal view of this theology to their students, including to those in the Essentials programme. They do not generally assert that the Messiah is going to come on a specific date, as do some other new religious movements; but in accordance with various traditional Jewish texts, students are taught that the Messiah may come on any day of the year, if Jews follow the *halakha*.

Communal lifestyle. Aish Hatorah owns about 20 properties in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, buildings primarily used as the yeshiva's classrooms, dormitories for students, and various administrative offices.[60] Most Aish Hatorah male students live in these dormitories, largely subsidized or free of charge, and have their meals in Aish Hatorah's dining hall. Full-time students spend most of their waking hours studying and attending classes in the yeshiva, briefly breaking for meals and prayers. Thus, they live in an extremely close-knit environment. In addition, as is the case with other ultra-Orthodox communities, many households of Aish Hatorah rabbis live in the same neighbourhood as the yeshiva, and often invite students for Sabbath meals as well as for holy days such as the Passover and Rosh Hashanah, thereby further strengthening this environment.

It is also important to mention that yeshiva students are allowed to wear the clothing of their choice, until they have reached a certain

level of studies at Aish Hatorah or have spent a fair amount of time there. However, after that stage they are strongly encouraged to dress in accordance with the general community standards, a dress code which includes the wearing of a white button-down shirt; a pair of black, grey, or khaki dress trousers; and a black skullcap — known as a yarmulka.[61] The students are also encouraged to begin observing more of the externally displayed *mitzvot* (commandments), such as the biblical command to wear *tzitzit* (a fringed garment). Thus, by changing his clothes to fit the standard dress code of the Aish Hatorah community and observing more *mitzvot*, a student gains greater acceptance within the community.[62]

Isolation from one's family. Aish Hatorah does not compel any of its students to remain in the yeshiva programme. However, students are often aggressively encouraged to stay at Aish Hatorah and to refrain from returning to the 'secular world', even if this means returning to an accredited university in the United States. Aish Hatorah teachers will attempt to persuade students not to leave and although there is clearly no physical force threatened, moral arguments are often used,[63] and great pressure exerted to remain within the fold.[64] Students are often reminded that there is a 'spiritual Holocaust' taking place against the Jewish community, and told that by leaving Aish Hatorah they will be adding to this problem. At times, they are also reminded that if they return to the Western world they are liable to fall back into old patterns of disregarding the *mitzvot* — which may potentially impede them from entering *ha'olam haba* (the world to come or the afterlife).[65]

Hate and/or fear of outsiders. Aish Hatorah claims that it is ready to educate Jews anywhere, regardless of affiliation or background,[66] and it is clear that the men's yeshiva is extremely careful not to allow any non-Jews the opportunity to study in its institution.[67] If an individual desires to enrol full-time at Aish Hatorah's men's yeshiva he is required to fill out an application which asks. 'Are your mother and father both Jewish? Did either one convert to Judaism? If so, what rabbinical denomination supervised the conversion?' In this manner, Aish Hatorah is able to apply immediately the halakhic parameters which separate Jews from non-Jews.

Aish Hatorah follows strict[68] halakhic standards in assessing an individual's status as a Jew. For example, in a situation where a student's father is Jewish, but his mother is not (patrilineal as opposed to matrilineal descent), the yeshiva requires that he undergo a ritual conversion if he wants to be enrolled in the yeshiva. In Orthodox Judaism, a Jew is the child of a Jewish mother (or one who converts to Judaism according to *halakha*). There have been reported cases of the yeshiva ensuring that a patrilineally-Jewish student 'convert' before he begins his studies, as well as rare cases of

allowing such a student to attend Aish Hatorah for a determinate period of time before the rabbis are convinced that the student has an earnest desire to 'convert'. Moreover, some Aish Hatorah teachers assert that if a student is not halakhically Jewish he does not have a Jewish soul and is therefore in essence different from a Jew.[69]

Active missionary work, including attempts to convert outsiders to their way of religious life. Weinberg has made it clear from the outset that he wants Aish Hatorah to be a learning environment where students will acquire not only more knowledge of Judaism, but will also engage in outreach in Jewish communities. Indeed, *keruv* is understood by Aish Hatorah teachers to be one of the *mitzvot* of the Torah which a Jew is duty bound to observe[70] and they therefore tell their students that it is incumbent upon them to engage in missionary work among other Jews in order to fulfil their halakhic duty as Jews.[71]

Weinberg realized in the early stages of Aish Hatorah's history that translating, as it were, Jewish texts into the language of Jews who had no background in Jewish learning is a difficult endeavour for a teacher unfamiliar with the secular culture in which his students were raised.[72] Thus, it is a primary component of Aish Hatorah's *keruv* strategy to appoint *ba'al teshuva* teachers to work at Aish Hatorah outreach centres. In addition, a majority of the rabbis who run these Aish Hatorah centres outside Israel received their *semikha* from Aish Hatorah itself, and were trained in Aish Hatorah's teaching techniques.[73] Having once been disaffected, non-religious Jews themselves, who chose to study at Aish Hatorah for many years, culminating in receiving rabbinic ordination from Aish Hatorah, these teachers can speak the proverbial language of their various constituencies and thus know how to persuade non-religious Jews to begin attending Aish Hatorah classes.[74]

The manner in which Aish Hatorah engages in missionary activity can be better understood by using a model developed by John Lofland in his study of the Unification Church.[75] Lofland describes a five-tier strategy used by the Unification Church to attract more people to its religious message: picking-up, hooking, encapsulating, love-bombing, and commitment. I will go through each of these stages, showing how Aish Hatorah engages in each one. In the first, picking-up, initial contact occurs between recruiters and members of the public either by involving face-to-face contact or indirectly, such as by the advertisement of programmes through the media. Aish Hatorah's worldwide organization is primarily involved in the latter. However, in Jerusalem there are other ultra-Orthodox recruiters, not officially affiliated with Aish Hatorah, who engage in face-to-face missionary work with the Jewish public, and offer potential recruits the opportunity to attend classes at yeshivot such as Aish Hatorah.[76]

Two of these recruiters, among the more well-known *ba'al teshuva*

missionaries in Jerusalem who have been separately engaged in this work for more than two decades, will be referred to here as A and B. Both are American-born rabbis. A primarily focuses on recruiting people who visit the Western Wall, in the Old City of Jerusalem. After first ascertaining that an individual is Jewish, this rabbi attempts to engage recruits by asking them questions about Judaism, to discover the extent of their knowledge about Judaism or whether they believe in God. Soon afterwards, he attempts to entice male recruits by offering them free board and lodging at his youth hostel, also situated in the Old City. For many backpackers travelling through Jerusalem, the opportunity to eat and sleep somewhere without payment is an attractive offer, even with the attached stipulation that they 'should' attend part-time classes at an ultra-Orthodox yeshiva as part of the deal.[77] B primarily engages in missionary work among American college students studying at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, rather than among tourists visiting the Old City. He runs his own Jewish outreach organization in addition to engaging in missionary work on behalf of various *ba'alei teshuva* yeshivot such as Aish Hatorah. He approaches students somewhat boldly, attempting to develop relationships with them in an extremely friendly manner. In addition to weekly lectures, largely given by ultra-Orthodox rabbis, B offers Hebrew University students incentives such as pizza dinners and the use of his organization's laundry machines, all free of charge.

Although Aish Hatorah rabbis and affiliates were engaged in face-to-face picking-up early on in the movement's development,[78] this is no longer the general case.[79] Instead, they now mainly use the media. In the United States, for example, programmes such as Speed-Dating have been publicised in such newspapers as *The New York Times*, gaining them notoriety and name recognition. One of Aish Hatorah's largest recent promotions was an anti-gossip advertisement campaign: in Philadelphia, for example, it posted a large billboard on a major city highway, attracting numerous viewers to its anti-gossip message, as well as to its organization's name.[80]

The second strategy, hooking, involves face-to-face interaction through activities such as lectures and dinners. In this stage, recruiters gauge a potential recruit's interest and make it clear that he is welcome to join the community for future additional activities. At times, each recruit is assigned a buddy, a member of the organization whose job it is to connect to the potential recruit on an emotional level. Aish Hatorah is well known for the numerous different programmes it offers, in the form of lectures, trips, and communal meals. Although it does not currently subscribe to a strict version of the buddy system,[81] it is clear that its programmes aim to stimulate recruits to participate in future events. Participants are often asked

to sign mailing lists, in order to receive notice of forthcoming events and recruiters are taught to engage in conversations in order to develop a closer relationship with them.

Encapsulating, the third strategy described by Lofland, occurs when recruits decide to participate in activities such as weekend retreats. In this stage, recruits are expected to give a greater amount of attention to their recruiters, creating a group collective focus in which all participants are expected to engage in the group's activities together. Like the Unification Church, Aish Hatorah offers recruits the opportunity to participate in weekend retreats (in this case to observe the Sabbath with them, in *shabbaton* programmes). In addition, longer group trips, such as the Jerusalem Fellowships, are offered to create a deeper commitment to studying in an Aish Hatorah environment, in this case for an entire month. During these programmes the men and women are scheduled to participate in activities all day, and are discouraged (and in some cases not allowed) to watch television or listen to the radio, but are asked to focus all their attention towards the specific programme in which they are participating. It is important to note that former Aish Hatorah students who worked with the Jerusalem Fellowships programme on a long-term basis contend that many of those who participate in this programme are unaware of its exact nature, having been misled about such things as the amount of class time participants are obliged to attend as well as the separation of male and female students for classes and for rooming accommodations.[82]

Love-bombing, the fourth strategy, is described by Lofland as the welcoming of a recruit into the community, a time in which one is encouraged to stay and participate in the group's activities on a more permanent basis.[83] Aish Hatorah has created an extremely warm environment, in both its outreach centres and its yeshiva, and once recruits are invited into the community they are very welcome to stay with Aish Hatorah rabbis and their families and are received with open and loving arms.[84] As mentioned earlier, yeshiva students are invited to eat their Sabbath and holy days meals with their teachers, and they are often given the opportunity to study in the yeshiva for indeterminate lengths of time, free of charge.

The final stage in this five-tier strategy is commitment, a time when a recruit must finally decide whether or not he is going to make a permanent commitment to the organization. Once a student has completed the Essentials programme he is often given the opportunity to continue his studies at the yeshiva, if he can undertake to study in the Intermediate programme for a minimum of five hours a day. Although that commitment is not always enforced to the maximum degree, a student is expected to honour his verbal promise. Other commitments are made in a similar manner as one decides to

spend more time in the yeshiva's other programmes, such as the written commitment a *semikha* student makes with the yeshiva to engage in future work for Aish Hatorah in order to receive financial assistance.[85]

Aish Hatorah's missionary behaviour is perhaps the most specific characteristic which differentiates it from other Jewish organizations also interested in educating Jews about Judaism, and there are many within the Jewish community who voice opposition to such an aggressive proselytizing zeal — in some cases because of the oft-quoted assertion that Judaism is a non-proselytizing religion.[86] However, some scholars dispute that assertion.[87]

Excessive focus on fund-raising. Fund-raising is a major component of Aish Hatorah's work. Indeed, the organization raises close to 20 million dollars annually,[88] and during the 2000–01 academic year Rabbi Weinberg himself spent a great deal of time outside Israel, raising funds for his organization. But Aish Hatorah gains much more than money with its fundraising activities. By soliciting funds and/or public endorsements from the following high-profile figures, over the last ten years alone, it has gained a great deal of credibility, something which has also led to further fund-raising success:[89] Kirk Douglas,[90] William Shatner,[91] Steven Spielberg,[92] Larry King,[93] Michael Milken,[94] Jeffery Katzenberg,[95] and Noah Wyle.[96] Some of these high-profile Hollywood donors have attended the numerous fund-raising dinners Aish Hatorah organizes each year,[97] whereas others have attended Discovery seminars.[98]

Aish Hatorah has also received donations from non-Jews and non-Jewish organizations. In plaques in and around the area of the Jerusalem yeshiva the following notable individuals are cited as having donated funds to Aish Hatorah: the actors Tom Cruise[99] and Nicole Kidman, former United States President Ronald Reagan, and former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Dr Jeanne Kirkpatrick. In addition, the following organizations are listed as Aish Hatorah donors: Time Warner, Walt Disney, and the Showtime Network.

Aish Hatorah is very adept at informing the media when famous individuals attend its gatherings, rarely letting a photograph opportunity go by unnoticed. In 1994, for example, in celebration of its twentieth anniversary, Aish Hatorah received endorsements from such notables as United States Senator Arlen Spector and former United States Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan; Emily Schindler, the widow of famed philanthropist Oscar Schindler; and former United States President William Clinton.[100] In 1998, at Aish Hatorah's 'Tribute Mission', organized to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was in attendance while William Clin-

ton, former United States Vice President Al Gore, former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, and Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan each offered personal testimonies which were presented at the function.[101] Aish Hatorah, like the Unification Church in its hosting of symposiums on the study of religion, understands that an organization gains legitimacy by having conferences and fund-raising events attended by high-profile figures.[102]

Conclusion

Aish Hatorah clearly behaves similarly to other new religious movements which arose in the 1960s and 1970s, although it primarily differs from these other groups in that its theological views are part of the centuries-old tradition contemporarily given the name of Jewish Orthodoxy, and in that its outreach is conducted only towards other Jews. This latter difference is crucial primarily because most new religious movements engage in outreach towards all people without distinction of religious denomination or nationality.

Aish Hatorah's two most discernible characteristics which distinguish it from other Jewish outreach organizations are its aggressive outreach strategy and its remarkable focus and success in raising organizational funds. Its outreach strategy, geared towards bringing Jews from various economic, educational, geographical, and denominational backgrounds towards an ultra-Orthodox understanding of Judaism, is highly developed and it has obtained well-publicized praise from famous personalities. These are among the factors which have led the original small Jerusalem men's yeshiva established in 1974 to develop into an affluent international organization.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on research and fieldwork conducted in the United States from February to the beginning of May 2000, and in Israel from September 2000 to the end of May 2001, the latter period as a Harvard University Frederick Sheldon Travelling Fellow. I am most grateful to Harvard University and the Committee on General Scholarships for providing me with the generous grant which made this study possible. I also wish to thank both current and former Aish Hatorah students, Aish Hatorah rabbis, and many other rabbis in the greater Tel Aviv and Jerusalem metropolitan area involved in *keruv* programmes who allowed me to interview them. Finally, I would like to thank Rabbi Andrew M. Sacks for the very great encouragement and support he gave me throughout the entire academic year I spent in Jerusalem conducting my research.

NOTES

[1] I am aware that such words as secular, religious, observant, and orthodox are very loaded terms, but I have nevertheless decided to use them to describe different groups in general terms, despite the fact that some *ba'alei teshuva* fall somewhere within the spectrum between religious and secular, before their religious transformation takes place.

[2] Although a Jew does not need to align himself with Orthodoxy in order to be labelled a *ba'al teshuva*, this phenomenon has by and large occurred within the Orthodox community.

[3] Some scholars are uneasy about using the term 'born-again' in referring to *ba'alei teshuva*, largely owing to the differences they see between the manner in which this phenomenon occurs in Jewish as opposed to Christian communities. But it is clear to me from my research that the religious transformation of many of these Jews is similar to the born-again phenomenon within the Christian community. For the purpose of this paper, the use of this term refers to individuals who are born into a religion yet are disconnected from their religious identity, and who later experience a shift in their religious perspective accompanied by a newly-found commitment to the religion into which they were born. For a critique of the use of the term 'born-again' as used in this context, see M. Herbert Danzger, *Returning to Tradition: The Contemporary Revival of Orthodox Judaism*, New Haven, CT, 1989, pp. 4–6, 197, 227–230.

[4] The terms *ba'al teshuva* and *hozer bitshuva* are generally used by Americans and Israelis, respectively, to refer to the same constituency of people. However, because this paper focuses on American *ba'alei teshuva* I have chosen to use this term rather than *hozer bitshuva*.

[5] For an analysis of the manner in which the *ba'al teshuva* transformation compares to the conversion process, see David Glanz and Michael I. Harrison, 'Varieties of Identity Transformation: The Case of Newly Orthodox Jews', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 20, no. 2, December 1978, pp. 129–141 and Lynn Davidman, *Tradition in a Rootless World: Women Turn to Orthodox Judaism*, Los Angeles, 1991, pp. 174–190.

[6] Although Aish Hatorah courses are taught from an ultra-Orthodox perspective, and most Aish Hatorah rabbis align themselves with ultra-Orthodoxy, as opposed to modern Orthodoxy, Aish Hatorah is a unique ultra-Orthodox institution in that it engages with the non-ultra-Orthodox Jewish world on a daily basis, through outreach activities. One of the defining characteristics of most ultra-Orthodox groups is that they are insulated and essentially refrain from interaction with the non-Jewish world, including a general insulation from non-ultra-Orthodox Jewish communities. However, as is the case of the Habad, or Lubavitch, sect of Hassidic Jews, Aish Hatorah interacts with Jews who are not ultra-Orthodox for the primary purpose of bringing these 'outsiders' into the ultra-Orthodox fold. For a further discussion of Habad and its outreach activities, see Douglas Mitchell and Leonard Plotnicov, 'The Lubavitch Movement: A Study in Contexts', *Urban Anthropology*, vol. 4, no. 4, 1975, pp. 303–315; Merill Singer, 'Chassidic Recruitment and the Local Context', *Urban Anthropology*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1978, pp. 373–383; and William Shaffir, *Life in a Religious Community: The Lubavitcher Chassidim in Montreal*, Toronto, 1974.

[7] For a concise discussion of the use of the terms 'cult' and 'new religious movement', see James A. Beckford, ed., *New Religious Movements and Rapid Social Change*, Newbury Park, CA, 1986, pp. ix–xiii and 29–31, and Thomas Robbins, William C. Shepard, and James McBride, eds., *Cults, Culture, and the Law: Perspectives on New Religious Movements*, Chico, CA, 1985.

[8] See Irving I. Zaretsky and Mark P. Leone, eds., *Religious Movements in Contemporary America*, Princeton, 1973; Charles Y. Glock and Robert N. Bellah, eds., *The New Religious Consciousness*, Los Angeles, 1976; and Thomas Robbins and Dick Anthony, eds., *In Gods We Trust: New Patterns of Religious Pluralism in America*, New Brunswick, NJ, 1981.

[9] See Robert Wuthnow, 'Religious Movements in North America', pp. 8–15, in Beckford, ed., op. cit. in note 7 above.

[10] Kenneth Keniston, *Youth and Dissent*, New York, 1971.

[11] Robert Wuthnow, *The Consciousness Reformation*, Los Angeles, 1976, and Alvin W. Gouldner, *The New Intelligentsia*, New York, 1979.

[12] Constant H. Jacquet, Jr., *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches*, Nashville, 1982.

[13] Wuthnow, op. cit. in note 9 above, p. 12.

[14] Robert Wuthnow, 'A Longitudinal Cross-national Indicator of Cultural Religious Commitment', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1977, pp. 87–99.

[15] Evyatar Friesel, *Atlas of Modern Jewish History*, Jerusalem, 1983, pp. 24–25.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Barry Kosmin and Jeffrey Scheckner, 'Jewish Population in the United States, 1990', *American Jewish Yearbook 1991*, ed. David Singer, New York, 1991, pp. 204–224.

[18] Many sources state that Jews were disproportionately represented among both the lay people and the religious leaders in various new religious movement groups of the 1960s and 1970s. For a further discussion of this issue, see Phil Kerns and Doug Wead, *People's Temple, People's Tomb*, Plainfield, New Jersey, 1979; André Ungar, 'Jews and Jesus Freaks', *Reconstructionist*, vol. 39, no. 9, December 1973, pp. 7–11; Mark Cohen, 'Missionaries in Our Midst: The Appeal of Alternatives', *Analysis*, vol. 64, March 1978, pp. 1–8; and Jack Nusan Porter, *Jews and the Cults*, Fresh Meadows, New Jersey, 1981.

[19] J. Gordon Melton and Robert L. Moore, *The Cult Experience*, New York, 1982, p. 30. In addition, some other scholars have estimated that this proportion was as high as 12 per cent. See Idy B. Gitelson and Edward J. Reed, 'Identity Status of Jewish Youth Pre- and Post-Cult Involvement', in *Cults and the Jewish Community*, ed. Aidan A. Kelley, New York, 1990, p. 344.

[20] Melton and Moore, op. cit. in note 19 above.

[21] Two possible reasons for this disproportionate representation of Jews are that the major constituency of new religious movement members were 18–25 year-old, middle-class, college-educated youth, a community in which Jews were also disproportionately represented (Gitelson and Reed, op. cit. in note 19 above) and that the top three states where new religious movements flourished were California, New York, and Illinois, three states where

approximately half of all United States Jews resided (Allen S. Maller, 'Jews, Cults, and Apostates', in *Cults and the Jewish Community*, pp. 379–384).

[22] Janet Aviad, *Return to Judaism: Religious Renewal in Israel*, Chicago, 1983, pp. 4–5.

[23] Ibid., pp. 13–14 and Danzger, op. cit. in note 3 above, pp. 13–14.

[24] Numerous scholars point out that following Israel's success in the Six-Day War there was a major shift in perception among American Jews in regard to Israel and its new-found importance to their religious identity (Chaim I. Waxman, 'The Fourth Generation Grows Up: The Contemporary American Jewish Community', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 454, 1981, pp. 70–85).

[25] Aviad, op. cit. in note 22 above, pp. 16–18.

[26] Rabbis Shlomo Carlebach and Zalman Shachter-Shalomi are thought by many to have been the true pioneers of the *ba'al teshuva* movement, beginning their outreach work as early as the 1950s. However, most of their outreach activities were conducted in the United States rather than in Israel. For a further discussion, see Danzger, op. cit. in note 3 above, pp. 58–61, 85–86.

[27] Andrea Heiman, 'Back to Basics', *Los Angeles Times*, 2 February 1997.

[28] According to Aish Hatorah's website, Weinberg '[first] sailed from New York [to Israel] in 1953 with little more than a suitcase packed of dreams' (www.aish.com/aishintl/about, p. 1). He then left and returned to Israel again in the early 1960s, with his wife, in order to create a *ba'al teshuva* institution (Janet Aviad, op. cit. in note 22 above, p. 16).

[29] According to Aviad, Weinberg did not originally intend to create a *ba'al teshuva* yeshiva which would be separate from other Orthodox yeshivot. However, it soon became clear to him that teaching texts to Jews who lacked fundamental skills, such as reading the Hebrew alphabet, would be an educational process entirely different from reacquainting Jews with the forgotten Jewish texts of their youth. Furthermore, many yeshivot at that time refused admittance to students with little prior Jewish education, partly because of their suspicion of types of Jews different from themselves (Aviad, op. cit. in note 22 above, p. 17).

[30] Ibid., p. 16.

[31] It is important to note that Weinberg broke off from his co-founders of his third institution primarily owing to a disagreement about how outreach should be conducted (ibid., p. 18, Danzger, op. cit. in note 3 above, p. 68, and Heiman, op. cit. in note 27 above).

[32] Danzger, op. cit. in note 3 above, p. 68.

[33] Ibid.

[34] www.aish.com/aishint/about, p. 2.

[35] This term was continuously used in interviews I conducted with both current and former Aish Hatorah students (telephone interviews, 16 and 17 April and 2 May 2001 and face-to-face interview, Old City, Jerusalem, 4 December 2000).

[36] Rabbi Noach Weinberg, 'Shedding Our Blinders', *The Jewish Observer*, vol. 14, no. 9, June 1980, pp. 39–40.

[37] Danzger, op. cit. in note 3 above, p. 125.

[38] Rabbi Noach Weinberg, *Tradition*, vol. 32, no. 4, Summer 1998, pp. 125–127.

[39] *Shabbatonim* are educational programmes where participants spend either parts of or the entire Sabbath together, learning about the Sabbath rituals that a Jew must observe according to *halakha*.

[40] See Monte Williams, 'Who Says You Can't Hurry Love', *The New York Times*, 5 March 2000, p. A27.

[41] It is clear that Aish Hatorah's immediate intention with programmes such as Speed-Dating is to combat out-marriage. However, their long-term goals indicate an attempt to reach secular Jews in order to expose them to Aish Hatorah's ultra-Orthodox understanding of Judaism.

[42] One former Aish Hatorah student who worked with the Jerusalem Fellowships programme for more than two years estimates that more than half of all students applying for this programme are given full scholarships (telephone interview, 16 April 2001).

[43] The Discovery programme, perhaps Aish Hatorah's best-known programme, is offered on almost any given weekend in America in at least two separate locations. It is estimated that in 1997 alone 25,000 Jews worldwide participated in Discovery (Arthur J. Magida, 'Targeting Skeptics', *Moment*, June 1998, p. 2) and that since the programme's inception more than 150,000 people have attended the seminar, offered in six languages (Discovery Seminar, Old City, Jerusalem, November 2000). In *Cults, Culture, and the Law* (op. cit. in note 7 above), various scholars discuss the role science plays in the teachings of many new religious movement theologies. It seems that Weinberg also understands the importance of supporting his religious claims by using science as a potential proof, and has therefore incorporated the Biblical Codes into Aish Hatorah's programme for this specific reason (see Robbins *et al.*, eds., op. cit. in note 7 above, p. 63). It must also be noted that Aish Hatorah has been greatly criticized by other Orthodox rabbis, in addition to Conservative and Reform rabbis, for using the Biblical Codes as part of its *keruv* programme. For a concise summary of the Biblical Codes, see www.religioustolerance.org/biblcode.htm.

[44] My interview with the Director of Aish Hatorah's Intermediate Programme, Old City, Jerusalem, 26 October 2000.

[45] Although Aish Hatorah's halakhic stance on issues becomes clear once the Intermediate programme is reached, a student might take courses in the Essentials programme for an entire month without knowing that Aish Hatorah is an ultra-Orthodox institution, largely because the teachers are less obvious about specific aspects of Aish Hatorah's views on Judaism at this early stage, perhaps choosing to become more explicit when the student is more ready to accept fundamentalist views.

[46] See note 44 above.

[47] Some of these *semikha* students were born into religious families and thus are not *ba'alei teshuva* (my telephone interview with the Director of Aish Hatorah's *Semikha* Programme, 23 April 2001).

[48] This last-listed element of the *keruv* programme is fostered throughout one's studies at Aish Hatorah, beginning in the Essentials programme.

[49] *Semikha* students who receive financial aid from Aish Hatorah are committed to work for Aish Hatorah for a minimum of two years, after their

programme is complete, in order to receive this assistance (my telephone interview with a former Aish Hatorah student, 17 April 2001; other former Aish Hatorah *semikha* students confirmed this statement to me in telephone interviews, 16 and 17 April and 2 May 2001).

[50] www.aish.com/progisrael/yeshiva, p. 1.

[51] Although there have been no published studies about the attrition rate of Aish Hatorah yeshiva students after they have taken classes at the men's yeshiva, my own preliminary research shows that it is slightly lower than the rate within the Unification Church, between five and six per cent. For example, according to one study conducted on the Unification Church by Marc Galanter, under ten percent of those participating in a weekend retreat continued to affiliate with this group (Marc Galanter, 'Psychological Induction into the Large-Group Finding in a Modern Religious Sect', *American Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 137, 1980, pp. 1574–1579). Furthermore, I found that the rate of attrition of students who persevere with their studies at Aish Hatorah for more than six months continues to increase. It is worth noting here that Eileen Barker's study of the Unification Church (in which she extended Galanter's research) showed that more than half of those members who decided to remain with the Church after their initial weekend retreat experience left the fold after two years (Eileen Barker, 'Who'd Be a Moonie? A Comparative Study of Those Who Join the Unification Church in Britain', in *The Social Impact of New Religious Movements*, ed. Bryan Wilson, New York, 1981, p. 64).

[52] Wilson, ed., op. cit. in note 51 above, p. v.

[53] Building on the definition of the term 'fundamentalist' taken from Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, the following will serve as this paper's working definition of this term: a person or group which exhibits an attitude stressing strict and literal adherence to a set of religious principles, primarily derived from a religious text or texts (www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary).

[54] Florence Klaskow and Mervin B. Sussman, eds., *Cults and the Family*, New York, 1982, pp. 3–27 and Larry D. Shinn, *The Dark Lord: Cult Images and the Hare Krishnas in America*, Philadelphia, 1987, p. 17. For further reference, see Rebecca Moore and Fielding McGhehee III, eds., *New Religious Movements, Mass Suicides, and the Peoples Temple*, Lewiston, England, 1989, pp. 181–182; John Saliba, *Perspectives on New Religious Movements*, London, 1995, pp. 11–12; and Shirley Harrison with Sally Evemy, *Cults: The Battle for God*, London, 1990, pp. 12–13.

[55] It is important to note that Aish Hatorah is much more open and candid about its ultra-Orthodox perspective in the environment of its yeshiva, whereas in other venues — such as in its outreach centres and the programmes offered there — Aish Hatorah advertises itself as a pluralistic, all-inclusive environment. In addition, although Aish Hatorah indeed allows Jews from all backgrounds to take courses in its outreach centres, this is not the case at its yeshiva (see section 'Hate and/or fear of outsiders' in this paper). One Aish Hatorah rabbi told me that in their outreach centres rabbis are 'open to the possibility of teaching non-Jews', but non-Jews are limited in what they are allowed to be taught (telephone interview, 10 May 2000).

[56] This is supported by my own observations, as a student-observer in the Essentials programme in the autumn of 2000, in addition to interviews with current and former Aish Hatorah students (face-to-face interview, Old City, Jerusalem, 4 December 2000 and telephone interviews 16 and 17 April and 2 May 2001).

[57] Although there are traditional Jewish texts which support this position, this opinion is fundamentalist nonetheless.

[58] Weinberg, op. cit. in note 38 above, p. 126.

[59] According to *halakha*, whereas a Jew must observe 613 *mitzvot*, a non-Jew needs to observe only seven, referred to as the *sheva' mitzvot benei Noah* (the seven commandments of the sons of Noah). These seven commandments are the following: one must not murder, steal, curse God, worship false gods, be sexually immoral, or eat the limb of an animal before it is killed, and one must set up courts of law and bring offenders to justice. Aish Hatorah believes very firmly that in order for a non-Jew to fulfil his obligation to Torah he must observe these seven *mitzvot*.

[60] Netty C. Gross, 'Old City Takeover', *The Jerusalem Report*, 13 March 2000, pp. 12–14.

[61] During the 2000–01 academic year, one student told me that he was offered free shoes and other clothing by one of his teachers in order to comply better with the dress code of the yeshiva, though he had made no mention to his teacher that he needed those items or was in any financial need (interview in the Old City, Jerusalem, 4 December 2000).

[62] Although some Aish Hatorah rabbis tell their students that they should take their time in becoming more religiously observant, students are rarely discouraged from discarding the clothes of their former lifestyle and choosing to dress in accordance with others in the Aish Hatorah community.

[63] See E. P. Bettinghaus, *Persuasive Communication*, New York, 1973 and Martin E. Marty and Frederick E. Greenspahn, eds., *Pushing the Faith: Proselytism and Civility in a Pluralistic World*, New York, 1988, ch. 1.

[64] A former Aish Hatorah student told me that when he decided to leave Aish Hatorah, after five years of studies there, and subsequently met the organization's *Menahel Ruhani* (spiritual director), he was told that he was 'sick' for deciding to leave Aish Hatorah (telephone interview, 17 April 2001).

[65] Part of Aish Hatorah's doctrine is that a Jew should fear, as well as love, God. The instilment of the fear of God in students is not unique to the ultra-Orthodox community and is supported by the Torah and by numerous traditional texts. However, it is important to note that some Orthodox *ba'alei teshuva* yeshivot prefer to focus on the awe one should have for God, rather than the fear (my interview with the head of a yeshiva in the West Bank, 24 November 2000).

[66] Aish Hatorah's mission, as cited on its website as well as most of its programme handouts, is as follows: 'to reawaken Jewish values and priorities, ignite Jewish pride, stimulate personal growth and promote Jewish unity through creative and meaningful education. We stand for all Jews everywhere regardless of affiliation or background'.

[67] In a telephone conversation on 19 November 2000, an Aish Hatorah rabbi told me that only academic researchers who are halakhically Jewish

would be allowed to conduct research on this organization. When asked what role one's religious identity played in pursuing an academic endeavour of this kind, he replied that if a researcher was not Jewish, Aish Hatorah had nothing to gain from his research, adding: 'One hour of time spent on a non-Jew is an hour that could be [better] spent on a Jew'. He concluded by saying that the purpose of the donations Aish Hatorah receives is to educate Jews, and not non-Jews, and that if he invested time on a researcher who was not Jewish he would not be fulfilling his responsibility to his organization or his donors.

[68] Whereas some Orthodox institutions accept halakhic conversions conducted by Conservative rabbis, such conversions are deemed by Aish Hatorah halakhic authorities to be suspect and need to be further investigated before they are accepted as valid.

[69] Interview with an Aish Hatorah rabbi, Old City, Jerusalem, July 1994.

[70] Rabbi Yitzhak Berkowitz, 'The Issue of *Kiruv*', Aish Hatorah Audio Centre, Jerusalem.

[71] It is important to note that although Aish Hatorah is not unique among halakhic authorities in contending that a Jew is halakhically bound to engage in *keruv*, and thus bring other Jews closer to Judaism, many rabbis advocate a much less aggressive approach than that taken by Aish Hatorah.

[72] See R. D. Winter, 'The Highest Priority: Cross-Cultural Evangelism', in *Mission Trends Number Two: Evangelization*, eds. G. H. Anderson and T. F. Stransky, New York, 1975.

[73] See note 44 above.

[74] In explaining the merits of *ba'al teshuva* teachers conducting outreach towards *ba'al teshuva* students, one Aish Hatorah rabbi told me in an interview on 8 March 2000: 'We come from the same backgrounds as our students. I personally was very assimilated ... but the first thing I did to incorporate Judaism in my life was to go into McDonald's and order a hamburger and not a cheeseburger [thereby starting to observe the *mitzva* of *kashrut*, by separating milk from meat]. For me this was a big step because I loved cheeseburgers ... Most *frum* (religious)-from-birth [Jews] don't have the experience to understand what that means ... I think that's one of the reasons we're so successful. People feel comfortable with us ... we've walked in their moccasins'.

[75] James T. Richardson, 'Proselytizing Processes of the New Religions', in Marty and Greenspahn, eds., op. cit. in note 63 above, pp. 143–154, citing John Lofland, *Doomsday Cult: A Study of Conversion, Proselytization, and Maintenance of Faith*, enlarged edition, New York, 1977.

[76] It is interesting to note that in Israel there are strict laws curtailing the missionary activities of non-Jewish missionary groups. However, even Jewish groups such as the Nuterei Karta, an ultra-Orthodox Jewish sect which is anti-Zionist, opposing the existence of the modern State of Israel itself, are legally allowed to engage in outreach, whereas groups such as ISKCON are severely limited in their contact with Israelis. According to Beit-Hallahmi, whether Israeli Jews consider themselves to be secular or ultra-Orthodox they are considered by law to be Jewish, whereas if Israeli Jews convert to ISKCON they leave their Jewish identity behind and effectively leave the Jewish collective altogether (Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, *Despair and Deliver-*

ance: Private Salvation in Contemporary Israel, Albany, New York, 1992, pp. 11–48).

[77] A former long-term employee of this youth hostel told me that although backpackers are not forced to attend classes at an ultra-Orthodox yeshiva such as Aish Hatorah, they are strongly encouraged to do so and may be asked to leave if they do not, although different reasons for their dismissal might be given (interview, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, 29 April 2001).

[78] See William Shaffir, 'The Recruitment of *Ba'alei Tshuvah* in a Jerusalem Yeshiva', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 25, no. 1, June 1983, pp. 33–46.

[79] Although face-to-face picking-up is clearly not the normal outreach technique of Aish Hatorah, in a lecture of *keruv* given by an Aish Hatorah rabbi describing the strategies which were successful in the Toronto outreach centre, students were told that a primary way students can draw Jews to outreach centre events is by bringing their friends to these events (that is, a sort of face-to-face outreach). In this manner, rabbis can then gain the 'trust' of students so that they will 'feel safe and listen' to what Aish Hatorah students and teachers have to say (Rabbi Shalom Schwartz, 'Opening an Outreach Centre', Aish Hatorah Audio Centre, Jerusalem).

[80] On 19 May 2001, I was told (in a telephone interview) by the Executive Director of Aish Hatorah's outreach centre in Philadelphia, that this billboard was placed in a specific location in which Jews and non-Jews would both read this message for two reasons. First, although a non-Jew is not bound to refrain from engaging in gossip from a halakhic standpoint, society is enhanced when all people (not Jews only) refrain from engaging in such behaviour. Second, when an issue becomes relevant to the wider general society it also becomes important to the Jewish community. Thus, an anti-gossip campaign which is successful among non-Jews will also affect Jews.

[81] In 1992, Debbie Friedman reported to Judith Cop, a writer for *The Washington Times*, that in her brief interaction with Aish Hatorah she had witnessed the buddy system in action (Judith Colp, 'Dissenter: Cultlike Aish Abuses Trust', *The Washington Times*, 5 October 1992, p. D2). It is clear that Aish Hatorah — as is the case with other groups such as ISKCON — has changed specific aspects of its recruitment practices over the course of its development. For a discussion of the changing outreach behaviour of ISKCON, see E. Burke Rochford, Jr., *Hare Krishna in America*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1985.

[82] My telephone interviews with students, 16 and 17 April and 2 May 2001.

[83] It is interesting to note that in a lecture entitled 'Moonies/Scientology', in Aish Hatorah's Audio Library, Sandy Gillmore discusses the numerous negatives about the love-bombing technique exhibited by Unification Church missionaries, and the use of such pejorative terms as 'zombies' and 'drones' in referring to Unification Church members, and 'closed cult' and 'crazy group' in referring to the Unification Church itself (Sandy Gillmore, 'Moonies/Scientology', Aish Hatorah Audio Centre, Jerusalem).

[84] In a lecture given on the halakhic issues concerning *keruv*, Rabbi Ari Kahn discusses the halakhic commandment to love other Jews and 'to care for them' as well as 'befriend' them for the sake of *ahavat Yisrael* (loving

[the nation of] Israel) and *keruv* (Rabbi Ari Kahn, '*Halakhic* Issues in *Kiruv*', Aish Hatorah Audio Centre, Jerusalem).

[85] See note 49 above.

[86] For a discussion of former Reform movement President Rabbi Alexander Schindler's call to the Jewish community to engage in outreach towards religiously unaffiliated non-Jews, and the subsequent unease with which many within the Jewish community reacted, see Peter L. Berger, 'Converting the Gentiles?', *Commentary*, vol. 67, May 1979, pp. 35–39.

[87] Indeed, some argue that Judaism has been a missionary religion since its inception, with the biblical patriarch Abraham paving the way by being the first Jewish missionary (see William G. Baude, *Jewish Proselytizing: In the First Five Centuries of the Common Era, The Age of the Tannaim and Amoraim*, Providence, Rhode Island, 1940; David Belin, *Why Choose Judaism: New Dimensions of Jewish Outreach*, New York, 1985; and Lawrence J. Epstein, *The Theory and Practice of Welcoming Converts to Judaism*, Lewiston, England, 1992). These scholars go on to argue that Jewish missionary behaviour declined after the ascent of Christianity and the institution of subsequent antisemitic laws which outlawed such behaviour, adding that it was not until the contemporary period that Jews were once again in an environment which allowed such behaviour to continue (Marty and Greenspahn, eds., op. cit. in note 63 above, pp. 48–49). Others have contended that Jews turn to proselytism when the survival of the Jewish community is at stake (Epstein, p. 160), the contemporary period being a time in which Jewish outmarriage, by many accounts, has never been higher and thus extremely threatening for Jewish survival. Perhaps for this reason, the emergence of the *ba'alei teshuva* has led to the development of a new approach to Jewish outreach (Danzger, op. cit. in note 3 above, pp. 80–81).

[88] Erik Schechter, 'The Battle for Jewish Souls', *The Jerusalem Report*, 14 February 2000, pp. 18–21.

[89] According to John Lofland, this behaviour is referred to as 'endorsement seeking' (see, Lofland, op. cit. in note 75 above, pp. 296–298).

[90] 'Actor Kirk Douglas Will Speak at Aish Hatorah Discovery Seminar', PR Newswire, 3 June 1996.

[91] 'Shatner Attending Ceremony Dedicating a Sculpture of the 12 Tribes of Israel at Aish Hatorah', AP Words Team, 8 December 1995.

[92] ' Aish Hatorah Festivities', *Sun Sentinel*, 27 May 1994, p. 4E.

[93] Peter Hirschberg, 'A Turn to God?' *The Jerusalem Report*, 21 February 1991, p. 20.

[94] 'A Beneficient Center', *The Jerusalem Post*, 20 June 1991, p. A1.

[95] Schechter, op. cit. in note 88 above, p. 20.

[96] Ibid.

[97] Each year Aish Hatorah hosts at least 22 fundraising dinners, where those attending pay $75–$500 a plate (Schechter, op. cit. in note 88 above, p. 20).

[98] It is worth noting that because many of these famous American Jewish men, who have donated either time or money to Aish Hatorah, have married non-Jewish women their children are not halakhically Jewish, and thus would not be allowed to study at Aish Hatorah's men's

yeshiva, according to Aish Hatorah's own standards, unless special arrangements were made.

[99] It is important to note that although Tom Cruise, a publicly outspoken devotee of the Church of Scientology, has donated money to Aish Hatorah, and Aish Hatorah advertises this fact via a large donation plaque found on the yeshiva premises. Aish Hatorah also has the following two audio tapes in their Audio Library, both disparaging the belief system of the Church of Scientology and referring to it as a 'destructive cult': 'Moonies/Scientology' and 'Cults: Spiritual Alternatives: Scientology', Aish Hatorah Audio Centre, Jerusalem.

[100] Op. cit. in note 92 above.

[101] Schechter, op. cit. in note 88 above, p. 20.

[102] See Robbins *et al.*, eds., op. cit. in note 7 above, p. 64.

FIELDWORK AMONG THE 'ULTRA-ORTHODOX': THE 'INSIDER-OUTSIDER' PARADIGM REVISITED

Lisa R. Kaul-Seidman

THE beginnings of the social scientific study of 'ultra-orthodox'[1] Jews in the new world can be traced to the works of George Kranzler[2] and Solomon Poll[3], both of whom focused on the *Hasidim*. Since then, anthropologists and sociologists have increasingly turned their attention to this section of Jewry — prompted, among other reasons, by a fascination with the 'survival' of this 'anachronistic' and 'stubborn relic of the past' in a modern-age.[4]

Although many of these studies are ethnographic in character and have used qualitative research methods — especially that of participant observation[5] — those published before 1970 do not provide detailed accounts of the *process* and *experience* of ethnographic fieldwork, nor of the issues these raise for the study of ultra-orthodox Jewry. This reticence can be traced partly to a disciplinary unease felt by both anthropologists and sociologists. As Tedlock, an anthropologist, puts it:[6]

> ... the public revelation of participatory details of the fieldwork experience is still considered to be embarrassingly unprofessional by some ethnographers. It is as though fieldwork is supposed to give us two totally independent things: reportable significant knowledge and unreportable mysticism and high adventure.

Since the 1970s, however, there has been a concerted move towards critical reflection on the implications of the method of participant observation, and especially on the issues arising from the dual roles played by the ethnographer as 'both detached and engaged, an element in the field of study and the instrument of its articulation'.[7] Increased recognition that 'ethnographers help to construct the observations that become their data'[8] has meant, to paraphrase Ruby,[9] that the ethnographer's behaviour, his/her basic assumptions,

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 44, nos. 1 and 2, 2002

the interactional settings where the research is conducted, etc., have all become data to be analysed and reported on in their own right. This move towards 'reflexivity'[10] has been bolstered by other shifts in anthropology, most notably the 'return' of anthropology 'home', and the concomitant rise of 'native' anthropology.[11]

The field of Jewish anthropology and sociology is fairly unique in that it has been and remains predominantly 'native'. As Kugelmass reports, '... the ethnography of American Jewry, ... very much like the sociology of American Jewry, ... consists for the most part of research done by Jews to be read chiefly by Jews'.[12] Unsurprisingly, most ethnographers of ultra-orthodox Jewry are identifiable, *to varying degrees*, as 'native' or 'insiders', in that they share a broad identification and affiliation with the Jewish tradition or with Jewish people-hood.[13]

Like reports of anthropological fieldwork done 'at home', fieldwork accounts of ultra-orthodox Jewry explore the 'dialogue between the anthropologist as outsider and the anthropologist as insider'.[14] Shaffir,[15] for example, writing in the pages of this Journal in 1985, focused on the way he had had to negotiate his 'Jewish' identity among the *Hasidim*, who were both familiar and yet utterly foreign to him, and the ethical dilemmas this raised. Although his upbringing in a 'traditional' home meant that he was fluent in Yiddish, it also gave him rough edges which he had to smooth in his presentation of self. In 'managing' this presentation of self during the period of his fieldwork he learnt not only quietly to accept hurtful opinions and views,[16] but also to affect various postures of an 'observant Jew'. He states: 'I stopped frequenting non-kasher restaurants in the vicinity of Lubavitch, kept a skullcap in my pocket in case I saw a Hassidic [sic] acquaintance from a distance, and became adept at describing my activities in a manner becoming to an observant Jew'.[17] Shaffir was prompted to shape his image in this manner primarily because he realized that the Tasher *Hasidim* found it easier to see him 'as a Jew interested in becoming more familiar with the requirements of Orthodox Judaism'.[18] In the interest of creating a rapport with the *Hasidim*, Shaffir not only allowed this portrayal of himself to exist, but

> actively and passively nurtured it: I listened attentively to explanations for the observance of various Jewish laws, participated in prayer services when called upon to do so, and appeared enthusiastic about broadening my knowledge and understanding of the Tasher view of Judaism.[19]

In a re-play of Shaffir's situation, Belcove-Shalin found that the *Hasidim* of Boro Park, among whom she did fieldwork, began to 'take her more seriously and open the door' to her when she 'encouraged ... their belief that one day [she] might become more observant'.[20]

In both cases, the Jewish ethnographer had to modify aspects of his/her 'insider' identity in order to facilitate his/her research. While both Belcove-Shalin and Shaffir highlight the ethical dilemmas which accompanied this modification, they were clearly given little choice: their informants demanded these 'modifications' of them. As Shaffir, who made every attempt *not* to 'become one of them' states:[21]

> They were seeing in me what they wanted to see — someone concerned with *Yiddishkayt* (Orthodox traditional knowledge of Judaism). Although I had frequently reminded them that I was conducting research, they repeatedly stressed that they were concerned about me as a Jew, not as a sociologist. In fact, most of them did not have much understanding of what a sociologist is. Many of those who did, I suspect, saw my research as a means through which my return to Judaism was to be achieved. As one man remarked, 'The *rebbe* doesn't mind people doing research on Lubavitch because this way they at least find out about *Yiddishkayt*'.

Difficult as this predicament was, Shaffir and Belcove-Shalin's Jewish identity was instrumental in facilitating their fieldwork because it offered them the opportunity to both identify and be identified with the socially legitimate category of the *ba'al teshuvah* (literally, master of repentance; feminine, *ba'alat teshuvah*).[22] Commenting on Belcove-Shalin's ability to use her personal status as a Jew to negotiate access to the *Hasidim*, Kugelmass asks:[23]

> Would a non-Jewish ethnographer feel comfortable in disguising his real motivations in quite the same way? Probably not. A non-Jew would probably assume that the distance between his own and his informant's culture was too vast. Nor would he or she be likely to be *offered the chance*.

In this article I address Kugelmass's question by analyzing my ongoing fieldwork among the ultra-orthodox *Neturei Karta* community of Jerusalem.[24] It is not my intention to list the comparative merits or demerits of the 'insider' versus 'outsider' anthropologist.[25] Rather, I am interested in showing how a combination of factors, namely, the nature of the anthropological enterprise, the modalities of ultra-orthodoxy's relationship to those who do not 'belong'[26], and the personal status and qualities of the researcher, *may* lead the field experiences of the non-Jewish 'outsider' anthropologist of the ultra-orthodox to be remarkably similar to those of a non-observant Jewish 'insider'[27] anthropologist. I suggest that both the non-observant Jewish 'insider' and the non-Jewish 'outsider' anthropologist attempt to 'belong' to the ultra-orthodox world, by adopting outward measures that help to efface or at least diminish their difference. For their part, as has been noted above, the ultra-orthodox view the non-observant Jewish ethnographer either as a *goyish yid*[28], or as one who is neither a *goy* nor a *yid*[29] (neither a gentile nor a Jew) and they tolerate and explain his/her existence in their midst by placing him/

her in the *liminal*[30] category of the *ba'al/ba'alat teshuvah*. I contend that when faced with a similarly anomalous non-Jewish ethnographer, who does not behave like a 'real' *goy*, the ultra-orthodox may explain his/her existence in their midst by using a *parallel* strategy of *incorporation*: they may place him/her in the *liminal* category of the potential *ger* (convert to Judaism).[31] In doing so, the ultra-orthodox are able to provide an emic explanation of the researcher, while exposing the ethnographer's anomalous role as both an outsider and an insider. Fieldwork reports on the ultra-orthodox are important, therefore, not only because they shed light on the process and experience of fieldwork for the individual researcher, but because they throw into relief social categories of the ultra-orthodox world. In what follows I present a descriptive account of my fieldwork experience followed in the conclusion by a brief discussion of matters raised in this section.

I

Background: Getting there

While doing research for my doctoral dissertation on the *Gush Emunim*,[32] I encountered several rather cryptic references to the *Neturei Karta* — both from the settlers in the West Bank settlement of Tekoa where I was doing fieldwork, and in the wider literature I was reading. Aramaic for 'Guardians of the City', *Neturei Karta* is the name of a small 'group' of ultra-orthodox, predominantly *Litai* Jews distinguished by its militant and uncompromisingly anti-Zionist stance.[33] The *Neturei Karta* has a central 'headquarter' in the Me'ah She'arim neighbourhood of Jerusalem,[34] and has 'members' elsewhere, especially in the United States and the United Kingdom. Its origins can be traced to the early 1930s, when a group of young men of the old *yishuv* broke away from the *Agudat Yisrael* to express their dissatisfaction over the latter's co-operation with the Zionists. Initially called *Ḥevrat Ḥayyim*, the group adopted the name *Neturei Karta* in 1938 while articulating its opposition to a defence tax. The Municipal Council of Jerusalem had sought to impose the tax in order to guard the Jews against attacks from Arabs, which had been particularly fierce in the preceding years. In the poster detailing its opposition, the *Ḥevrat Ḥayyim* recounted a passage from the Talmud[35] which states that teachers and scribes, rather than policemen (*sentorie karta*) are the true guardians of a city. Hence, by adopting the name *Neturei Karta*, the group signified its opposition to claims by the Zionists that they were the defenders or guardians of the Jewish people.[36] The *Neturei Karta* base their opposition to Zionist attempts at self-defence and sovereignty in their reading of selective passages of Jewish scripture. In particular, they draw on a passage in the Talmud,[37] which is

based on a verse from the 'Song of Songs', to argue that the Jews are to accept God's decree of exile and live as a purely spiritual community until God deems it time to send His Messiah; only then may the Jewish people return *en masse* to sovereignty in *Eretz Yisrael*. The *Neturei Karta* continue to articulate their opposition to the 'Zionist state' by adopting a variety of strategies, ranging from demonstrations and petitions to the United Nations, to co-operation with the Palestinian nationalists.

As I learned about the *Neturei Karta*, I came to view their anti-Zionist position as one end of the spectrum of Jewish religious nationalism, with the *Gush Emunim* at the other end.[38] Hence on finishing my doctorate I considered researching the *Neturei Karta*, as they were the logical next stop on the path of my ongoing research on Jewish religious nationalism. However, after conducting a preliminary survey of the literature on the *Neturei Karta* specifically and the ultra-orthodox world more generally, I concluded that gaining access to the 'closed' and 'impenetrable' world of the *Neturei Karta* would be an insurmountable task, especially given my gender (female), my non-Jewish status (Catholic), and my inability to speak or understand Yiddish (being Indian). I shelved the project for several years, until in a moment of abandon, I wrote an application for a Research Fellowship proposing the comparative study I had earlier envisaged. At the interview for the Fellowship I cautioned my interviewers that I could not guarantee the success of the project, as I was unable to predict whether I would be 'allowed' to do ethnographic fieldwork among the *Neturei Karta* — especially as I had, in the intervening years since Tekoa, added to my list of 'liabilities' by marrying a secular Jew. Regardless of this complication, I resolved to be absolutely truthful about my identity, as I had been in Tekoa.[39] In the following months I had ample occasion to reconsider the wisdom of that decision.

A first step involved learning Yiddish, and much to the consternation of my teacher, I was unable to tell her *which* dialect of Yiddish I needed to know.[40] Since literature which is particular to the *Neturei Karta* is scarce,[41] I began to familiarize myself with the history and sociology of ultra-orthodox Jewry in general, and of the *Ḥaredi* world in Israel in particular — by reading academic texts, newspaper and journalistic accounts, as well as novels which featured aspects of *Ḥaredi* life. I sensitized myself to the minute differences which distinguish different *Ḥaredim*, but which are undiscernable to the untrained eye, creating tables of the various factions and sects, and correlated these with markers of identity, such as residence, organization, dress, accent, and stance on Zionism and the State of Israel.[42] In addition to 'simulating' the world that I wanted to enter, I tried to memorize rules of social and ritual etiquette because I wanted to

ensure, given what I saw as my precarious social status, that I would be able to keep blunders to a minimum. This clearly stemmed from my insecurity as an outsider. In sharp contrast, Belcove-Shalin exploited her 'ignorance' by accessing the 'institutionalised role of the *amorets* [sic] (a person ignorant of Jewish law and custom)', which allowed her to 'make even the most elementary queries without incurring stigma'.[43] The next step was to embark on actual fieldwork in the *Neturei Karta* community of Jerusalem.

When I flew to Israel in February 1999, I had no idea about how I would gain access to the *Neturei Karta* community. Unlike Heilman and Shaffir, who could use the excuse of ritual obligations bestowed upon them by their gender to facilitate initial contact with 'their' ultra-orthodox communities, I was handicapped by the fact that I was both female and non-Jewish, and so could not access the same pool of 'ritual requirements': I could not, for example, appear at a *mikveh* before Yom Kippur and use my experience there as ethnographic data[44]; neither could I appear at services and expect to have my presence tolerated because the congregants assumed that I was attending a service in order to recite the mourner's prayer.[45] I had to think of strategies suitable to both my gender and my personal status.

II

Journeying to the inside: Gaining access, Making contact

There were essentially two strategies open to me: the covert and the overt. The covert, suggested to me by several secular Israelis, revolved around 'posing' — either as an *au pair*,[46] or as someone interested in 'returning' to or converting to Judaism. My 'advisers' added that I could always substantiate this latter claim by citing my husband's Jewish status as the driving force. I rejected both these options, primarily because of the element of falsehood they involved, but also because of the tortured logistics they would have entailed. Later I came to realize that both these options were impractical and unrealistic: most of the members of the *Neturei Karta* lead extremely modest lives and cannot afford an *au pair*; and the community does not have a programme of Jewish outreach and, hence, would have found it highly suspect if I had chosen to knock on their door from among the numerous doors of Jewish outreach in Jerusalem.[47]

I chose the 'overt' strategy of presenting myself to someone in the *Neturei Karta* community and being completely straightforward about my identity and goals. However, this left me with the problem of finding a person to contact. In my previous fieldwork I had managed to gain access to a settlement by contacting the *Yesha* Council,[48] which gave me telephone numbers of mayors of several settlements.

It was by contacting the mayor of Tekoa that I was able to live in Tekoa. Hence, I considered looking for a 'head' of the *Neturei Karta*, whom I could approach. I discovered, however, that ever since the deaths of the two original founders of the *Neturei Karta*, Rabbis Amram Blau and Aharon Katzenellenbogen, leadership of the 'group' has been contested. A second option was to approach an 'interstitial person'[49] who had somehow 'bridged the gap with the secular world' — either because of his American upbringing, his 'secular' past (in the case of a *ba'al teshuvah*), or because he was a designated or self-appointed spokesperson for his community.[50] I settled on Rabbi Dovid Fishman,[51] because he met two of these criteria: he was of American origin (hence spoke English), and he appeared regularly in the print media as a 'spokesperson' for the *Neturei Karta*. In order to procure his address and telephone number, I contacted one of the journalists[52] at the *Jerusalem Post* who had been covering the activities of the *Neturei Karta*. The journalist provided me with a telephone number, but also cautioned me: apparently the last non-Jews who had lived in Me'ah She'arim had been attacked and their apartment ransacked because of a rumour that they were missionaries. He warned that I might face physical danger, especially if rumours were spread about me.[53] In fact, his advice only served to strengthen my resolve to be absolutely honest about my identity.

With some trepidation I telephoned the number and told the person at the other end, whom I presumed to be Rabbi Fishman, that I wanted to research the *Neturei Karta*. Without asking me any questions he gave me the number of a cellular phone where I was able to reach Rabbi Fishman, who immediately agreed to meet me and then asked where I had procured his number. I am not sure if the mention of the journalist from the *Jerusalem Post* added to my legitimacy, but it certainly did not detract from it. However, he did not fix an appointment with me straight away, but asked me to ring back later that day. When I did so we agreed to meet a few days later at his son's house, and he requested that I should telephone an hour before the appointment in order to confirm it.

Since the neighbourhood of Me'ah She'arim is small and intimate, I wanted to arrive for my meeting comparatively inconspicuously. I also wanted to adhere to the rules of modesty. Hence earlier in the week I did a reconnaissance of the area and, on the day, I dressed in a crude approximation of a *'frume vayb'* (an observant Jewish woman) with a headscarf tied tightly, dark stockings, and a high-collared, well below the calf, long-sleeved dress.[54] Unfortunately a sudden downpour somewhat foiled my plans to pass unnoticed. Lacking an umbrella, I followed the example of the *Ḥaredi* men who protect their hats with plastic bags, but my plastic bag happened to be a colourful 'duty free' one, which drew several curious glances.

A stern young woman met me at the door of the house of Rabbi Fishman's son and invited me, in American-accented English, to sit down. Her manner was polite but extremely forbidding, and striking up a casual conversation seemed out of the question. She left me to sit alone and ponder my fate at the dining table, under the high ceiling of a sparkling clean room with arched doorways. Eventually the heavy silence was broken by the sound of a telephone ringing elsewhere in the house, which she brought to me stating that Rabbi Fishman wished to speak with me. He had telephoned to cancel the appointment and asked me to arrange another appointment with the lady of the house, who was his daughter-in-law. He suggested a time for later that evening, but in an over-zealous bid not to appear 'immodest' I declined the invitation.[55] After making an appointment for a later date, I summoned up the courage to ask his daughter-in-law whether I could ask her a couple of questions. I began by asking what dialect of Yiddish they spoke, and moved quickly and rather nervously into telling her about my research. I was pleasantly surprised to find that despite my earlier impression she had a gentle manner and an amiable disposition, and I left on the optimistic note that she would 'speak to her husband' concerning people I could communicate with. In the weeks to come she (Malka) would become a central informant and friend.

A few days later I did manage to interview Rabbi Fishman 'formally'. The interview established the pattern I would have to follow thereafter when speaking to men: we would always meet in the presence of another woman, for the sake of modesty, and our conversations would always be 'formal' and 'structured' in nature. The rules of modesty meant that I was unable to greet any of the men I knew in the street, let alone initiate a conversation or 'hang out' with them. The only occasions when I was able to speak with them outside the context of a formal interview were when invited to dine with the family, or when I was visiting and the man happened to be in the same room as the rest of the family. Although the formality imposed by a structured interview was far from ideal, it made it clear that I would have to distribute my fieldwork according to the genders.[56]

After my first meeting with Rabbi Fishman, Malka agreed to be interviewed. At the beginning, I observed the same rules of formality with her as I had with Rabbi Fishman and spoke to her only about 'business'. As the interview progressed, however, I realized that casual conversation with Malka was not only possible, but actually welcomed by her. Although it took me a while to find suitable contexts within which I could merely 'hang out', with Malka and with the other women I later met, the women themselves offered several clues, as well as taking the lead in showing me paths of possible conversation which were of interest to them. In observing the conver-

sations these women had when they met casually at one another's homes, I noticed that they often exchanged information — either mundane or pertaining to ritual observance. And so, I began to initiate conversations, or to jump into conversations, by raising questions pertinent to 'women's work' — candle lighting, *kashrut*, and local customs pertaining to the Jewish festivals. These questions were always welcome — even though the husbands were often enlisted to provide me with explanations of ritual or theological significance. Being a woman clearly helped as I could always fall back on the 'standard' stock of female[57] conversation: children, recipes, and dress (which in this case often revolved around the difficulty of obtaining ready-made clothes which were sufficiently modest, and extended to deriding the 'immodest' dress of the 'others'). Finally there was the subject of my background. Perhaps because India and Hindus do not occupy a place in their mental map of the world, the women initially hesitated to ask me about my background. Once I had deliberately pointed out aspects of Hindu custom which would be familiar to them (rules of commensality, menstrual taboos, and arranged marriages to name but three) they became more forthcoming with their questions.

A more significant 'ice-breaker', and perhaps the turning point in my quest for 'entrée', was the subject of my husband's relationship to Judaism as well as my own feelings towards it. Rebbetzin Rivke, the wife of Rabbi Fishman, perhaps legitimated by her age, her *yikhes* (literally, pedigree; she is the daughter of one of the founders of the *Neturei Karta*) and the renowned strictness of her religious observance, was the first to broach this 'taboo' subject. When she first asked her daughter-in-law to tell me to 'stop by', I assumed that she had agreed to be interviewed. On reaching her house, however, I realized that she was completely uninterested in answering any of my carefully prepared questions. Instead she asked me about my husband's relationship to Judaism as well as about my own attitudes. She then sat me down to listen to a radio broadcast[58] by a returnee to the faith, while she *davnt* (prayed) with great feeling and enthusiasm. Although she apologized at the end for not answering any of my questions and for raising difficult issues with me, she became more direct as she continued this pattern in our subsequent meetings. Once Rebbetzin Rivke had raised this topic, Malka, as if on cue, also began to talk about it.

While establishing relations with those whom I managed to meet was easier than I had expected, expanding my 'network' of contacts proved much more difficult. My initial contact, Rabbi Fishman, was happy to speak with me. He was, however, very reticent and diffident about suggesting the names of others, let alone offering to contact others to whom I could speak on my behalf. I later came to realize

that his reticence stemmed from two, related sources. First, Rabbi Fishman occupied a fairly controversial position within the *Neturei Karta* community because of his over-active support for the Palestinians. He evidently preferred that I should take his views as representative of *Neturei Karta* thought. Thus although he did not actively discourage me from speaking to others, he would ask such rhetorical questions as: 'You've spoken to me, isn't that enough? Why do you want to speak to 15 people? Do you want 15 different opinions?'

A second source of his reticence lay in the unwritten rules of social conduct. Thus, he often mentioned that I should 'speak to the girls' and that something would 'turn up'. Although I was disappointed, I realized that he was gently nudging me in the direction of the women, and was rather discretely letting me know that it would be improper for him to introduce me to other men. In fact, being connected to him might also have jeopardized my position among those who disagreed with him. However, on more than one occasion people mentioned that they saw me as a legitimate person to speak with, because the Fishman family had approved of me, and 'their *heksher* (literally, validation) is kasher'.

Creating a network among the women proved equally frustrating. While Malka and subsequent contacts all promised to 'ask their husbands' about people I could contact, nothing came of these promises. Even when my contacts did cite the names of possible contacts, they would add that these people were either very busy or in ill health. In due course I realized that my contacts did not want to impose my presence on others. Hence, I devised a strategy whereby I could meet women in a 'useful' context: I asked Malka if she knew of women who would be willing to spend an hour or so to tutor me in Yiddish conversation. I said that I needed to listen to the local idiom and that I was willing to pay a modest amount for these lessons. Moreover, I was willing to go to their homes for the lessons at a time convenient for them.

In the months that followed, I came to have four Yiddish teachers, all of whom proved to be indispensable sources of information. I had not envisaged, at the outset, that my prospective teachers would also become my 'informants'. It was purely by accident that I realized that they could play this role. I had taken some questions which I had prepared for an interview to my teacher, in the hope that she would correct my grammar. My teacher saw the questions as a framework within which to conduct a Yiddish conversation and so chose to answer the questions herself. Thereafter, I asked permission to tape our classes — a practice which I continued with my other teachers. Through my teachers I came to meet their friends and to learn something about my initial contacts in the Fishman family. Eventually, I established a network of about fifteen women. Five of

these became my core informants, with whom I was able to 'hang out', conduct formal interviews, celebrate the Sabbath and the festival of *Succoth*, walk around the neighbourhood, and make a pilgrimage to Meron.

III

Presenting 'myself': Did I really have a chance to be myself?

Three factors influenced my presentation of self. The first stemmed from my upbringing in India, where one learns to respect the customs of others when in their space (for example, to cover one's head while visiting a *gurudwara*, the Sikh place of worship). This meant that I did not share the antipathy many secular Israelis feel to *Ḥaredi* 'hegemony' over dress codes in *Ḥaredi* social spaces. Second, I consciously wanted to distance myself, in the eyes of my informants, from those secular Israelis who make a point of disregarding the dress codes which posters request of those entering Me'ah She'arim. Third, given the ghetto-like character of Me'ah She'arim, where everyone is under public scrutiny, I wanted to make myself as unobtrusive and 'invisible' as possible.[59]

In my initial forays into the neighbourhood, I did my best to dress as an unmarried *frum* (literally, pious) girl. However, I quickly switched to dressing like a married *frum* woman, because the image of an unmarried *frum* girl was unworkable and did not pass muster. There were essentially three categories of unmarried, young religious women in the neighbourhood. There were those who lived there, who were considerably younger than I, and with whom I could not blend. Second, there were those who did not live there, were of either Sephardi or Oriental Jewish origin, and who dressed differently. I could have matched these girls in appearance, but they came to Me'ah She'arim and its environs primarily to shop for clothes or groceries, not to spend hours in the bookshops as I did. Third were the American girls, whose New York chic, cell phones, and loud voices set them apart. Of all three categories, it was only some among the first who were to be seen walking alone. Even so, they walked purposefully to and from errands, and it was only on the Sabbath or on festivals that they were to be seen strolling through, and then they were always accompanied by other girl friends and the inevitable gaggle of younger siblings. Moreover, few if any stopped to read posters or to take notes on them.

Hence, I chose to present myself as the married woman I was, but to conform to *their* idea of how a married woman ought to look. Even this proved to be fraught with problems. A minor technical difficulty was that it took some practice and a lot of observing on my part to discover how to achieve 'the look'.[60] In addition, I found myself

unconsciously adopting local mannerisms and figures of speech — squeezing to a side or even crossing a street to let a man pass by, answering all questions about my well being with the phrase *'Borukh Hashem'* (literally, 'blessed be the Name' — that is, God), adding *'b'ezrat Hashem'* (with the help of God) to statements about the future, and affecting the appropriate gestures and sounds to convey my dismay and shock at tawdry goings on in the secular world.[61] Additionally, I often drew explicit parallels between their lives and mine, which I thought would 'go down well': for example, I often mentioned that I did not have a television set at home; or when leaving my Yiddish class, I would remark on the housework I needed to do, since I, too, was a *baleboste* (housewife); I also mentioned that I, like many of them, worked while my husband studied. The latter backfired miserably, primarily because my husband's studies at a secular university clearly did not count as *Lernen* (studying) in their eyes. Hence, instead of the anticipated rapport, I found older women asking why my husband was not interested in a *parnose* (livelihood) and whether I resented having to work while he pursued his studies.[62]

While I had been careful to craft my presentation of self in order to make myself acceptable, I was unprepared for the manner in which my efforts would be interpreted and the expectations they would raise — especially among those who were not my informants, but who were relevant to my relationship with my informants. These included the general population of Me'ah She'arim, as well as friends and relatives of my informants. I had not foreseen, for instance, that in virtue of being dressed like a *frum* woman, I would also have to *behave* like one, especially in public spaces. Hence, I became a magnet to *tzeddaka* (charity) collectors, to whom I felt I had to give something in order to keep up appearances. Second, I needed to have the appropriate knowledge to conduct myself as an 'insider,' because any breach of social mores on my part would be noticed, and would make people suspicious of me. For example, while buying biscuits for a friend, I crossed to the far side of the shop to see whether the *kashrut* certification was appropriate. I turned around quickly when I felt the eyes of everyone in the shop upon me, only to realize that I was standing in the men's section of the shop. In my haste, I had failed to see the *mehitzah* (partition). While such a breach could well have been expected from a tourist, it was puzzling from someone dressed as a local resident. Third, there was no going 'off-duty' while dressed as a *frum* woman. Once, at the end of a long evening, I found myself engaged in casual conversation with a young, religious, but not *Haredi*, shopkeeper from whom I often purchased fruit. I was made aware of my transgression both by the look of surprise on his face, and by the stern looks I received from an older woman who entered the shop.

While these implications of my appearance arose in the wider social context of the neighbourhood, and affected my relationship with my informants only indirectly, my appearance also had implications which impinged on my relations with my informants in more direct ways. This occurred primarily with 'third' parties, who happened to visit my informants while I was there. Since my informants were not keen to introduce me, because they did not want to have to explain who I was and what I was doing, I thought it politic to be reticent about myself. However, my informants' visitors often asked me the 'usual' slew of questions about where I lived, where my husband studied, where I was from, and how I knew the mutual friend. While I learned how to answer the last question 'correctly', finding suitable answers to the first three took some time. After telling one person that I was from India, and being faced with the further question of how I managed to get kasher food in India, I began to tell people that I was from England and that my husband *'learnt'* in England. Unfortunately, since Oxford hasn't made it to the list of the world's great yeshivas, and since it does not sound like a particularly respectable Jewish neighbourhood, I learned to stall questions about 'where in England'. Similarly, I quickly learned not to let on that I lived in a non-*Ḥaredi* neighbourhood in Jerusalem.[63] Instead, I would state vaguely that I lived 'close-by', and would name a *'Ḥaredi'* street which was recognizable.

I was finally prompted to construct a consistent and believable story after an occasion on which, while my informant was out of the room, a visiting acquaintance of hers became suspicious of my vague and inconsistent answers to her questions. She began to bombard me with questions, until I had no choice but to admit the full truth about myself. That did not solve the matter entirely, because she was convinced that I was being deliberately deceitful. When my informant returned to the room, the acquaintance, who was older than my informant, told her that I was a fraud, berated her for speaking with me, and stormed out of the room. By dressing as an 'insider', I had clearly bitten off more than I could chew; but I was unable to turn back. While I had started out trying to be respectful as well as invisible, my disguise took over and forced me to adopt mannerisms which I had not considered adopting. While it might have been possible to go from an uncovered head to a covered one, reversing the process was clearly not an option.

IV

Explaining myself

It had been difficult enough to explain to the security staff of *El Al* airline that I was a non-Jewish, Indian anthropologist with a post-

doctoral fellowship from a Theology Department in a university in England planning to research the *Neturei Karta*. I expected that explaining myself to the *Neturei Karta* would be even worse. Although I had resolved to be completely truthful about my work and my identity, I recognize in retrospect that I repeatedly lost my nerve, or at least some of it, when confronted with the actual situation.

Looking back at my field notes from my first, awkward encounter with Malka (the rabbi's daughter-in-law), I now realize that I sterilized the account I gave her. I began by telling her that I was learning Yiddish, that I was interested in learning about the *Neturei Karta*, and was to that end interested in living in Me'ah She'arim. I also told her that I was willing to be an *au pair* in exchange for lodging, despite the fact that I had originally rejected this last option. Fortunately for me, she did not know what an *au pair* was. Instead of retracting the offer, however, I suggested that I could be a 'baby-sitter'. Again she offered me a way out, asking how being a baby-sitter would help me. 'You want to see the lifestyle?' she asked. She had hit the nail on the head. But she had also exposed a sore spot for me: the history of anthropology is inextricably linked to colonial practices, and perhaps because of my 'third world' background, I have always read 'studying a lifestyle' to suggest condescending 'objectification'.[64] So I hid my discomfort by offering a more 'neutral' suggestion: 'No, it is more the *ideology* that I'm interested in learning about'. I omitted to mention my own background to her, or to explain the context of my research. For her part, as she later told me, she *assumed* that I was Jewish, because I was learning Yiddish: why else would someone learn Yiddish, if she wasn't, or didn't want to become, Jewish?

When I met Rabbi Fishman for the first time, I began by 'laying my cards on the table': telling him that I was non-Jewish and married to a Jew. He listened to this bemusedly — and then dismissed it as 'not relevant to our interview'. Despite my good intentions, however, I could not bring myself to mention that I was Catholic. I also omitted to tell him of the wider theoretical questions about religious nationalism underlying my research, or the element of comparison with the *Gush Emunim*. Later on, I began to offer various descriptions of my research, depending partly on the language in which I was communicating (English, Hebrew, Yiddish), and partly on the person to whom I was speaking. In its most minimal form, my explanation was that I was 'writing a book'. In its more expansive forms: a), I was looking at the ideology and how this translated into action; b), I was interested in the women's role in reproducing the ideology; c), I was interested in the construction of *Neturei Karta* identity; d), I was interested in the more general relationship between religion and the State; e), I was interested in the *Neturei Karta* as an example of a *nationalist* group that does not require a state to articulate its nation-

alism; and f), I was interested in comparing the religious nationalist ideology of the *Neturei Karta* with that of the *Gush Emunim*.

Because my informants were open and vociferous in their disdain for the *Mizraḥim* (followers of the religious Zionist *Mizraḥi* political party), it took me a long time to proffer the last explanation, even though it was closest to my actual research. At one stage, in fact, I thought that my association with the Tekoans would be far more damaging than my Catholicism. However, on accidentally revealing my familiarity with the *Mizraḥim*, I was greatly relieved to find that I did not cause irreparable damage to myself. Even then I did not admit that I was interested in a comparative study, however. Instead, I rather feebly stated that I hadn't made up my mind about the focus of my research. To which my informant asked, thoroughly puzzled, 'you mean to say you can keep changing your mind? Didn't you have to tell them what you were going to do?'.

Although I did eventually reveal that I was a Catholic (and had been all my life), this was in order to rule out expectations that I was interested in converting to Judaism. This expectation had been bolstered by several early discussions about my own and my husband's relationships to Judaism, where by being 'truthful', I had only served to implicate myself. For example, I had stated that we often marked the Sabbath by lighting candles and sitting down to a special meal. Very quickly, I realized that my husband's expressions of 'cultural' or 'traditional' affiliation were open to a different interpretation and I began to be asked questions pertaining to my personal life. At that point, I decided to state unequivocally that I was Catholic and not interested in converting. Having done that, I had to explain why, *as a Catholic*, I was interested in understanding the *Neturei Karta*.[65] Unfortunately, my honest answer that I had no clear, rational reason for my interest, save that I had always been fascinated by things Jewish, merely served to fire their imagination that, despite myself, I was 'drawn' to Judaism and, hence, must be a 'lost' soul struggling to return. Thus, despite my attempts to be honest, it became increasingly clear that none of my explanations were taken at their face value. Instead, my informants chose to construct their own explanation of who I was and what I was doing.

V

Their questions and explanations: The story they found believable

Although I was not the first researcher in the neighbourhood, and although I had made every effort to be as candid as I possibly could, my informants remained rather confused by the aims of my research:[66] why would the *goyim* be interested in learning about the *Neturei Karta*? Would I 'get in trouble' with the Zionists for writing

about the *Neturei Karta*? Was I sure that I knew who my sponsors were? Had I ever considered the possibility that I was being 'used'? What was this kind of research that required that I spend so much time talking to so many people? Why did I need to know about the local customs and ritual traditions? Why was it not enough for me to read the publications of the *Neturei Karta* in which 'those who knew' expressed their views?[67] Even more puzzling was my presentation of myself: Why, if I was only trying to be 'modest', someone queried, did I need to go the whole way and dress like a *frume vayb*, especially since it meant considerable discomfort in the soaring temperatures of the Jerusalem summer? Last, but not least: why should I, a Catholic, be so interested in learning about them and their rituals? Was I sure that my parents were my real parents? Was I sure that I had no European ancestors?[68]

These questions were posed to me with considerable frequency; and since none of my answers seemed to satisfy, they were clearly rhetorical. As in Shaffir's[69] and Belcove-Shalin's[70] experiences, my informants chose to understand my academic interest as a spiritual quest. Hence the ease with which I was learning Yiddish, my sartorial style, and my comportment were all seen as proof of my 'inherent affinity' for things Jewish. Moreover, my marriage to a non-observant Jew who was nevertheless sympathetic[71] to the political position of the *Neturei Karta* complicated the picture immensely. Although I managed, aided by my husband's outright refusal to partake in ritual practices, to convince them that my husband was not interested in becoming a *ba'al teshuvah*, I was unable to convince them of my integrity as a Catholic. This might well have been because I, unlike my husband, continued to be interested in ritual matters. They became increasingly convinced that it was my husband who stood in the way of my 'Jewish *neshema* (soul)' returning to Judaism. Malka, for example, frequently told me the story of a man adopted by a Christian couple who, upon learning that his biological parents were Jewish, broke up his marriage to convert to Judaism. Others told me stories involving people who were 'drawn' to aspects of Jewish life only to come to know at a later stage that they were in fact Jewish. Although my informants continued to pepper me with these stories and with other oblique hints, the orthodox Jewish aversion to proselytizing prevented them from speaking openly about the possibility of my conversion.

Things came to a head, however, when the daughter-in-law of one my informants, who had never spoken to me before, heard me speak in Yiddish and became confirmed in her suspicion that I wished to convert. She immediately took me to meet a young *ger* and introduced me as someone who also wanted to convert. Puzzled and somewhat distressed, I tried to reconstruct possible reasons for this misun-

derstanding. Undoubtedly I had been somewhat ambiguous about my relationship to Judaism in the early days of my fieldwork. Additionally, my presentation of myself had sent out all the wrong signals. However, as soon as I became aware of the misunderstandings I was generating, I was extremely careful in all I said and did. Hence, I ensured that when necessary, I quickly washed my hands, rather than making a show of washing 'ritually' as I had been doing. I also took to exhibiting signs of my status as an outsider. For example, I began to carry my satchel again after having given it up for a plastic carrier bag.[72] Yet it was precisely when I had thought that the issue was settled (despite the stories of the adopted man and other returners), that I was taken to exchange notes with a complete stranger, all because she was a *ger*.

I was clearly not alone in my puzzlement or distress. All those who had previously asked me about my relationship to Judaism had been extremely apologetic when broaching the subject. Similarly, they had been careful to precede their stories about converts with the caveat that they, unlike Christians, did not believe in proselytizing. They clearly found themselves in as anomalous a situation as I did. And it took the daughter-in-law of one of my informants who had never spoken to me before to cut through the ambiguity and to express what was clearly uppermost in their minds. However, this person merely provided an answer as to who I was and what I was doing. When I confronted Malka with the issue, she articulated the *question*, which had been bothering her: *how could someone be exposed to true Judaism, and not be swayed by it?*

On returning to the field, after an intermission of two years, I resolved to restate my disinterest in converting as forcefully and as often as necessary — even if this should prove hurtful or should jeopardize my reception. Most of my previous informants finally accepted my claim — even as they defended their earlier assumption by saying that my behaviour and the level of my interest had been misleading. Although this led to an awkward initial week in which I was over-cautious about not 'misleading' them, and in which they were careful not to let me feel that they thought of me as a potential *ger*, my informants have not closed their doors to me. On the contrary, some have made a genuine attempt to understand my research and have been more forthcoming with information on the *Neturei Karta*. Many now accept my presence there as a 'part of my *parnose*' (livelihood). To my surprise, by talking freely about my 'other' life in England, I have been able to establish a different level of 'intimacy'.[73] The third time that Malka proclaimed to me that she couldn't believe that I did not normally wear a *tikhl* (headscarf), I felt comfortable enough to show her a photograph of myself taken in my 'real' life as proof. 'Nice to meet you', Malka responded. For their

part, my informants have come to ask me more personal questions about myself even as they have entrusted me with personal confidences which I would be loath to publish. Despite this, I clearly remain an anomaly, who poses difficult questions for them as they continue to extend a welcome to me. For example, Malka's seven-year-old son has wanted to know why she speaks to a gentile. And although I am now accepted as an anthropologist, for whom this research is a *parnose*, my informants still ask me occasionally, 'Do you *really* know why you are doing this?'

Conclusion

Ever since Frederick Barth's[74] seminal work on ethnic groups, anthropologists have held that it is at the boundaries or in encounters with the 'other' that a group's identity is constructed and reinforced. Following this school of analysis, Shaffir[75] analysed aspects of *Hasidic* curricula, proselytizing activities, and negotiations of conflict to show how the *Hasidim* proclaim and maintain their distinctiveness in these three areas by throwing the otherness of the 'others' into relief.

Barth's thesis has a similar relevance to the *Neturei Karta*. The *Neturei Karta* distinguish themselves from other *Ḥaredim* in their personal practice by the stringency with which they interpret and apply the law. Likewise, public practices which distinguish the *Neturei Karta* aim to create a metaphorical four cubits of space between them and the Zionists, while providing an example of 'authentic' Judaism to other *Ḥaredim*.[76] Through all these processes of distinguishing themselves from 'others', the *Neturei Karta* maintain an idealized and essentialized picture of the other as well as of themselves, open to neither inspection nor scrutiny. This is evident not only in *Neturei Karta* rhetoric but, for instance, in the plethora of posters which request modest dress and comportment in the neighbourhood. These serve not only to protect the young from undesirable sights; they also reinforce the stereotype of the immodest outsiders, even in their physical absence.

In reflecting upon my own fieldwork experience, I have come to realize that despite my fastidious concern with the way I presented myself, and despite my inflated sense of self-importance, my informants' interpretations of my actions, and the story that they came to believe about me, had little to do with me. It had to do with them, and with the challenge that my presence as an anthropologist posed to them. The anthropologist interrupts the process by which *Ḥaredim* essentialize the other, by forcing them to *engage* with an outsider, giving them the opportunity to question the outsider and inspect her/his identity. Moreover, the anthropologist makes every attempt

to be sociable and likable, and this means becoming *like* them, and in particular becoming a Jew like them. On the other hand, as long as a woman remains an anthropologist, she does not become entirely like them: she remains other. The presence of a likable, somewhat-Jewish other, who remains other even as she expresses interest and affinity, poses an existential challenge to the certainty of the ultra-orthodox Jew. As Malka put it, how can someone be exposed to the truth, and not be swayed by it? Unlike the idealized, essentialized 'other', the anthropologist is a mirror in which *Ḥaredim* can see no clear reflection of themselves. And the *Ḥaredim* recognize this problem. Thus Shaffir[77] and Heilman[78] discovered the *Ḥaredim* to be wary of exposing their children to the anthropologist.

In order to avoid an actual confrontation with the uncertainty that the anthropologist can cause, the ultra-orthodox throw themselves and the anthropologist a life-line: the category of a potential *ba'al teshuvah*, or potential *ger*. Both categories are suitably liminal to contain contradiction and ambiguity[79]; and both are suitably processual not to require any immediate change. More importantly, they are existing social categories of the system, and so reinforce the belief in the comprehensiveness of the system, and its capacity to explain anything, no matter how anomalous, in its own terms of reference.[80]

In the light of my recent field experience, I am persuaded to see the throwing of this life-line as a reflex, which helps to contain uncertainty and ambiguity at the level of the collective. However, when *Ḥaredim* are faced with an anomaly which does not disappear even in the face of the explanation provided, some individuals accept that 'not everything can be black and white'. In my case, bonds of friendship, combined with the desire to publicize the *Neturei Karta*, allow some of them to live with ambiguity, *as long as it does not threaten*.

Anthropologists report a variety of roles which they have adopted, or which have been foisted upon them, while in the field. Considering that these include such categories as 'ignoramus, fool, and child',[81] the roles of *ba'al/ba'alat teshuvah* and potential *ger* are fairly complimentary. In retrospect, I ought to have viewed my placement in the category of potential *ger* as a gesture of incorporation, rather than as an occasion for dismay.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the Academic Study Group (Israel and the Middle East) for a travel grant and to the University of Birmingham for two 'School Research Grants' which enabled me to study Yiddish and to travel to Israel. I am also grateful to Dr Kerstin Hoge for help with Yiddish transliteration.

NOTES

[1] The term 'ultra-orthodox' is of recent provenance and is a term of identification rather than one of self-identification. It works to distinguish among those who were previously identified simply as 'orthodox', according to the degree of their engagement with modernity. In Israel, *Haredi*, literally 'one who trembles' (as based on Isaiah 66:5), replaces the term 'ultra-orthodox'. In this paper I am using 'ultra-orthodox' as a blanket term which comprehends the many divisions of the ultra-orthodox world. In particular, I use the term to refer to both *Hasidic* and *Mitnagid* (opponents of *Hasidic*) Jews as well as to those 'who withdrew' (*Prushi*). For a discussion of the emergence of ultra-orthodoxy, see M. Silber, 'The Emergence of Ultra-Orthodoxy: The Invention of a Tradition', in J. Wertheimer, ed., *The Uses of Tradition*, New York, 1992, pp. 23–84. See also M. Samet, 'The Beginnings of Orthodoxy', in *Modern Judaism*, vol. 8, no. 3, October 1988, pp. 249–270.

[2] G. Kranzler, *Williamsburg: A Jewish Community in Transition*, New York, 1961.

[3] S. Poll, *The Hasidic Community of Williamsburg*, New York, 1962.

[4] For an overview of studies on *Hasidim* see J. Belcove-Shalin, 'The Hasidim of North America: A review of the Literature', in W. Zenner, ed., *Persistence and Flexibility: Anthropological Perspectives on the American Jewish Experience*, Albany, 1988, pp. 183–207.

[5] Although the meaning and modalities of anthropological fieldwork have changed over the years, one feature continues to be seen as constitutive of the fieldwork process: participant observation. Bronislaw Malinowski is popularly credited with outlining the parameters of this distinctive method, which entails: a long-term immersion into an 'other' culture; participation in that culture as though the anthropologist 'belongs' to that culture; and a simultaneous maintenance of 'detachment' which enables the anthropologist to 'observe' the culture, and to give an 'objective' description and evaluation of what goes on there. For details of this method, see S. Drucker-Brown, 'Participant Observation: A Social Anthropologist's view of the label', in *Cambridge Anthropology*, vol. 10, no. 3. 1985, pp. 41–73. See also H. R. Bernard, *Research Methods in Anthropology. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 2nd Edition, London, 1994.

[6] B. Tedlock, 'From Participant Observation to the Observation of Participation: The Emergence of Narrative Ethnography' in *The Journal of Anthropological Research*, vol. 47, no. 1, Spring 1991, p. 71.

[7] D. Bell, 'Introduction 1. The Context', in D. Bell, P. Caplan and W. Karim, eds., *Gendered Fields. Women, Men and Ethnography*, London and New York, 1993, p. 1.

[8] C. Davies, *Reflexive Ethnography*, London and New York, 1999, p. 5.

[9] J. Ruby, 'Exposing Yourself: Reflexivity, Anthropology, and Film' in *Semiotica*, vol. 30, no. 1/2, 1980, p. 162.

[10] For an early and excellent discussion of this movement, see J. Ruby, ed., *A Crack in the Mirror. Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology*, Philadelphia, 1982.

[11] Anthropology has traditionally been a 'Western' discipline with non-Western subjects. Changed economic, political, and historical factors have encouraged the shift in focus from non-Western to Western subjects. Nonetheless, early forays into the West focused on the marginal. See for

example, J. Okely, *The Traveller-Gypsies*, Cambridge, 1983. For extended discussions of anthropology 'at home', see A. J. Jackson, ed., *Anthropology at Home*, London, 1987; D. Messerschmidt, ed., *Anthropologists at Home in North America: Methods and Issues in the Study of One's Own Society*, Cambridge and New York, 1981.

[12] J. Kugelmass, 'Introduction', in J. Kugelmass, ed., *Between Two Worlds. Ethnographic Essays on American Jewry*, Ithaca and London, 1988, p. 1. His comment on the state of American Jewish studies is, for the most part, also applicable to the non-American context. See also S. Cohen and E. Greenstein, eds., *The State of Jewish Studies*, Michigan, 1990.

[13] The category 'native' is neither unproblematic nor undifferentiated. I use the term here as a generalized gloss to denote the widest and most tenuous links between the 'Jewish' ethnographer and his/her 'Jewish' subjects. While I use this term for convenience, I recognize Narayan's suggestion (K. Narayan, 'How Native is a "Native" Anthropologist?' in *American Anthropologist*, vol. 95 no. 3, 1993, pp. 671–686) that the terms 'native' and 'non-native' have outlived their usefulness and that it might be more profitable to 'view each anthropologist in terms of shifting identifications amid a field of interpenetrating communities and power relations' (ibid., p. 671).

[14] Kugelmass, op. cit. in Note 12 above, p. 1.

[15] W. Shaffir, 'Some Reflections on Approaches to Fieldwork in Hassidic Communities', in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 27, no. 2, December 1985, pp. 115–34.

[16] The Satmar, for example, viewed his Jewishness as suspect. Furthermore, they offended his sensibility by denouncing the State of Israel and Zionism. Similarly, the Lubavitch were contemptuous of the school in which he had received his Jewish education: op. cit. in Note 15 above, p. 130.

[17] Ibid., p. 130.

[18] Ibid., p. 127.

[19] Ibid.

[20] J. Belcove-Shalin, 'Becoming More of an Eskimo: Fieldwork among the Hasidim of Boro Park', in J. Kugelmass, ed., op. cit. in Note 12 above. Davidman also reports a similar experience: L. Davidman, *Tradition in a Rootless World. Women Turn to Orthodox Judaism*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford, 1991.

[21] Op. cit. in Note 15 above, pp. 122–23.

[22] 'Master of repentance' is a term used to describe a secular Jew who decides to observe the rules of Orthodox Judaism — a 'born-again' Jew, or a 'returnee to the faith', so to speak.

[23] My emphasis. Op. cit. in Note 12 above, p. 17.

[24] This paper is based on fieldwork I conducted in three stints for a total of four and half months in 1999 on the *Neturei Karta* community in Jerusalem. Although my husband joined me for the summer in 1999, he did not take part in fieldwork. There were only two occasions on which he accompanied me to the field when we were invited to dine with a family. I returned to the field in 2001 for a month and have made some revisions in the light of that visit.

[25] See for example, S. Heilman, 'Jewish Sociologist: Native-as-Stranger', in

The American Sociologist, 15 May 1980, pp. 100–108. See also his discussion in the Introduction in S. Heilman, *Synagogue Life*, Chicago, 1976. For a wider discussion of this issue, see M. Kanaaneh, 'The "Anthropologicality" of Indigenous Anthropology', in *Dialectical Anthropology*, vol. 22, no. 1, March 1997, pp. 1–21.

[26] As Anthony Cohen points out (A. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London and New York, 1985), the issue of 'belonging' is a 'symbolic' one and subject to contestation. Hence although the Jewish ethnographer may be, to borrow an example from Heilman (S. Heilman, 'Jewish Sociologist: Native-as-Stranger', in *The American Sociologist*, 15 May 1980, pp. 100–108) an 'affective' insider, he/she may not belong. Similarly the non-Jewish ethnographer may be a social insider who clearly does not belong.

[27] The relationship between the observant Jewish ethnographer and the ultra-orthodox is a complex one. I am inclined to suggest that even the orthodox ethnographer is often treated as a version of the *ba'al teshuvah* rather than as an *apekoiris* (heretic). Heilman's discussion of how a Belz *Hasid* interpreted Heilman's presence at the Belz yeshiva as a 'triumph' and as a 'cultural victory in history' of the *Ḥaredim* over the 'acculturated' seems to bear my suggestion out. As another *Hasid* told Heilman, 'You went out there but in the end you were drawn back. You see that what truly matters is in here, not where you have been living.' (S. Heilman, *Defenders of the Faith. Inside Ultra-Orthodox Jewry*, New York, 1992, p. 73).

[28] Belcove-Shalin, op. cit. in note 20 above, p. 85.

[29] Shaffir, op. cit. in note 15 above, p. 130.

[30] Belcove-Shalin (op. cit. in note 20 above) also notes this point. See Note 79 below.

[31] It is not my intention to claim that this is the *only* way in which ultra-orthodoxy relates to an anomalous non-Jewish ethnographer.

[32] The *Gush Emunim*, or the Bloc of the Faithful, are distinguished by their irredentist stance towards the occupied territories of the West Bank, Gaza, and the Golan Heights, which they see as integral parts of the Land of Israel, and the settlement of which they see as facilitating the coming of the Messiah.

[33] The *Neturei Karta* do not identify themselves as a 'group'. Neither do they have membership lists. Hence the issue of identifying who is a 'member' of the *Neturei Karta* is a complex one. Although the 'core' of the *Neturei Karta* in Jerusalem is *Litai* (Lithuanian) several *Hasidic* groups also subscribe to the *Neturei Karta* ideology and participate in its actions. This overlap results partly from the close identification between the *Neturei Karta* and the *Eda Ḥaredith* — formed in 1919 to represent those members of the old *yishuv* (pre-Zionist Jewish community of Palestine) who did not wish to be allied with the Zionists or with the soon to be established Chief Rabbinate. Hence the late Satmar Rebbe, Rabbi Yoel Teitalbaum — who was the head (*nasi*) of the *Eda Ḥaredith* — was one of the clearest expounders of *Neturei Karta* ideology. Since the late 1960s the *Neturei Karta* has come to be increasingly distant from the *Eda Ḥaredith*, and has developed an identity as a *'kannoi'* (zealot) group which is identifiably *'Litai'*, albeit with *Hasidic* supporters. For details of the relationship between the *Neturei Karta* and the *Eda Ḥaredith*, see M. Friedman, 'Religious Zealotry in Israeli Society', in S. Poll and

E. Krausz, eds., *On Ethnic and Religious Diversity in Israel*, Ramat-Gan, 1975.

[34] Since the *Neturei Karta* is not a *Hasidic* group there are no requirements of residence for members. However, the core of the community continue to live in and around the Me'ah She'arim neighbourhood.

[35] Jerusalem Talmud, Hagigah 76:B. See also N. Lamm, 'The Ideology of the *Neturei Karta* according to the Satmarer Version' in *Tradition*, vol. 12, Fall 1971, pp. 38–53.

[36] I am grateful to Professor Menachem Friedman (in personal conversation) for bringing this point to my notice.

[37] Ketuboth, 111a.

[38] For a somewhat similar understanding see A. Ravitzsky, *Messianism, Zionism, and Jewish Religious Radicalism*, Chicago, 1996.

[39] For details of my fieldwork in Tekoa see L. R. Kaul, *Re-claiming the Nation Through Land: Jewish Religious Nationalism in Israel*, unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, University of Oxford, 1995.

[40] Knowledge of the 'correct' dialect proved to be an unimportant and extraneous detail since my informants themselves spoke a variety of dialects.

[41] I am not aware of a full-length ethnography devoted exclusively to the *Neturei Karta*. Literature on the *Neturei Karta* can be divided into the following categories: (A) Accounts written by members of the *Neturei Karta*, which discuss the ideology and activities of the group. Notable in this category are I. Domb, *The Transformation. The Case of the Neturei Karta*, London, 1958; M. Schonfeld, *Genocide in the Holy Land*, New York, 1980; and R. Blau, *Shomrei Ha'ir*, Jerusalem, 1979. (B) Studies written by academic 'sympathizers'. Most notable in this category is E. Marmorstein, *Heaven at Bay. The Jewish Kulturkampf in the Holy Land*, London, 1969. (C) Studies written by 'objective' academics, notably, M. Friedman, *Hevrah v' Da'at*, Jerusalem, 1979, ch. 6; D. Schnall, 'Natore Karta: Religious Anti-Zionism', in *Midstream*, vol. xxv, no. 1, January 1979, pp. 55–64; and N. Lamm, op. cit., in Note 35 above.

[42] In retrospect, this classification served to blind me to the subtle variations that exist within the categories. It took me a while to overcome my classifying zeal and to appreciate the various permutations and combinations which exist within and sometimes across the categories.

[43] Op. cit. in Note 20 above, p. 94.

[44] Heilman, op. cit. in Note 27 above, pp. 3–9.

[45] Shaffir, op. cit. in Note 15 above, p. 120.

[46] This was prompted by the reportedly successful attempt of an Israeli journalist to enter the *Haredi* world by posing as an *au pair*. Unlike me, she was Jewish, and had been able to school herself in matters of Jewish orthodoxy. I have been unable to confirm this research.

[47] Jerusalem has some of the best-organized networks of Jewish outreach, catering to different segments of the Jewish population — native Israelis and tourists. Youngsters are often accosted at the *Kotel* (Wailing Wall) or at other tourist attractions. See J. Aviad, *Return to Judaism*, Chicago, 1983 and J. Smith, 'The Pick Up Artists', in *The Jerusalem Report*, July 29, 1993, pp. 20–21.

[48] An umbrella organization representing the various settlements in the West Bank, Gaza, and the Golan Heights.

[49] I am grateful to Dr Sacha Stern for suggesting this term. That anthropologists often end up talking to those who are 'marginal' to their communities is commonly recorded. See for example T. El-Or, *Educated and Ignorant. Ultra-orthodox Jewish Women and their World*, Boulder, Colorado and London, 1994.

[50] That this tactic is not necessarily fool-proof is evident from Shaffir's (op. cit. in Note 15 above, p. 128) experience of a university graduate who had recently joined the ranks of the Tasher *Hasidim*. This *ba'al teshuvah* was anxious to distance himself from his past, and was not particularly helpful.

[51] All names are pseudonyms.

[52] I am grateful to Haim Shapiro and Dan Williams.

[53] Although the journalist based his advice on a recent incident, secular Israelis often stereotype *Ḥaredim* as 'violent' and 'dangerous'. One young television journalist actually advised me to carry 'Mace' (an aerosol used to immobilize an attacker) with me when I went to Me'ah She'arim.

[54] In retrospect I realize that my choice of colours was a trifle loud. Also, I had tied my scarf to approximate a turban — a style the *Neturei Karta* women did not favour.

[55] I was transposing cultural mores from India, where it would be considered 'improper', at least among the traditionally-minded, for a woman to travel alone in the late evening for an interview. Later I learned that most people in Me'ah She'arim are 'night birds' and that the streets come to life at night.

[56] I formally interviewed very few men. Despite the constraining nature of the interview, I was able to speak to them at length and as frequently as I needed to.

[57] Belcove-Shalin (op. cit. in Note 20 above, p. 95) reports a different experience: although she had expected to have a rapport with the younger women, she was able to create a rapport only with the older women, who filled the 'grandmother role'. See also the critique of feminist anthropologists that a 'shared' gender does not necessarily produce a common discursive space, nor material to fill in the space — for example, Bell, Caplan, and Karim, eds., op. cit. in Note 7 above.

[58] She explained that she did not normally listen to the radio, but that her husband 'allowed' her to listen to some channels and programmes of educational value. Why she needed to listen to stories of those who had returned to the faith, which included unpleasant details of their past lives, was something which puzzled me initially. However, with the passage of time the puzzle began to unravel: these stories reinforced her stereotype of the 'other'. I discuss this in the conclusion.

[59] I had a rather surreal experience of the 'success' of my invisibility. During the long summer there were several attacks by *Ḥaredim* on Shabbat desecrators driving on the outskirts of Me'ah She'arim. One Shabbat I went to watch the altercations and was amused to find a crowd of *Ḥaredi* children derisively calling an Israeli woman in trousers a *'shiksa'* (gentile woman; pejorative). I, the real *shiksa*, was invisible behind my clothes and headscarf and was safely ensconced among the youth.

[60] On one occasion I presented someone with a scarf as a gift, and was able to observe her tie it on top of her existing scarf. I also discovered

eventually that I would need what I call a 'sock-hat' under my headscarf. Finally, I had to cut my shoulder-length hair to a close crop.

[61] None of these were deliberate, but resulted from my tendency unconsciously to imitate those among whom I find myself.

[62] Not only were these gestures rather pathetic as attempts to establish a rapport, they were particularly inappropriate. *Ḥaredi* society defines itself in contradistinction to others. By highlighting similarities, I was unintentionally challenging the assumption of uniqueness upon which *Ḥaredi* identity is predicated. I discuss this in the conclusion.

[63] I lived in the Musrarah neighbourhood, which is a five-minute walk from Me'ah She'arim.

[64] In my previous visits to Israel, I had consciously chosen not to visit Me'ah She'arim, because I did not wish to treat the people who lived there as 'fossilized objects' from another age to be gawked at.

[65] The temptation to tell them that I was a Hindu was extremely strong, not only because India does not have a history of antisemitism, but because Hindus were an unknown and alien category.

[66] I was unable to translate the term 'research' because some of my informants were not familiar with the Hebrew or the Yiddish equivalents. Hence, I began to state that I was 'writing' about the *Neturei Karta*.

[67] I am grateful to an expert reader of *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* for pointing out that Rosalie Wax (R. Wax, *Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice*, Chicago, London, 1971) highlights a similar reception to her research.

[68] This was perhaps prompted by my disclosure that my maternal grandmother came from a Chinese–Portuguese background.

[69] Op. cit. in Note 15 above.

[70] Op. cit. in Note 20 above.

[71] I volunteered this piece of information. Although knowledge of my husband's political position was important to the extent that it made him and, by extension, me 'acceptable', they were far more interested in his 'spiritual' status as a Jew.

[72] I am grateful to the aforementioned expert reader (in Note 67 above) for pointing out that 'researchers rely on speech, appearance, or objects to signal that they are retaining an essential component, or portion of their identity'. In particular, he/she highlights William Stringfellow's and William Whyte's field experience as cited in Rosalie Wax, op. cit. in Note 67 above, pp. 47–48.

[73] For an interesting account of ethnographic intimacy, see T. El-Or, 'Do You Really Know How They Make Love? The Limits Of Intimacy With Ethnographic Informants', in R. Hertz, ed., *Reflexivity and Voice*, London, 1997. I am thankful to Dr El-Or for bringing this article to my notice.

[74] F. Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Boston, 1969.

[75] W. Shaffir, 'Boundaries and Self-Presentation Among the Hasidim: A Study in Identity Maintenance', in J. Belcove-Shalin, ed., *New World Hasidim. Ethnographic Studies of Hasidic Jews in America*, Albany, N.Y., 1995.

[76] I discuss the strategies with which the *Neturei Karta* construct and maintain their distinctive identity in L. Kaul-Seidman, 'Guardians of the City: The *Neturei Karta*'s Construction and Defence of "Jewish" Place', unpublished Conference paper, London, 2000.

[77] Op. cit. in Note 15 above, p. 125.
[78] Op. cit. in Note 27 above.
[79] For a discussion of the liminal state see V. Turner, *The Ritual Process*, New York, 1991 (first published in 1969).
[80] Writing about the caste system in India, Dumont makes a similar observation. He suggests that the composite parts of the caste system attain significance and meaning only in relation to the whole system, rather than independently or in relation to one another. Similarly, the anthropologist makes sense only when located within the all-encompassing world-view of the ultra-orthodox: L. Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus. The Caste System and Its Implications*, Complete Revised English Edition, Delhi, 1988.
[81] M. N. Srinivas, A. M. Shah, and E. A. Ramaswamy, eds., *The Fieldworker and the Field*, Delhi, 1979, p. 6.

OUTREMONT'S HASSIDIM AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS: AN ERUV AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS

William Shaffir

DURING dinner, a French Canadian resident of Outremont[1] admits to being peeved about the hassidim's encroachment in public spaces and their disregard for the law. He says: 'This used to be, and still is, a nice neighbourhood; I don't want to see that change'. He is troubled by the addition of an eruv in Outremont. A spokesperson for the hassidim in Outremont states: 'This is a manufactured issue. There seems to be a perception that the Jews are taking over, that they are creating a ghetto. This is discrimination that impedes on our quality of life'. A hassidic woman, perturbed that the hassidim are again a focus of attention, observes: 'We're a visible minority. So what happens to visible minorities is we become singled out'.

At issue is the recent controversy surrounding the presence of an eruv[2] in Outremont, Quebec. This controversy, I suggest, masks deeper concerns and tensions which have strained relations between hassidim[3] and their Gentile neighbours, and which show no clear signs of abating. The controversy, itself, includes a cast of central and minor characters who can be divided into opposing camps, each having staked out a dominant position concerning the addition to the physical landscape. In a nutshell, eruv proponents claim that this addition would greatly convenience observant Jews within its perimeter on the Sabbath and other Jewish holy days, while opponents contend that it unnecessarily advantages one religious group over others. While the controversy is typically framed around essential freedoms of expression and religion, it is, more fundamentally and mundanely, about a clash between different cultural groups — ultra-Orthodox Jews and their less religiously-committed non-Jewish

neighbours — over a contested terrain within whose boundaries each side wishes to preserve a certain quality of life.

In considerable measure, the hassidim's visibility is, indeed, due to their distinctive garb and physical appearance: the men bearded in black suits or long black coats with black hats over side curls and the women in high-necked, loose-fitting dresses, with kerchiefs or traditional wigs covering their hair. Even the hottest summer weather does not cause them to appreciably alter their attire. Moreover, hassidim have been catapulted into the public eye by the media which have considered a number of their activities worthy of attention.[4] Most recently, Outremont's hassidim were featured in the media because of their efforts to secure an eruv in their city, and because a Quebec Superior Court judge upheld the constitutional right of Orthodox Jews to erect permanent eruvim (plural of eruv) in the municipality.

In this article, I sketch the central elements of the eruv controversy and, in particular, present how the situation was defined and interpreted by a segment of Outremont's non-hassidic population. In line with Spector and Kitsuse's formulation of social problems, the controversy itself is best analysed around '. . . the activities of individuals or groups making assertions of grievances and claims with respect to some putative condition'.[5] Claims-making involves complaints, or demands for change, and responding activities. As these authors emphasize, one is less concerned whether or not the imputed condition exists; instead, '. . . the significance of objective conditions . . . is the assertions made about them, not the validity of those assertions as judged from some independent standpoint'.[6] I begin, however, by offering a context which helps to frame the conflict over the eruv. An eruv is perhaps best characterized as a largely symbolic enclosure that expands the list of permissible tasks which observant Jews may perform on the Sabbath. It incorporates existing telephone and electrical lines as well as unobtrusive lengths of fine wire, to mark an unbroken line — a religious boundary — within which, according to rabbinic law, observant Jews may carry objects on the Sabbath and other holy days.

A Background Frame

Relations between Outremont's hassidim and their non-Jewish neighbours have sometimes been strained during the last 14 years. In 1988, a benchmark year, the Outremont City Council — in a vote of six to three — denied an application by local hassidim of the Vishnitz sect to amend the municipality's zoning laws to allow for the construction of a hassidic synagogue on a vacant lot zoned for residential use. The request to re-zone from residential to commer-

cial-institutional usage was tagged 'l'affaire Outremont' by the media[7]. Outremont's hassidim captured the headlines when a September 1988 front-page article announced: 'Outremont se découvre un problème juif' (Outremont discovers it has a Jewish problem).[8] That the article appeared on the first day of the Jewish New Year added fuel to the fire, evoking for many Jews the language of Nazi Germany. The hassidim were described as a 'bizarre minority, with the men in black looking like bogeymen and the women and children dressed like onions'. The article also referred to the high birth rate of hassidic families, noting that 'Outremont is discovering that its minority has children . . . and with their families of often ten or more . . . they'll keep taking up more space'.[9]

Other articles on the subject added to the tensions. For example, one columnist concluded that the hassidim were a problem in the area; more specifically, he declared: 'I don't like that these hassidim . . . park in the middle of the street and refuse to go forward, under the pretext that their religion forbids them to see me'. A few days later, an editorial in *La Presse* apologized for the article which had referred to a 'Jewish problem' in Outremont. However, responding to claims that expressed concerns about hassidic activities in Outremont smacked of antisemitism, it concluded that '. . . what some Jews have a tendency to see as manifestations of anti-Seminitism are nothing more than a facet of tensions between the francophone majority and groups who chose English as their language'.[10] At the same time, a two-page spread included an editorial cartoon entitled 'The French Quebecois Problem' and implied that the small minority of hassidic Jews in Outremont expected the francophone majority to adopt their ways while it should be the other way round.[11]

A casual stroll through the hassidic areas of Outremont would help an observer to better understand the existing tensions and accusations. Historically, Outremont has been the bastion of the province's French-Canadian elite. In the 1970s, it profited from the influx of francophone professionals who acquired properties and renovated them at considerable expense. In the midst of this renovation and reconstruction, which signalled prosperity, progress, and change, hassidic Jews clung tenaciously to centuries-old convictions and customs. Though a quaint addition to the neighbourhood, the hassidim were also an irritating presence. Instead of looking to the future by embracing a new and vibrant Quebec society, they embodied the past, and displayed all too little commitment to accommodation, tolerance, and neighbourliness. A community within a community, they kept entirely to themselves and wished the same from their neighbours. With their extraordinarily large families, their numbers seemed continually on the rise. From the perspective of many francophone residents, it was but a matter of time before they would

attempt to shape their immediate surroundings to suit their religious needs. Within this larger context, then, the hassidim's request for an eruv in Outremont triggered tensions and anger which had been simmering for some time.

At One Centre of the Controversy

In April 2001, the hassidic communities in Outremont were victorious in the first round of their legal battle to maintain an eruv in that city. The eruv would symbolically enclose the area bounded to the west by Stuart Avenue, to the north by Van Horne Avenue, to the east by Hutchison Avenue, to the south by St Joseph Boulevard, and to the south-east by Cote St Catherine Road. *The Canadian Jewish News* reported:[12] 'Just before Passover, Quebec Superior Court Judge John Gomery issued a temporary injunction for the 10-day period of the holiday, allowing the eruv to be completed with a very fine wire'. In 1999, the communities had approached the city to find some accommodation for the wiring, but had not received a firm answer. But in September 2000, before the high holy days, while not barring the eruv as such, the city cut down the wires which filled gaps in the eruv's boundary that had been installed on public property. *The Canadian Jewish News* stated that Outremont's mayor, Jérôme Unterberg, had maintained that: ' . . . the installation of such wiring on public property was illegal because the Provincial Cities and Towns Act does not give municipalities the power to authorize religious use of public space.'[13] According to him, the city's position, 'based on a straightforward, objective legal analysis',[14] was consistent with the Canadian and Quebec human rights charters. He acknowledged that an eruv would make religious practices easier by offering a wider range of possibilities to observant Jews, but added: ' . . . it is not necessary to fully respect all the Jewish regulations' and that the absence of an eruv did not prevent Jews from enjoying religious freedom: 'They are not forced to do anything contrary to their laws'.[15]

The hassidic communities' lawyer, Julius Grey, claimed that the eruv's very absence caused the hassidim irrevocable harm by denying them the possibility of fully celebrating their religious holy days. Both Grey and the hassidim were pleased with the judge's decision. Grey stated: 'The principle that a city must be secular means that a city must not be religious in nature. It does not mean it cannot tolerate religious practice, quite the contrary'.[16] He noted that even in the United States, committed in law to the separation of church and state, the court upheld a Jewish community's right to an eruv in a New York case. When the Outremont case would go to trial, he said, he would argue that religious freedom should be accommodated especially where no damage is done to the rest of the public. Further-

more, he would maintain that Outremont's position that public space cannot be used for religious purposes demonstrated a misunderstanding of the Canadian concept of state neutrality which was less rigid than in the United States. In Canada there was no prohibition on religious expression in the public sphere, unless a practice were forced on someone. The 'secularity' of the city would in no way be compromised by an eruv since the wiring used was so unobtrusive that it would not be noticed unless someone were searching for it. He also noted that Outremont puts up Christmas lights and decorations on public property and finally that in Quebec, Outremont stood alone in its objection: eruvim existed in other municipalities, including Cote St Luc, Town of Mount Royal, Hampstead, St Laurent, Dollard des Ormeaux, and in the city of Montreal itself.[17]

Outremont's lawyer Yvon Denault maintained that municipalities had no jurisdiction in religious matters and, therefore, could not participate 'directly or indirectly, actively or passively in the creation within their territory of a sector having a religious character'.[18] He denied that Christmas decorations assumed a religious character and maintained that groups did not enjoy the right to use the public domain to exercise their religion. He further contended that the absence of an eruv did not prevent Jews from practicing their religion; an eruv was admittedly a great convenience but not absolutely essential. Supporting the Outremont position, as an intervenor in the case, was the Mouvement Laïque du Quebec. It advocated secularism in the public sphere and maintained that it was unfair that citizens be inconvenienced because of the impositions of another group's religion. In its written submission, the Mouvement claimed that an eruv has the effect ' . . . of transforming the street into a place of worship or an extension of the private domain that exclusively benefits one group'.[19] And adding a voice to Outremont's defence was independently-elected City Councillor Céline Forget whose long-running dispute with the hassidim centred around zoning violations. Objecting to the eruv wire that was attached to her apartment building at a height of 15 feet, she said ' . . . it constituted physically a private space of a religious character in the public domain'.[20]

For the hassidim, it was claimed that the absence of an eruv caused hardship to the Jewish residents. Because the temporary injunction judgment was handed down on the Friday before Passover, not all the wires could be put in place for the first two days of the festival. Alex Werzberger — a Satmar hassid, as well as president of the Coalition of Outremont Chassidic Organizations, and one of the five plaintiffs against the city of Outremont — was quoted in the Jewish press as follows: 'This meant I had to hire a non-Jewish nurse to push my 93-year-old mother in a wheelchair outside. I also had

six grandchildren in from New York, under the age of 2, and we could not push them in strollers'.[21]

In June 2001, responding to the petition by the plaintiffs, a Quebec Superior Court ruled that the hassidic Jews in the City of Outremont were entitled to establish an eruv and mark it off with thin wiring even if the connecting wires crossed public property. Ruling that the presence of such wiring was no different from churches which ring their bells on Sunday to summon worshippers, Judge Allan Hilton upheld the constitutional right of Orthodox Jews to permanent eruvim. In the particular matter, Outremont had the duty to accommodate the hassidic Jews, as had other municipalities on the island of Montreal. His ruling dismissed the argument of Outremont that eruvim cannot be tolerated as Quebec law requires cities to remain strictly secular. He also dismissed the claim of the Mouvement Laïque du Quebec, that the eruv's presence forced non-Orthodox Jews to live in a religious ghetto and, therefore, infringed their rights. He ordered the city not to dismantle the eruv again. It could, he ruled, institute regulations detailing the height of the lines, the number that could be erected on each street, or require notification by the communities of their location, but Outremont had a 'constitutional duty' to provide accommodation for religious practices that did not impose 'undue hardship' on its residents. The following excerpt[22] from his 14-page judgment helps to understand why the hassidim were relieved, and why, in particular, a hassidic woman said to me, 'We were very happy with the ruling. We won':

> In this case, the City of Outremont is not being asked to expend public funds, to advance the precepts of Orthodox Judaism, or to associate itself or any of its citizens in any way with the erection of eruvim. It is being asked to tolerate the barely visible wires or lines traversing city streets and not to take them down when they are erected. In doing so, it is not being asked to associate itself with the Orthodox Jewish faith any more or less than it associates itself with Christianity when it allows Christmas decorations to be displayed on city property, including city hall, or when it tolerates the ringing of church bells on Sunday morning to summon Christians to worship . . . .

Outremont's mayor announced that the municipality would not appeal. The hassidim did, indeed, win the court battle, but the victory was not without a price. It was not unexpected, therefore, when one of the plaintiffs, while pleased and relieved with the judgment, remained concerned about the underlying animosity which had motivated Outremont residents to complain in the first place. He commented: 'There's a small group that won't be happy until there are no Jews in Outremont . . . . These people say we don't integrate, that we work behind the scenes to get what we want. Now, I don't

think that they can say that going to court to establish a legal principle is going behind their backs'.[23] For numbers of Outremont residents, however, both the court battle and its outcome signalled the increasing influence and power that hassidim were successfully wielding to their advantage. From their perspective there was, indeed, cause for alarm: the judgment would only serve to reinforce the intolerance and disregard for city zoning regulations which characterized the hassidim's behaviour in the first place. I now turn to their concerns.

At the Other Centre of the Controversy

For the non-hassidic residents of Outremont whom I met in September and December 2001, charges of antisemitism levelled by the hassidim against their opponents was a defensive response entirely lacking in credibility. One of them said: 'They're always accusing people of being antisemites every time someone opposes them. They accuse the Mayor of the same thing'. A more just and complete understanding of the eruv controversy, they maintain, would recognize the wider context of the problem. The hassidim greedily ensure that their way of life is preserved at all costs and, in the process, violate principal freedoms by seeking to impose their ways on all others. Moreover, in due course, as the hassidim increase in number, they will flex their newly-acquired political muscle more aggressively at the expense of their non-hassidic neighbours.

A non-Jewish resident, while claiming that the eruv 'doesn't harm anyone' and should not be deemed objectionable, nevertheless maintains that living side by side with hassidic neighbours 'is not always easy'. She adds: 'It's hard to live on the street for 20 years and watch their kids grow up and never get to know them, and for my daughter not to be allowed to play with all these beautiful children'.[24] But the neighbours learned long ago that the hassidim wished to remain separate and to minimize any relations with outsiders. In this respect, they regard the hassidim as odd or bizarre and have grudgingly accepted their desire for isolation. Of more immediate concern, and with further-ranging consequences, is a perception of hassidim as less than model citizens who flagrantly violate the city's zoning regulations and exert political pressure to amend some existing by-laws to suit their distinctive lifestyle. Most fundamentally, eruv opponents are deeply troubled by the prospect that Outremont will eventually become a hassidic ghetto in which their freedom of movement might be curtailed.

A notable critic who has invested heavily in championing a particular cause is Céline Forget, mentioned above. She had moved to Outremont in 1995 and rented an apartment, then soon became aware

that a synagogue was functioning in the basement of the building, and that existing zoning regulations forbade any such usage.[25] She was unwilling to overlook the presence of what she termed an 'illegal' synagogue and insisted that the authorities terminate any further deviation by the hassidim. 'They don't care about zoning', she contends. 'This is a residential property, so from a civil law standpoint, this is an illegal synagogue'. That synagogue, according to her, had been in use for some time. For reasons she deemed political, municipal authorities failed to challenge its presence by enforcing its own regulations. She stated: 'Every time there was an election, they [the city] were pulling back any accusation . . . . So it was a political gift'. She saw little need to confront the hassidim about their synagogue's illegality because, according to her:

> . . . the problem is with the city. It's like a kid. If a kid, you let him do whatever he wants and one day someone comes and says to the kid, 'Don't do that', the kid will not understand. He will say: 'Why this person doesn't want me to do that and the other person let me'? Well, that's what happened. The city let them do whatever they wanted and they knew they were illegal and they knew they were parking their cars illegally. They knew everything but the city was not doing anything. So I addressed myself to the city. I asked them to have regulated the situation.

In a conversation with me, she claimed that the city's response was both surprising and unbelievable: 'They said, "Well, we're not obliged to apply our laws. So if you are not happy with what we're doing, just do it yourself" '. She did just that; she took the case to court and won a judgment. At the time, she had not yet been elected to City Council, a victory she won only in 1999. The legal procedure began in 1997 and two years later was documented on a local television station,[26] thereby fanning the flames even more. The hassidim accused her of being a firebrand and troublemaker and hoped that she would go away or, failing that, that the zoning would be reclassified. While Outremont's authorities were prepared to re-zone, Céline Forget successfully mobilized enough residents in the area to prevent any such reversal. Her crusade against the synagogue not only attracted support from non-hassidic residents equally concerned about the violation of zoning regulations in Outremont, but also antagonism and contempt from the hassidim. Some of them, she maintains, said that she was motivated by antisemitism — an accusation she vehemently denies — and her physical safety was called into question. 'So they started to harass. They were breaking my car windows. Now I cannot park my car in the street because of the damage', she says. One of her supporters adds: 'No, they hate her. They follow her at night. They used to make up to 60 phone calls a week . . . '. Indeed, when I visited Céline Forget shortly after her defeat in the

November 2001 election in Montreal (she lost by a mere 42 votes, to the hassidim's great relief), 'We win, you lose' was scrawled in bold black marker on her apartment's front door. 'Oh, I don't even clean anymore. Let them do what they want' she said, adding: 'At one time when it was very bad, we had threats and everything on our lives, so we moved out for two or three months'. Convinced that her apartment would be vandalized, she removed some of her possessions but made certain to return frequently: 'If I go away, that means that they succeeded at what they wanted to'.

At the time of writing (January 2002), Céline Forget's popularity and support appear to be growing, and though defeated in the election, she remains committed to her cause. She lost by less than one per cent of the vote. 'And people mostly voted for her because she's always fighting these illegal things and a lot of people are preoccupied' commented one of her supporters. According to Céline Forget, tensions in the neighbourhood stem from the hassidim's blatant disregard for the civil law. She said to me:

> We have a common agreement that as citizens in a city that ... it's the municipal law [civil law] that we agree to live by, to respect. So if a group of people come in that city and say, 'No, the law we respect is this law, our religious law ... [the problem] starts from there. Someone, a group, that does not want to recognize the civil law, that's where the problem starts. Because in Outremont, like in Montreal, there is a mix of so many communities and nobody is opposed to that. But the hassidic, they ... don't respect the parking, they don't respect the zoning ...

The problem, from her perspective, is simple: people should be law-abiding. She asserts: 'Everybody else is respecting the by-laws. If someone is not respecting, they have to be asked to do so'. For her supporters, the expression 'deux poids deux mesures' (double standard) best captures what is happening in Outremont. She herself claims: 'If you're hassidim, you can do whatever you want, and if you're not, you can be sued by the city for really stupid things. So people are really upset'. A specific example she cites relates to parking tickets violations:

> When I was elected there was a big change at the city because they never realized what I was asking for — to be fair with people. So there were four cars parked [illegally] on Bloomfield [street name in Outremont]. They had four tickets. So I said, 'Oh well, that's getting good'. It was a Jewish holiday. So I went to a car, a $42 ticket. OK, that's good. I went to the other car. I knew it was a guy living on the other street, a hassidic — zero. It was no charge and the car was just beside the other one with the $42. I was so upset.

While the eruv court judgment does not require any physical accommodation to the religious desires of a minority, Céline Forget and her supporters claim that it has already empowered them. In an article in the French daily newspaper, *Le Devoir*, entitled 'Erouvs et maillots de bain' (Eruvs and Bathing Suits), the author reminds readers of a controversy in Outremont some 15 years earlier when the hassidim, concerned about immodest dress in public places, successfully petitioned the Mayor to ban the wearing of bathing suits in the city's parks. According to the author, the regulation was rescinded when challenged in the courts, but not before Outremont became a national laughing-stock.[27] However, for at least some residents of the area, the issue of an appropriate dress code has already resurfaced as shown by the following excerpt from a reader's recent letter to *Le Devoir* under the heading 'Ladies, Watch Your Dress'.[28]

> ... on this beautiful and warm day, I decided to go to the Mile End library .... Wearing a black legging and a green cotton t-shirt, neither too big nor tight, but not really sexy, I stopped near the synagogue on the corner of Saint Viateur and Hutchison to chat with some young women who were working on the shooting of a film ...
>
> A Jewish hassidic woman approached us and asked me in English to avoid wearing sleeveless clothes when I pass by the synagogue. It's true that my t-shirt exposed the roundness of my shoulders! She showed me the proper sleeve length ....
>
> Should one deduce from this that in addition to being forced to dwell in a ghetto by Judge Hilton which we neither chose nor wished, that we'll have to observe a dress code agreeable to the colonizers?

Another letter published in the same newspaper in October 2001,[29] also points to the hassidim's undue influence in shaping the boundaries of public morality:

> Thanks to the vigilance of the independent city councillor Céline Forget, a letter is circulating that some hassidim asked for and obtained in 1999 the removal of four innocent plaster statues which were decorating the terrace of the Croissanterie Figaro on the corner of Hutchison and Fairmont. In the name of morality, the hassidim have firstly asked that these naked bodies be covered or placed inside the café. This not having been done, the Director of Goods and Services ... had these statues removed diligently ...
>
> Where are we going? After the banning of bathing suits and the story of the eruv, are we now going after statues?

The writer asks that all candidates in the forthcoming election indicate their position on the emergence of a 'fundamentalist ghetto' in Outremont.

But the most critical public response to the eruv came from a self-identified journalist, Pierre Lacerte, who raised concern about the rising tide of fundamentalism in Outremont:[30]

> On July 9th, while a large number of Outremont residents were on vacation, a crowd of citizens, of various ethnicities, filled the Outremont city council chambers to capacity to demand that mayor Jerôme Unterberg appeal the Superior Court judgment that had legalized, on behalf of Hasidic Jews, the erection of an 'érouv' around much of the municipality. Their request for an appeal was rejected.
>
> In the course of that highly charged meeting, representatives of the ultra-Orthodox community tried to suggest to the assembled that an 'erouv' should be thought of as just a fishing line, a comparison as grotesque as suggesting that the chalice in a Catholic's communion was comparable to a bowl for eating Cheerios. In fact, an 'érouv' is a powerful symbol, and its alleged low visibility does not alter that reality one whit.
>
> Let's call a spade a spade. Catholic have had their 'Fous de Dieu'. Muslims have their Taliban. Well, Jews have their fundamentalist groups as well. Does one have to be an 'anti-Semite' to describe the Hasidim as fundamentalist?
>
> ...
>
> After the 'érouv', what will the Outremont theocrats demand next from our democratic system which they seem to manipulate to their ends although democracy is not part of their own way of life? Are Outremont streets to be closed to traffic on their sabbath? While we're at it, why not close down the cafés? Meanwhile, they have not been shy about defying zoning regulations and opening synagogues in residential zones. Better yet, these same illegal synagogues are graciously exempted from taxes.
>
> ...
>
> Outremont is faced with a group of fanatics who cry 'racism' while preaching anything but tolerance and multi-culturalism. Their demagogic allegations, the crudest sorts of misinformation, are an insult to anyone's intelligence. Fortunately, the deception looks to be self-limiting insofar as other Outremont residents are gradually figuring out what is happening within their midst.

For Lacerte, and others sharing his views, the fear is that their quality of life will be adversely affected owing to the hassidim's growing presence. For example, in a conversation I had with two opponents of the eruv, they raised the possibility that the hassidim will ultimately try to restrict areas of the neighbourhood to their own kind or might even pursue attempts to bar traffic within designated areas on the Sabbath and Jewish holy days. When I suggested that both actions are far-fetched, if not impossible, one of them said:

> They can't do it because they're a minority. But what we're also afraid is they're only 10 per cent who can vote. More than that now with all the kids, but they can't vote yet. But at the rate they reproduce, what happens in 10 years from now if they happen to be more than 50 per cent of the population?

The other commented: 'You know, someone parked on Durocher [name of street in Outremont]. A little hassidic kid goes by and says:

'Why do you park on our street?' This will look like Boisbriand [a reference to the Tasher enclave]. It will become that way'. There was ready agreement: 'That's for sure. . . . And who is going to buy the houses? We all invested to have a house, not to have a conquest of territory. What they're doing is a conquest of territory'. From their perspective, having set their sights on Outremont, the hassidim were eagerly purchasing available property to accommodate their growing needs. It was, therefore, necessary to stem this tide before it was too late. At the very least, non-hassidic residents ought to mobilize to protest against the favouritism which municipal authorities have shown the hassidim.

Conclusion

Like most current stereotypes, the one characterizing hassidim as totally divorced from the real world, and completely immersed in Torah study, is a sweeping and inaccurate generalization. Admittedly, there are hassidic Jews who have secluded themselves from mainstream culture and who have concluded that anything more than a perfunctory familiarity with the secular world is not only distracting but even unnecessary. In fact, however, hassidic society includes a cast of character types resembling the variety found in secular circles. Among the hassidim are political entrepreneurs who have familiarized themselves with the intricacies of the political process and have managed to navigate their way through them. The hassidim may well attract attention because they constitute a visible minority. But they have also caught the public's eye owing to their successes at courting politicians and government bureaucrats to influence the political process to their advantage. Writing in *The Canadian Jewish News*, G. K. Simcoe states: 'The so-called "ultra-Orthodox" in Montreal and Toronto are becoming very comfortable in the halls of government — any government. Learning from the successful experiences of their co-religionists in the United States, chassidic groups are lobbying governments for their own projects. And it would appear that they are doing so to great effect'.[31]

In the case of the eruv controversy in Outremont, however, such success has generated a range of emotions and tensions that could eventually affect the hassidim adversely. As their numbers continue to increase, and as the community's infrastructure strains to meet the various needs of its members, hassidim will be required to turn to outside bodies for support that was formerly received from within. Such a turn of events will necessitate even more adroitness in the realm of negotiations with government and bureaucratic officials which will maximize their visibility even more. Should the hassidim be perceived, as numbers of Outremont residents already do, as

framing their agenda within the context of extremist religious beliefs that may impinge on the day-to-day activities of their non-Jewish neighbours, their efforts may meet increasing objection by the larger public. It would be naive to believe that the court's decision concerning the eruv in Outremont will enhance relations between the hassidim and the local non-hassidic residents. Quite the opposite. Numbers of citizens, suspecting that hassidim are gradually encroaching upon areas that properly fall within the secular domain, might decide to mobilize in order to stem that tide.

Writing about the many small societies not yet swept out by the broom of our industrial and urban civiization, Everett C. Hughes enquired: 'How long will it take to mop them up, no one knows. The process seems to be going on rapidly now, but it will probably last longer than any of us would predict'.[32] Contrary to all expectations that they would assimilate, hassidic Jews have become even more visible by virtue of their growing numbers, their leadership's acquisition of political sophistication, and their growing strength at the ballot. For many, the recent turn of events in Outremont is a case in point. For these reasons, political developments involving the hassidim, in and around Outremont and elsewhere in Quebec, should remain worthy of further sociological attention.

Acknowledgement
I would like to thank Nachman Ben Yehuda for his instrumental role in re-acquainting me with the tensions in Outremont.

NOTES

[1] Nearly 1.8 million people live within the Montreal Urban Community (MUC) area. The MUC was made up of 28 municipalities but recently merged into one city — Montreal. Outremont, one of these former municipalities, is situated just west of Montreal's Mile-End district and north-east of Mont Royal. With a population of close to 22,000, more than 25 per cent of the residents are from backgrounds other than that of the French majority and they include some of the province's best-known cultural, financial, and political figures. There are some 4,000 hassidic Jews in Outremont and their numbers are believed to double about every 15 years.

[2] One writer aptly described the eruv as '. . . an imaginary boundary — something like a safe zone in a kid's game of tag, a force-field protecting the starship Enterprise. Orthodox Jews create such safe zones to allow the faithful to abide by the many rules of Shabbat without surrendering every convenience or, most gentiles would no doubt believe, necessity'. See Amy Silverman, 'Eruv Awakening', 9 May 1996, phoenixnewtimes.com. A much-publicized on-going battle concerning an eruv is occurring in Tenafly, New Jersey, where the Tenafly Eruv Association has gone to court against the Borough of Tenafly. After Tenafly's borough council voted unanimously to have the eruv removed, the case reached the United States District Court

of New Jersey. In his August 9, 2001 ruling saying the eruv could be taken down, U.S. District Judge William Bassler maintained that the Tenafly council was not exclusively targeting Orthodox Jews, and that the concern that public property not be allocated for religious purposes was legitimate. Critics of the eruv claim that they have been unfairly targeted as antisemitic by Jewish organizations and other pro-eruv groups when their true interests centred around not allowing any church or religion to impose their beliefs and their use of public properties. Despite the different judicial rulings in the Outremont and Tenafly cases, there are enormous parallels in the arguments marshalled by the different sides and in the sentiments and emotions which were stirred. In both cases, the conflict masks a deeper struggle involving the political strength of the Jewish community (or of some of its segments) and matters of identity, integration, and assimilation. In the case of Tenafly, one writer has commented: 'Over the past year, that suburban New Jersey town has become the latest flash point in the unfolding American kulturkampf. It is, for the most part, a conflict simmering on low boil, erupting every so often in a synagogue zoning suit here, an *eruv* dispute there, with larger communal policy issues like vouchers and Jewish religious pluralism forever looming in the background'. See Eytan Kobre, 'Drawing Lines In The Sky', *The Jewish Observer*, September 2001, p. 52.

[3] According to a 1977 survey, a total population of hassidim and other ultra-Orthodox Jews in Outremont and surrounding area is estimated at roughly 6,250 people. According to the authors, this figure is supported by the 1991 Canadian Federal Census data. Census tracts data corresponding to the geographic area examined in the survey show that the number of Jews by religious affiliation was 7,125. As a result of a high birth rate as well as the immigration of hassidic Jews into Outremont from New York State, the hassidic population in this area of Montreal has grown substantially over the past two decades. The survey results are contained in C. Shahar, M. Weinfeld, and R. Schnoor, *Survey Of The Hassidic & Ultra-Orthodox Communities in Outremont & Surrounding Areas*, Outremont, Quebec, 1977.

[4] Affairs involving the Tasher hassidic sect, whose self-enclosed and largely self-contained community is located some 25 kilometres north of Montreal, have been among the most notable and controversial. Among other matters, the media have reported on their attempt to achieve independent municipal status, their public endorsement of the Parti Quebecois's quest for sovereignty, as well as the reported invitation to the Austrian politician Joerg Haider to attend a wedding in February 2000. In September 2000, a group called Construit Toujours Avec Bonté, an alleged fund-raising arm of the Tasher, pleaded guilty to selling false charitable-donation receipts and phony bills and was fined $400,000. The Tasher were not the only hassidim that captured the media's attention. Lubavitch, the hassidic sect characterized by its intense proselytization within the Jewish community, was a focus of media attention when it encountered difficulty from both Cote St Luc constituents and the municipality's City Council after it announced its intention to build a community centre. Lubavitch was again featured in the news when the Town of Hampstead, adjacent to Cote St Luc, was opposed to the sect's constructing a synagogue. And as I report in

this article, events in Outremont relating to the eruv have received extensive coverage in the local and national press.

[5] Malcolm Spector and John I. Kitsuse, *Constructing Social Problems*, Menlo Park, CA, 1977, p. 75.

[6] Ibid., p. 76.

[7] For a more detailed analysis of 'l'affaire Outremont', see William Shaffir, 'Montreal's Hassidim Revisited: A Focus on Change', in Simcha Fishbane and Jack N. Lightstone, eds., *Essays in The Social Scientific Study of Judaism and Jewish Society*. Montreal, 1990, pp. 305–322.

[8] *La Presse*, 13 September 1988, front page.

[9] Ibid.

[10] *La Presse*, 21 September 1988, front page.

[11] The tensions sparked by 'l'affaire Outremont' were mainly responsible for the documentary *'Bonjour Shalom'*, offering outsiders an appreciation of the hassidic lifestyle. While including excerpts from some Outremont residents who were critical of hassidic practices to remain separated from the mainstream, it sensitively characterized everyday life within the hassidic community as seen through a hassidic lens.

[12] 'Court Oks eruv wires for Pesach', *The Canadian Jewish News*, 19 April 2001. www.cjnews.com

[13] Ibid.

[14] 'Outremont refuses to allow eruv installation', *The Canadian Jewish News*, 12 October 2000. www.cjnews.com

[15] Ibid.

[16] *The Canadian Jewish News*, op. cit. in note 12 above.

[17] Ibid.

[18] 'Outremont eruv dispute goes to court', *The Canadian Jewish News*, 14 June 2001. www.cjnews.com

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] *The Canadian Jewish News*, op. cit. in note 12 above.

[22] Quebec Superior Court, District of Montreal, No: 500-05-060659-008, June 21, 2001.

[23] 'Quebec court upholds right to erect eruvim', *The Canadian Jewish News*, 28 June 2001. www.cjnews.com.

[24] 'Work on eruvs begins after court intervenes', *The Gazette*, 23 June 2001. www.canada.com/montreal/montrealgazette/

[25] The synagogue named 'Amour pour Israel' had been functioning in that building since 1989. This discussion is meant to illustrate briefly that the hassidim are perceived by some of the area's residents as disregarding some zoning regulations. The natural history surrounding the organization of, and crusade against, this controversial institution should include the claims and counterclaims of all of the involved parties, including City Council members, irate residents, and hassidic officials and will likely form the focus of a future article. In this particular case, what began as the complaint of one resident, assumed, in time, the dimensions of a more public crusade. It is worth noting even at this point that the synagogue did, in fact, function illegally for a number of years. The building in question was purchased by the Vishnitz hassidic sect whose members hoped that the property would

be rezoned for the establishment of a synagogue. Previously, the space had served as a neighbourhood grocery store. Under the pretext of establishing a kasher restaurant, members of the sect assembled there for prayer services. One informant remarked: 'It was a kosher restaurant in name, it never existed. Everybody knew that it wasn't, and everybody tolerated it'. Becker's notion of moral entrepreneurs is a useful concept for highlighting dimensions of the conflict. He maintains that the rule creator is not satisfied with the existing rules and is profoundly disturbed by them. In the Outremont case, Ms Forget approved of the existing rules but was perturbed by the failure of the officials to enforce them. (See Howard S. Becker, *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, New York, 1973, pp. 147–162.)

[26] On 10 September 1999, at 7 p.m., TVA, a French cable television station in Quebec aired a segment featuring Céline Forget's campaign to remove the synagogue from the basement of her apartment building. The segment was entitled, 'Une femme seule contre une synagogue illégale'. In obedience to a court ruling on that day, the synagogue vacated the premises.

[27] 'Erouvs et maillots de bain', *Le Devoir*, 3 July 2001. www.ledevoir.com.

[28] 'Mesdames, attention à votre tenue vestimentaire', *Le Devoir*, 1 August 2001. www.ledevoir.com

[29] 'Non au ghetto intégriste', *Le Devoir*, 15 October 2001. www.ledevoir.com

[30] 'La pêche à l'érouv', *Le Devoir*, 27 July 2001. www.ledevoir.com

[31] The writer goes on to identify their advantages in the political process: 'First, they are extremely disciplined, and their leadership can direct uniform support to a particular candidate. Second, they tend to live in very concentrated areas, which makes for a very potent voting block. Third, they really look "Jewish," and politicians love to demonstrate how accessible they are and how comfortably they can interact with every constituency'. See *The Canadian Jewish News*, 'Scene in Ottawa', 29 April 1999.

[32] Everett C. Hughes, *Where People Meet*, New York, 1952, pp. 25–26.

JEWISH REFUGEES IN BRITAIN AND IN NEW YORK

Hilary L. Rubinstein

(Review Article)

RHONDA F. LEVINE, *Class, Networks and Identity: Replanting Jewish Lives from Nazi Germany to Rural New York*, xi + 195pp., Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md., 2001, n.p.; MAXINE SCHWARTZ SELLER, *We Built Up Our Lives: Education and Community Among Jewish Refugees Interned by Britain in World War II*, x + 261 pp., illus., Greenwood Press, Westport, Ct., 2001, n.p.

THESE two books contribute to our understanding of the Jewish refugee experience through case studies obtained from oral testimonies and, as Levine notes of her own methodology and findings (p. 3), they lie at what the eminent American sociologist C. Wright Mills called the 'intersection of biography and history'. Levine's book is based on interviews (supplemented by archival research) with 43 people from rural German Jewish families who emigrated during the 1930s to the United States. Seller's derives from interviews or correspondence with 63 refugees from the Greater Reich, who went to Britain — only to be interned during 1940 as 'enemy aliens' who posed a potential security threat. While the two groups of respondents had a shared historical experience and a common destiny, their experiences differed in several significant ways, predicated upon two essential distinctions: the socio-economic milieu from which each group of respondents came, and the countries in which, following emigration, they found themselves.

Levine places her rural German Jews firmly within a socio-historical framework prepared by other scholars, whose theories and conclusions are reinforced by the experiences of her respondents. The opening chapters of her book are based heavily on the work of historians Monika Richarz and Werner Cahnman, trailblazers in the study of rural German Jewry, as well as of Marion Kaplan, arguably the foremost historian of German Jewish women in the modern period. Levine's work reinforces what we have learned from scholars such as these: that the Jews of German villages and small country

towns tended to be more tradition-bound and religiously Orthodox than their urban co-religionists, right up to and including the Nazi years. We can read of such communities in articles in the *Leo Baeck Year Book*.

Until emancipation in 1871, when mass settlement of Jews in the urban centres of newly-unified Germany began, most German Jews lived in the countryside. In 1933, 50 per cent of Jews, compared with 90 per cent of non-Jews, resided outside the nation's six largest cities. Moreover, although the number of rural-based Jews had declined markedly, many had been born in the countryside, and those who remained there continued to play an important part in the agrarian economy, and in the manner of nineteenth-century *shtetl* Jews further east, they acted as conduits between the surrounding non-Jewish peasantry and urban areas, owing to their kinship and commercial links with urban inhabitants. Since the eighteenth century the most widespread occupation among rural German Jews had been cattle-dealing, and it continued to be so, for in some villages around 75 per cent of all Jewish traders earned their living in that way, and at the end of the First World War 60 per cent of Germany's 40,000 independent cattle dealers were Jews. They were concentrated mainly in the south and west.

The 24 men and 19 women in Levine's sample came from families which had for generations been cattle dealers, in areas such as Hesse and the Rhineland. These were families in which work was performed along archetypal gender-based lines: with women immersed in domestic duties and child-rearing and men travelling all week buying and selling cattle and returning on Fridays to spend the Sabbath at home, setting off again each Sunday. It was a world in which women were the transmitters of Jewish culture, tradition, and identity to their children, and of close-knit communities in which kin networks typically spanned several villages and small towns within a given area, since owing to a lack of marriage partners within one's immediate locality, people were compelled to seek a spouse further afield. (It was not uncommon for villages to contain only a single Jewish family.) Rabbis were in short supply in these rural districts, yet so strong was Jewish tradition and commitment that as late as the 1930s the male cattle dealers had imbibed so much Jewish knowledge and were so familiar with the liturgy and ritual that almost any one of them was capable of leading prayers at *shul*, so that the absence of a minister did not matter. Not surprisingly, in view of their occupation, many were licensed *shohetim*.

It was, then, a self-sufficient, self-contained world. But it was not an insular one. Right up to 1933, and in many cases surreptitiously thereafter, friendships between Jews and their Christian neighbours flourished. These inter-ethnic friendships were forged mainly by

women at the domestic level, socializing in the marketplace, in shops, and in the street, and meeting for coffee and cake in each other's homes. Often there would be a lone Jewish child at the local school, and he or she would be befriended by non-Jewish children. True, there was antisemitism, but it was neither widespread nor virulent, as the testimonies of the respondents makes clear. In 1933 German farmers were forbidden to trade with Jews, a law which was largely disregarded since Jews continued to extend credit to their clients whereas non-Jews did not. Admittedly, these farmers were at least partly driven by self-interest, but there were plenty of instances of more obvious altruism. There were cases of close friendships between young Jewish and Christian women continuing to be maintained even after the latter became married or engaged to Nazi party members. Levine states (p. 32), in explicit refutation of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's thesis in *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (New York: Knopf, 1996): 'this is not the portrait of a people who were determined to exterminate or even eliminate all Jews'.

The migration patterns of these cattle-dealers and their families lend weight to the view that German Jews believed that Hitler was a passing aberration in the fabric of political life: as the father of one respondent from rural Baden commented (p. 38), when on the eve of her departure for the United States in 1934 she proposed taking the family's valuables with her: 'You will be back in two years. This won't last.' Overwhelmingly the women were more enthusiastic than their menfolk about leaving Germany, owing to the impact the regime was having on their daily lives and that of their families. They felt social ostracism and humiliations endured by themselves and their children keenly, especially the insults the latter suffered at school. This desire to emigrate became an urgent necessity after *Kristallnacht*, when many wives learned that their husbands, herded into concentration camps, would not be released until they produced emigration documents. Hitherto, men had been reluctant to leave, fearing that they would be unable to earn a livelihood in the United States, the preferred destination of their wives owing to the presence of relations there.

It was now that the kinship networks of the cattle-dealing families proved invaluable and a chain migration ensued. By 1940 there were 20,000 German Jews in Washington Heights on the northern tip of Manhattan. While Jews constituted only 10 per cent of the area's residents, theirs was a significant enough presence for the area to be dubbed the 'Fourth Reich'. Immigration restrictions were still in place, but the wives of the cattle-dealers managed to secure visas through the sponsorship of relatives in Washington Heights, who had emigrated earlier.

On arriving in the area the cattle-dealing husbands and their

wives took menial jobs in order to survive. But, surprisingly, they did not assimilate to an urban lifestyle: they missed their rural environment and occupations. Fortuitously, an opportunity presented itself for resettlement on the land. Immediately after the war, land in northern New Jersey and Long Island was sold for development. Consequently, land for dairy herds became scarce there. Yet the demand for milk was increasing owing to an expanding metropolitan population (and, although Levine does not say so, owing to the growth of enterprises involving dairy products — notably ice cream and milk shake parlours — and perhaps also to the routine daily consumption of milk in elementary schools). This opened a niche which the former cattle-dealers eagerly filled, purchasing land in rural south-central New York state with money saved from their urban employment. By the 1960s they constituted 90 per cent of cattle-dealers there, performing a multiplicity of dairy industry-related functions, bolstered by their kinship networks, and encountering very little anti-semitism. Their wives supplemented the family income by operating kasher guest houses and running summer camps for Jewish children which offered diverse fun-filled activities and an *Oneg Shabbat* each Friday. These camps brought together the children of the dispersed rural families and injected them with a sense of Jewishness which most of them retained, although identification with German culture did not survive the parental generation. Nor, for the most part, did involvement in cattle breeding, as with notable exceptions the children entered a range of white-collar occupations and the higher professions. Remarkably, given their isolated rural upbringing, intermarriage rates among the children of the cattle dealers was substantially lower than the national Jewish average, and more of those who did marry non-Jewish partners brought up their children as Jewish than was the norm in mixed marriages — a testimony to the strong sense of Jewishness that characterized their parents and which was carefully instilled in them.

The respondents in Seller's sample differed from those in Levine's in several pertinent respects: they were mostly the sons and daughters of urban professionals in Germany or Austria, including fathers who were Jewish communal functionaries; they did not invariably emigrate as part of a family group; some were 'non-Aryan Christians'. Lacking contacts in their chosen destination they experienced more difficulty in obtaining entry permits than did the cattle-dealers; and their subsequent destination — it was not in all cases the preferred one — was Great Britain. These respondents, as children and young people, were among the 28,000 'enemy aliens' of German and Austrian nationality (including 4000 women) who — out of a total German and Austrian refugee presence of about 55,000 — were perceived as a security threat during 1940 and consequently inter-

ned by the British government. As the respondents make clear, determination as to who would be interned and who would be left at large depended to a great extent on the degree of zeal of local tribunals operating in conjunction with Home Office directives.

While it is on their responses to the experience of internment that the book chiefly dwells, their backgrounds and their reasons for deciding to emigrate were important factors. Again we see that many German Jews were unwilling to believe that flight was necessary. Thus one girl, from a small German provincial town, recalled that her father believed 'things weren't *too* bad right up to the end', becoming convinced only in the wake of *Kristallnacht* that the Jewish community was in danger (p. 43). Respondents remembered the courtesy of British immigration officials, and described the jobs that they took in Britain in order to survive, frequently suffering a loss of social status in the process. For example, in a pattern which has become well-documented, girls from prosperous homes found themselves working as maids or seamstresses; lawyers, their expertise in Roman law useless in the new land, worked as artisans or in non-managerial office jobs. But, slowly, they started — in the recurrent theme of the book — to rebuild their lives, and were disrupted once again by being interned. They were taken to the Isle of Man; seven in the sample were among the 6000 men sent to detention centres in Canada or Australia. The period of internment ranged from five weeks to more than two years. It eventually proved easy for males to get out by enlisting in the armed forces.

The core of the book is concerned with the strategies adopted by the internees for coping with depression, loneliness, disrupted education, and stalled careers. They showed considerable ingenuity in organizing themselves, holding lectures, concerts, religious services, and instituting libraries and camp newspapers. Two respondents were so intrigued by these developments that they had subsequently written novels based on their experiences. Seller skilfully compares and contrasts the psychological impact internment made on each individual, and the subtle differences which existed between life in the men's and women's camps. All this makes for a fine and fascinating study, which concludes with a synopsis of how the internees adapted to life after release when they flocked to join the war effort.

'Internees were adequately fed and housed and not mistreated', concedes Seller (p. 3), despite the obvious traumas of isolation and of being mistaken for allies of their persecutors. Furthermore, some respondents spoke of a reluctance on the part of many people to believe the stories coming out of Germany, which compounded their loneliness and frustration. There were major blunders on the part of camp administrators, arising perhaps more out of ignorance than

insensitivity: for example, at a camp in Canada Jews were made to share quarters with German Nazis, who immediately greeted them on arrival with the notorious *Horst Wessel* song, and at another camp in the same country 123 Orthodox Jews who refused to work on Saturday were compelled to do so by soldiers wielding bayonets.

It is lamentable that Seller has relied exclusively for background upon the work of historians who have pilloried Britain's stance towards Jewish refugees and who have claimed that British society was riddled with antisemitism and xenophobia. Either she is unaware of scholars presenting the alternative viewpoint or she has chosen to ignore their works. Had she taken them, and the countervailing philosemitism, into account she might have tempered the statement (p. 69) that 'At first confined to the middle and upper classes, anti-alien feeling spread throughout the population'. That statement is woefully misleading, and does her no credit.

The internment of the refugees is regrettable with hindsight, but the point cannot be too strongly emphasized: the measure was taken during a time of understandable panic when Britain, fighting alone against the Nazis, seemed about to be invaded. Many of the respondents, clearly realizing this, said so in explicit terms and argued against the views of one-sided historians. And as Seller concedes (p. 241): 'The oral histories suggest that the most powerful reason for the blunting of their anger at having been interned was their awareness of the alternative.' To quote Professor Fred Gruen — an internee at Tatura camp in Australia (not in Seller's sample) — in the *Australian Financial Review*, 25 March 1983:

> We were physically safe — whilst . . . our contemporaries on the continent of Europe were being killed and maimed by the million . . . .
>
> . . . [I]nternment provided me with an opportunity to study, which I would certainly not have had at that time in any other place.

In *Hitler's Gift: Scientists Who Fled Nazi Germany* by Jean Medawar and David Pyke (Richard Cohen Books, London, 2000, pp. 209–210), an internee received a letter from a friend who commented:

> What I feel about this internment is that it is an awful thing for the innocent ones, but it is very hard for them to distinguish between innocent and guilty, and the only thing is to intern everyone. I am sure people like yourself will put up with this for the sake of England?

The recipient of that letter noted: 'That is precisely what I thought about internment'. He was 20 years old then and later became a leading Q.C.

THE JEWISH ECONOMIC MAN

Harold Pollins

(Review Article)

DEREK J. PENSLAR, *Shylock's Children. Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe*, xi + 374pp., University of California Press, Berkeley and London, 2001, $45.00.

A BOOK that comes with the plaudits of such luminaries as Sander L. Gillman, David Sorkin and Paula E. Hyman ought to be approached with enthusiastic anticipation. One of them speaks of it as a 'magisterial study' and as 'brilliant and unique'. Another describes it as 'A groundbreaking work'. A third says it is 'A major contribution' and 'an original interpretation'. The novelty lies in the book's placing economics at the centre of Jewish history, on which basis it aims to throw new light on various aspects of Jewish experience. The book is about the 'Jewish question' or the 'Jewish problem' which Penslar addresses in a different way. Traditionally it is seen in political terms, whereby a homogeneous, modern nation shows unwillingness to admit a group which is deemed to be pre-modern. But what distinguished the Jews from other minorities was that 'Jews were thought to be fully capable of taking care of themselves . . . European Jewry had always cared for its own poor . . . ' (p. 9). Thus, he says, the nineteenth-century Jewish problem was socio-economic as well as political. The aim of the book, he says, is that 'By examining the Jewish question's economic dimensions and attempts by Jews to address the question through organized social policy, I hope to make . . . readers . . . aware of the power of economic issues in shaping modern Jewish consciousness' (p. 9).

The 'economics' is a study, not so much of Jewish economic activities as of the economic ideas of certain Jewish writers and thinkers although, at the same time, the author places his discussion within the general history of economic theories and practices. There is, nevertheless, some information about Jewish economic activities; indeed, at the very start of the book the author makes the unexceptionable point that, 'Throughout much of European history, Jews concentrated in certain occupations and displayed particular characteristics in the practice of their livelihoods' although he continues

the sentence with the surprising statement: 'and the spending of their earnings' (p. 1). One wonders what surveys of Jewish expenditure patterns have ever been undertaken. In practice, he is referring to the history of Jewish philanthropy which, alongside the theme of economic ideas, takes up a good proportion of the work. Indeed he explains that his book is a work of both 'theory and praxis', it is about 'a Jewish political economy that catalyzed and guided Jewish social policy' (p. 3). Milton Friedman, in his 1972 presidential address to the Mont Pellerin Society, referred to the paradox that while Jews in the last century had consistently opposed capitalism and had done much ideologically to undermine it they nevertheless owed 'an enormous debt to free enterprise and competitive capitalism.'[1] In a sense this book reflects the second part of that statement.

However, although the author spends most time on the period from the late eighteenth century he deals with more than the supremacy of capitalism. The book covers a long period, beginning with the Middle Ages and going up to the 1930s with the final chapter, 'Epilogue', briefly touching on more recent decades. The geographical coverage is broad but essentially centres on Germany from which most of the evidence derives. This might appear strange since Britain was the chief economic power for much of the nineteenth century — and Britain is certainly not ignored — but that country was not renowned for any major writings on Jewish themes let alone those specifically on the themes of this book. Yet while the sub-title of the book refers to the study's relevance for Europe the author makes it clear that 'In the early nineteenth century, the particular sociopolitical situation of German-speaking Jews produced unique cultural forms, such as the Jewish political economy that emerged during the last phases of the German Haskalah' (pp. 2–3). However, the Jewish social policy which, he says, was guided by this Jewish political economy spread throughout Europe, the USA, and the Middle East. It is therefore of general relevance.

Although the emphasis is on the internal history of Jewry the book begins with a discussion of the economic causes of antisemitism, briefly beginning with the Middle Ages. It is seen from the viewpoint of the non-Jewish world which categorized Jews, paradoxically, as both rich manipulators and conspirators as well as paupers. The former included moneylenders and later the Court Jews but he acknowledges the existence of philosemitism notably in the seventeenth century which included a positive view of the economic value of Jews to society. But there is no doubt of the existence and persistence of the economic aspects of antisemitism, although the author is careful to avoid any form of economic reductionism and notes the fact of other elements in antisemitism, not least theological and political ones.

I suppose the heart of the book is contained in two chapters: chapter 2, 'The origins of Jewish political economy, 1648–1848' and chapter 4 '*Homo economicus judaicus* and the Spirit of Capitalism, 1848–1914.' By Jewish political economy he means 'reflection about the economic structure, behavior, and utility of the Jews within the framework of the society in which they lived' (p. 51). Despite the initial date of Chapter 2 he begins with a brief excursus into earlier times, dealing with rabbinic animadversions on economic matters, including on moneylending. There was also one view that a man's task was primarily to study the Torah and that his wife should run his business. Moreover, while the book is largely about German Ashkenazim it was the Sephardim of the seventeenth century who pioneered modern thinking on Jewish economics and this could only happen when economic life was divorced from halakhah and Jews were able to conceive themselves as part of the host economies. One feature of their writings was an emphasis on commerce and on the Jewish utility to the host economies. But he makes the explicit point that, 'The science of Jewish political economy originated in Germany. Germany's *maskilim* undertook a systematic reconceptualization of all aspects of Jewish life, including, over time, economic behavior . . . [yet] Jewish political-economic thinking was limited to a few members of a small circle of intellectuals who produced what is known to history as the Berlin Haskalah' (p. 68). One important feature of their thinking was that the Jewish occupational pattern was lop-sided and that Jewish economic activities needed to be restructured. This last is taken up in Chapter 3, 'The Origins of Modern Jewish Philanthropy, 1789–1860'. But there was no uniformity in the restructuring proposals of the various writers. Some were in favour of commerce and advocated the teaching of such appropriate skills as bookkeeping and mathematics. Others proposed restructuring away from commerce towards crafts and agriculture, notably for the poor. Underlying such ideas was the notion that Jews were unproductive and the purpose of the exercise was to ensure that Jews added to the wealth of society. Many schools were opened to teach crafts but efforts to encourage Jews to enter agriculture were generally unsuccessful. Moreover, the expansion in the number of Jews in craft occupations began to decline in the 1840s. By that time, the mid-nineteenth century, the triumph of capitalism generally affected Jews, evoking a 'sunny triumphalism, an image of the Jew as a trailblazer of capitalism' (p. 123).

This positive image of mid-nineteenth century Jewry was, indeed, put forward by non-Jews in keeping with the notion of the value of commerce — although later on this would be transformed into antisemitism because of the supposed Jewish domination of German life. The Jewish contribution to capitalism appeared specifically in

the writings of Adolph Jellinek of Vienna and Ludwig Phillipson of Magdeburg but also in works by other writers. Among the ideas were that Jews were more or less responsible for the development of capitalism, notions taken up by non-Jews, notably by Werner Sombart in his *The Jews and Economic Life*. Penslar spends several pages discussing and criticizing Sombart's views and looks at a number of contemporary German-Jewish responses to Sombart. He indicates that while there was much criticism of the empirical content of *The Jews and Economic Life* there was also some praise for its indication of Jewish necessity for the economy.

The discussion so far has taken up four of the book's six chapters (apart from a brief Epilogue) and the next two chapters are concerned with social matters; Chapter 5 is entitled 'Solving the "Jewish Problem": Jewish Social Policy, 1860–1933' and Chapter 6 is 'From Social Policy to Social Engineering, 1870–1933'. The 'Jewish Problem' in this period was essentially that associated with the emigration of Eastern European Jews, mainly to the USA, but to a large extent the routes through and, to some extent, their settlement in some countries of Western Europe. The policy of the Jewish authorities in the latter countries was primarily to ensure that the immigrants did not stay in their countries but were either deterred from emigrating in the first place or, if they did, to encourage them to move on, notably to the USA. Nevertheless a number remained and efforts were made, rather as earlier in the century, to encourage them to diversify their occupational structure to make them more productive. 'Social engineering', in the final chapter, is mainly about 'planned, large-scale agricultural colonization in a chosen territory' (p. 223). This obviously includes Zionism but also refers to experiments in various other countries, in South America, Eastern Europe and even Birobidzhan in the Soviet Union.

This is a work of great erudition — the bibliography alone is some thirty pages long — and of many insights. Placing economics at the centre of an interpretation of Jewish history is a valuable exercise and useful light is thrown on a neglected area. It is clearly an important work and there is much new information and helpful analysis. However, there are difficulties with the book. The author seems to lose sight of his main objectives — what exactly are his themes? The linking of economics and Jewish identity, as noted in the book's sub-title, does not necessarily come off. For one thing, much of the description is of the proposing of economic ideas and of the practice of philanthropy/social welfare/social policy by small groups of leading characters. The 'ordinary' Jew comes into the picture as the object of their activities but the ordinary Jew's own notions of Jewish identity are unknown. Thus, when he asks the question why did 'the concept of occupational restructuring win so much support in

German Jewish philanthropic circles' he answers it in this way. 'The most obvious reason is that Jewish social critics internalized economic antisemitism. Respectable Jews engaged in self-criticism precisely because they wanted so dearly to be respected' (p. 213). He is referring to the 'Jewish social critics' and to 'respectable Jews'. Moreover, on the same page he shows that in Germany there was a similar attitude towards encouraging agriculture and crafts, a nostalgia for the preindustrial order. There was, that is to say, not necessarily anything particularly Jewish about these ideas.

A further point is that I feel that the linking of the theme of Jewish economic ideas with that of social policy is not a happy marriage. The chapters on the latter, while having an economic input, such as on occupational restructuring, tend to become straightforward accounts of divers developments of social welfare activities. They discuss, for example, questions of the centralization of welfare activities, the role of women in social work and whether or not Jewish social welfare activities mirrored those of contemporary non-Jewish society. These and other matters are interesting in themselves but do not really tell us about the relationship between economics and social work.

There is a small number of factual errors. He states that 'Jewish dominance in British industry was limited to textile production (and only that up to the early 1870s)' (p. 129). If he is referring to those engaged in manufacturing then this is hardly the case. There was a mere handful of Jewish manufacturers in the main textile industry, the production of cotton cloth, and only a few in such others as woollen-, lace- and linen-making. It is true, however, that they were prominent in the commercial side of those industries, in the export trade.[2] The statistics of applications to the (London) Jewish Board of Guardians are not quite right. The number of new applications from recent immigrants in 1869 (p. 198) was not, in total, as he says, 226 — that was the figure for applications from Russians and Poles only. The total for all recent immigrants was 275.[3] He speaks, correctly, of the Jewish Boards of Guardians' aims to 'remove poor immigrant youth from not only petty commerce but also certain crafts, such as tailoring and cigar making' but adds 'in which eastern European Jews had long congregated' (p. 206). Tailoring certainly was an eastern European trade but cigar-making in London was a Sephardi and Dutch-Jewish occupation.[4] He states: 'The Jewish lower class in cities such as London, Paris, and Berlin did not form a true industrial proletariat' (p. 133) but a recent study, comparing Jewish immigrants in London and New York, shows that in London a higher proportion remained as workers.[5] And the name of the author of *The Secret Agent* was Joseph not James Conrad (p. 155).

NOTES

[1] Referred to by S. Herbert Frankel, *Modern Capitalism and the Jews*, Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1983, p. 3.

[2] Harold Pollins, *Economic History of the Jews in England*. London & Toronto, pp. 93–95.

[3] V. D. Lipman, *A Century of Social Service 1859–1959. The Jewish Board of Guardians*, London, 1959, p. 276.

[4] The 1874 *Report* of the Jewish Board of Guardians stated, 'Cigar-makers and shoeblacks, with very few exceptions, are all Dutchmen, tailors and shoemakers nearly all Poles and Germans.' Quoted in Lipman, op. cit., p. 35 n 1; G. H. Whitehill (ed.), *Bevis Marks Records, Part III. Abstracts of the Ketubot or Marriage-contracts and of the Civil Registers of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation for the period 1837–1901*, London, 1973, p. 13: 'The predilection [of Sephardi grooms] for the cigar-making industry is very marked; throughout the whole period it forms by far the largest single group [of occupations], although it tails off in the last two decades of the century.'

[5] Andrew Godley, *Jewish Immigrant Entrepreneurship in New York and London, 1880–1914. Enterprise and Culture*, Basingstoke and New York, 2001.

THE JEWS OF BRITAIN, 1656–2000

William D. Rubinstein

(Review Article)

TODD M. ENDELMAN, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000*, xii + 347 pp., University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, £15.95.

THIS is the fifth general history of the Jews of modern Britain to appear since 1990, the others being by David S. Katz (covering 1485–1850), V. D. Lipman and Geoffrey Alderman (both covering the period since 1858), and my own book, which surveyed the whole span, but with an emphasis on the post-1850 period.[1] I am thus the author of a 'rival' history, and had better declare that fact at the outset, although I would be surprised if this generally sympathetic review would be any different if this were not the case. Professor Endelman, of the University of Michigan, is well-known for his pioneering study *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society* (1979; revised edition 1999). That book was one of the first modern academic studies of Anglo-Jewish history; it surveyed a period which had been generally neglected. Endelman has also written or edited widely-noted works on assimilation and intermarriage in modern Jewish (especially Anglo-Jewish) history, and some valuable general essays on the distinctive features of Anglo-Jewish history. As an American, he brings objective neutrality and wider perspective to his research.

The Jews of Britain surveys the whole of Anglo-Jewish history since 1656 in one well-written and scholarly volume. There is probably no better general introduction to the field, for either the lay or the academic reader. Moreover, the author has ably presented a synthesis and analysis of the leading interpretations of Jewish history in Britain since Oliver Cromwell's Readmission of the Jews. It should be noted, however, that this is not a volume for the casual, uninformed reader; is not textbook history of Anglo-Jewry but a more sophisticated work, which generally assumes at least a basic knowledge of modern Jewish and modern British history. An impressive 42

pages of notes and a 17-page bibliography demonstrate Endelman's expert knowledge of the field; they are a valuable tool for other researchers. He devotes considerable space to the pre-1850 Anglo-Jewish community, as befits his expertise, without neglecting the modern period. The book's six chapters give approximately equal weight to each chronological period in Anglo-Jewish history. The arrival of the pogrom-driven Russian Jews from 1881 is only reached in Chapter Four, beginning on page 127, while the post-1945 chapter occupies only 27 pages, in contrast to the thirty-seven pages which Alderman devotes to eighteenth-century Anglo-Jewry.

This volume is an important contribution to the debate which has emerged in recent decades over the nature of Anglo-Jewish history. An older interpretation, associated with Cecil Roth (1899–1970), the great pioneering historian of British Jewry, viewed the evolution of Jewish history in modern Britain as essentially benign, an example of the steady triumph of liberalism. That interpretation has been challenged since the 1960s by a school of younger historians, such as Geoffrey Alderman, David Cesarani, Tony Kushner, and Bill Williams. They have highlighted what they believe to have been the greatly underestimated amount of antisemitism in British society and the equivocal nature of British liberalism, especially its alleged intolerance of deviant modes of behaviour and of cultural minorities. For my part, I have striven to defend the view of Cecil Roth as had the late V. D. Lipman and many of the historians working under the aegis of the Jewish Historical Society of England. The JHSE was established in 1894 and used to be largely the domain of well-meaning amateur historians but now its members include many academically-trained scholars.

Endelman's position is somewhere in the middle, but slightly on the 'optimistic' side of the divide. He emphasizes that Anglo-Jewish history cannot be compared with the tragic history of Jews on the European continent, although he is also at pains to stress the amount of antisemitism which did exist, the limitations of British liberalism for the Jews, and the frequent inadequacy of the response of the Anglo-Jewish elite. He has also been struck, as many others have been, by the general mediocrity of Anglo-Jewish culture and the failure to produce a native-born intelligentsia, either secular or religious, of any distinction or in any way comparable to that found in pre-1939 central Europe or post-1918 United States. It should be noted that Endelman does categorically reject the far-left interpretation of the Anglo-Jewish working class, especially that of those historians who view the religious and secular nationalist Jewish loyalties of the Jewish working class as examples of 'false consciousness'. Endelman's conclusion that 'the history of the Jews in Britain is not the success story that Roth claimed ... [n]or, however, is it the

opposite, a sorry or unenviable tale . . .' will perhaps not appeal to either side in this debate, and nor will his emphasis on (*Ibid.*) 'the messiness of the past', one which is not 'too tidy and unidimensional' (p. 269). Anglo-Jewish history is surely less 'messy' than he argues.

It is, of course, very valuable to have a balanced view (particularly one by such a distinguished scholar) which takes into account recent writings in the field. However, there are many areas where I would disagree with Endelman's conceptualization of modern Jewish history; two of these are his conclusions about British antisemitism and about the group identity of British Jews. It may be obvious to note that it is always easier to find antisemitism than to be struck by its absence or rarity, since antisemitism consists by definition of particular acts or words, while its absence consists of nothing. The extent of antisemitism in a society cannot be judged by examples of incidents or statements unless there is an attempt to place them in some kind of context. Moreover, these incidents of antisemitism can often be read in quite different ways, particularly when placed in a wider context. It seems to me that Endelman not infrequently falls into such traps. For instance, he highlights (p. 153) the distinct antisemitic edge frequently given by Liberal and radical critics of Disraeli's Turkish and Russian policies, a subject which has recently attracted some attention by historians. But he fails to note the opposite, that Tories and the 'Establishment', virtually to a man (or woman, in the case of Queen Victoria), strongly supported Disraeli. 'London society "the upper ten thousands" condemned by Gladstone, were overwhelmingly behind Disraeli', Robert Blake noted.[2] Indeed, it was then — especially at the time of the Congress of Berlin in 1878 — that the Apotheosis of Disraeli to national hero genuinely began: for instance, he was offered a dukedom by the Queen on his return from Berlin.

As for the antisemitic language and imagery employed by the Liberals, the point surely is that this could not last and could not become a fixed tenet of the British left; British Liberals, tolerant about religion, could never become antisemites. Similarly, Endelman interestingly highlights (p. 163) Virginia Woolf's dislike of Jews: 'how I hated their nasal voices, their oriental jewellery, and their noses and their wattles' and he claims that Bloomsbury (including John Maynard Keynes) 'was entirely conventional in its contempt for Jews'. But Endelman ony briefly notes the irony of the fact that Virginia Woolf was married to a Jew for nearly 30 years, apparently as happily as she could have been (as she emphasized in her suicide note to her husband, Leonard Woolf) and, after all, is known to us — by her own choice — by a Jewish surname. Is it really likely that Virginia Woolf would have had any less derogatory things to say if she had married a man from a family of Primitive Methodists or Catholics? If she had

married not Leonard Woolf but James Joyce, would her description of Dublin life be less unflattering? Nor is anything said by Endelman of the distinguished efforts of Keynes on behalf of Jewish refugee academics during the 1930s, his championing of Ludwig Wittgenstein, or his close association with Richard Kahn (Lord Kahn), his chief associate (some say more than collaborator) in writing *The General Theory*. Similarly, discussing (p. 199) 'anti-Jewish discrimination in the interwar period', Endelman states: 'Masonic lodges and golf, tennis, and motor clubs introduced membership bans. Restaurants and hotels advertised that they did not cater to Jews . . . Admission to public schools and the most desirable colleges became more difficult.' Oddly (and most uncharacteristically), not a shred of evidence is provided for these sweeping claims: no sources cited for these assertions in contrast with the hundreds of footnote citations in the volume. So far as I am aware, all the claims are in fact either misleading or flatly wrong.

Concerning the claims that Jews were debarred from joining social clubs at that time, I know of only one piece of direct evidence. In August 1934 the *Jewish Chronicle* carried a lengthy story that Victor Rothschild and other Jews had been denied membership of the 'Barn Club', a kind of country club in Barnet, Hertfordshire. The story was also widely reported in the general press. The *Jewish Chronicle* then invited its readers to report on other instances of discrimination by social clubs. Only *one* other reader replied, claiming that a country club near Cardiff had barred a 'Jewish professional man' from membership. Thus, two known instances of antisemitic discrimination by social clubs. If there were other such cases or if the practice was widespread, Endelman has simply not provided the evidence. In contrast, no American Jewish newspaper in 1934 would conceivably have asked its readers if they knew of social clubs which discriminated against Jews; it was taken for granted that virtually all of them did. Professor Endelman here may be inferring conclusions about the British situation on the basis of American models.

Part of the reason why Endelman dissents from a more optimistic view of Anglo-Jewish history is that he believes (pp. 259–260) that there was 'a price (short of baptism) to be paid for inclusion and acceptance' in British society, whereby 'Jews . . . suppressed, toned down, or reconfigured their Jewishness to conform.' A full discussion of the nature of the variations of Jewish identity in the modern world would obviously require a separate book, as would a sensible discussion of the apparent demographic decline of Anglo-Jewry in recent decades. Nevertheless, it seems to me that Endelman may well understate the distinctive, positive, and successful elements of mainstream Anglo-Orthodoxy, centred around the Chief Rabbi and the United Synagogue, between around 1900 and 1965. It was 'winning'

its 'war' with the more observant Federation of Synagogues during the interwar years and into the 1960s, becoming the synagogue of preference of most immigrants as they prospered and moved to the suburbs. The United Synagogue's ambience of decorum and British Empire loyalty and patriotism was a positive, distinctive Jewish ideology, no less 'authentic' than any other, which seemed congruent with the situation of the British Empire as the largest and arguably most important geo-political unit in the world until 1939. This ideology was no less 'Jewish' than any other, and only appears to be so with post-Holocaust, post-State of Israel hindsight, and with the collapse of British power and the traditions associated with it. It was one among many Jewish ideologies and modes of identity that emerged between the time of the Haskalah (Enlightenment) and the current post-1933/48 Jewish consensus largely formed by the Holocaust and the re-emergence of Israel. It exacted no 'price to be paid' from its willing Jewish adherents.

Perhaps I have been more critical here than I might have been; this is because Endelman's latest study is an important work which deserves to be seriously examined by other historians. I found very few minor errors. Sir Moses Montefiore (p. 164) was not the first Jewish knight or baronet; they were, respectively, Sir Solomon de Medina in 1700 and Sir Isaac L. Goldsmid in 1841.

NOTES

[1] The other recent general histories are: David S. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England, 1485–1850* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994); Geoffrey Alderman, *Modern British Jewry* (Oxford University Press, 1992); V. D. Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain Since 1858* (Leicester University Press, Leicester, 1990); and W. D. Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain* (Macmillan, London, 1996).

[2] Robert Blake, *Disraeli* (Macmillan, New York, 1968), p. 577.

BOOK REVIEWS

DEBORAH S. BERNSTEIN, *Constructing Boundaries: Jewish and Arab Workers in Mandatory Palestine* (SUNY Series in Israeli Studies), xviii + 277pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, 2000, £23.95 (paperback).

In an important sense this is essentially a study of industrial relations. It deals with labour markets and with the methods of trade unionism. But it is more than that, in two ways. First, it is a contribution to the debate on Israeli historiography. Whereas the 'traditional' approach focused on the Jewish community which was portrayed 'as isolated, even insulated from its Arab neighbors in a manner that located it in a contextual vacuum' (p. 3), here the existence of the Arab majority is neither ignored nor taken for granted but rather forms an integral part of the discussion. The author argues that 'the Jewish settlement cannot be understood as an isolated autonomous entity, but rather as an evolving entity, affected by, and responding to, the conditions and the population within which it developed' (p. 6). Second, the relations between Jewish and Arab workers in Mandatory Palestine, the substance of the book, are discussed within a modified form of Edna Bonacich's Split Labour Market Theory.

Bonacich's theory states that where two groups of labour from different ethnic or national origins meet in the same labour market, then the more advantaged group can obtain a higher value for its labour while the less advantaged group attracts lower wages and is thus more attractive to employers. The former group reacts by pursuing strategies to protect itself; these might include efforts to ensure that jobs go to members of the advantaged group, or to equalize the wages of both groups so as to prevent competition (and this might mean a degree of co-operation between the two groups). While other factors are involved — gender, for example — the point, according to Bonacich, is that 'Race, sex, nationality become the symbolism in which the conflict is expressed, but they are not in themselves the cause' (quoted, p. 11). However, Deborah Bernstein argues that the theory does not fully explain the empirical situations she studied. It was necessary to place them within their historical context and there were three ways in which she modified the theory. On the one hand, she argues that nationalism was an independent variable, a causal factor and not merely a consequence of the split labour market. One

needs to take into account the objectives of Zionism and especially of the Jewish labour movement in Palestine which aimed at ensuring that jobs in the Jewish sector should be given to Jews. There was also the growing Arab nationalism. Moreover, the analysis is more subtle; instead of a universal application of the theory — although there is a valid generalization that Jewish workers generally attracted higher wages than did Arab workers — different situations led to differing responses. One industry might experience more competition for work between Jewish and Arab workers than did other industries; sometimes, as mentioned earlier, there would be co-operation between the two groups. Finally, the theory does not discuss the reaction of the less advantaged group.

This is exemplified in the book's six chapters (in addition to an Introduction and a Conclusion). The first discusses the split labour market in Mandatory Palestine in general which indicates the two separate parts — the Jewish and the Arab — along with the government sector. More Arabs than Jews worked for the government while few Jews worked for Arab employers but Arabs were employed by Jews. Yet there were economic relationships between the two sectors. However, the bulk of the study concentrates on Haifa which was the centre of economic growth in the period — the author is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Haifa. Haifa was a particularly apt choice as it was a mixed town and, therefore, the relationships between the two groups could be more readily studied. She examines in details four separate industries: construction, manufacturing, the port, and the Palestine Railways — but not agriculture.

The construction industry was characterized by its complicated structure — the large numbers of Jewish and Arab contractors as well as the existence of Solel Boneh, the construction arm of the Histadrut — and by severe fluctuations in activity. The latter varied mainly in accordance with waves of Jewish immigration. Jewish and Arab contractors broadly carried out the same functions and so there was direct competition between the two groups of workers. Given the fissiparous nature of the industry the highly-organized Jewish workers could not control entry into the industry although they made great efforts to demarcate jobs in the Jewish sector for Jewish workers, especially in periods of boom when attempts were made to block the entry of Arab workers into the Jewish sector. However, in times of depression in the industry there was less such competition and therefore less emphasis on the displacement of Jewish workmen by Arab labour. On occasion there were attempts at co-operation between the two groups or at the Jewish unions trying to reduce competition by equalizing the terms and conditions of Arab workers. But they were normally unsuccessful.

The manufacturing sector was in direct contrast with construction;

the Jewish and Arab parts were very different from each other. There were few Arab products that competed with the products of Jewish manufacturing and the Jewish workers were more highly skilled. As a result of the lack of competition there were some efforts at co-operation — not least in a few enterprises where both Jews and Arabs were employed. Thus, in 1927 there was a five-month long strike of both groups of workers but shortly thereafter the owners substituted Arab for Jewish labour.

Disputes at the Nesher Quarry and at the Mosaica Tile Factory similarly produced short-lived co-operation between the two groups. The latter case exemplified a paradox. The Jewish workers were members of Hashomer Hatzair — which was politically left and advocated close relationships between Arabs and Jews — but at the same time they were affiliated with the Histadrut as indeed were the Arab workers through the Palestine Labour League. In November 1935 the Jewish workers went on strike but the Arab workers had a separate problem. The employer had leased land from the Jewish National Fund to which he planned to move his plant and since the JNF obliged employers to use only Jewish labour the employer aimed to dismiss the Arab workers. The Jewish workers were in a difficulty: they were strongly committed to the principle of Jewish labour but also felt committed to the Arab workers. However, the (Jewish) Haifa Labour Council made an agreement with the employer which undoubtedly disadvantaged the Arabs.

The other two industries — the port of Haifa and the Palestine Railways — were part of the government sector but differed from each other in their conditions of employment. Most of the (irregular) work in the port was carried out by Arab workers employed by Arab contractors. Jews were able to enter employment through the creation of an enclave using Jewish contractors. There was little prospect of co-operation in this field although there was one joint strike of Arab and Jewish seamen in which the latter supported the former. But this was an exceptional case. Both groups were paid by an Arab employer and the strike took place before the large-scale introduction of Jewish workers.

On the Palestine Railways the situation was very different. In practice the Jewish workers tended to concentrate on the skilled jobs where they worked alongside skilled Arab workers. In that circumstance it was necessary to work together to obtain improvements in their terms and conditions of employment. At an early stage a labour organization came into existence, under the auspices of the Histadrut, consisting of half Arab and half Jewish workers but very quickly there were dilemmas. The Histadrut was committed to Zionism and proposed separating the Jewish and Arab membership although that was against the wishes of the left-wing members of the Histadrut

and of the railway union. The Arabs also faced a dilemma, in favouring some form of joint organization but not within the aegis of the Jewish national movement. A separate Arab railways workers' union was formed although a number of Arab workers remained with the original union. For a number of years the two unions worked together (intermittently and with difficulty) in a Joint Committee but this came to an end with the onset of the Arab Rebellion in 1936. During and immediately after the Second World War there were co-operative efforts, not least a successful strike in 1946. But it all ended tragically in fighting between Arab and Jew at the end of the Mandate and the exodus of Arabs from Haifa.

To some it will appear to be a depressing story but as a piece of research it is excellent. It is readable, its observations are acute, and the analysis judicious. It proceeds from the general to the specific and the empirical details are interesting and well chosen. The final chapter of Conclusions is a worthwhile summary of the book's main findings. It should also be said that this is not a robotic analysis of material conditions. Human beings enter the discussion and the few illustrations are useful.

HAROLD POLLINS

STUART A. COHEN and MILTON SHAIN, eds., *Israel: Culture, Religion and Society 1948–1998*, vi + 98pp., Jewish Publications — South Africa, Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre of the University of Cape Town in association with the Argov Centre of Bar-Ilan University, 2000, n.p.

This short book is the result of a colloquium held in 1998 to celebrate the jubilee of the establishment of the State of Israel. There are essays on the changing Jewish identity of Israelis (by Anita Shapira and Charles Liebman); on political divisions inside Israel (by Bernard Susser); on the conflicts between Israel and the Arab/Palestinians (by Gabriel Ben-Dor); on the status of women in Israel (by Hanna Herzog); and on the Israeli army by one of the editors — Stuart Cohen.

The overall historical perspective is provided by Anita Shapira who highlights the 'debate over whether or not the State of Israel has already reached a position of such security that it can now confront its past courageously and honestly' and at the time of writing she optimistically believed that a 'historical process of reconciliation between Israel and the Arab world' seemed to be taking place. Sadly, after the book went to press, September 2000 saw the start of another *Intifada* by the Palestinians while on 11 September 2001

there was the atrocity of the terrorist attacks in New York and in Washington. Anita Shapira's essay shows that historical analysis requires a far greater time-distance from events in order to gain some objectivity.

On the other hand, Gabriel Ben-Dor, a political scientist, manages quite skilfully to present a balanced account of relations between Arabs and Israelis: he had made a cautious assessment during the peace process, before the *Intifada*, commenting that in his opinion it would be 'a vast exaggeration to argue that the Arab side no longer poses a threat to Israel's existence'.

The contributions are very short and not sufficiently supported by research evidence or references; but together they do provide a useful general overview of the State of Israel's first fifty years.

ERNEST KRAUSZ

ANDREW GODLEY, *Jewish Immigrant Entrepreneurship in New York and London 1880–1914: Enterprise and Culture*, xii + 187pp., Palgrave, Basingstoke and New York, 2001, n.p.

Although comparative histories of Jews throughout the Diaspora are often particularly illuminating, works of this type are few. Andrew Godley's excellent book, in the series *Studies in Modern History* (General Editor, J. C. D. Clark), is therefore both novel and highly important. It deserves to become well-known. Godley, a lecturer in economic history at Reading University — who, incidentally, is not Jewish — has compared the relative propensity of Jewish immigrants in London and New York between 1880 and the mid-1920s to become business entrepreneurs. He demonstrates, employing elaborate research, that (male) Jewish immigrants to New York were twice as likely to enter that field than were (male) Jewish immigrants in London; in demographic terms, the two groups were virtually identical. The author bases his conclusions on a careful and sophisticated comparison of synagogue marriage records in London (which give the occupation of the bridegroom in addition to other salient information) with census records in New York which contain much the same data. He argues that this difference between the two groups in his study reflects the comparatively anti-entrepreneurial values of British society as a whole, especially the existence of a conservative craft culture entirely absent from New York; this is exemplified by the large number of craft 'journeymen' in London.

Taking home ownership in suburban locations as the measure of upward social mobility, he suggests that the two groups had very similar experiences: New York's Jews moved out of the Lower East Side to

Brooklyn and the Bronx in great numbers shortly after the First World War, while the Jews of Whitechapel and environs moved out of the East End to North London neighbourhoods about a decade later. If anything, London's immigrant Jews appeared to be more affluent than their New York counterparts, who regularly continued to live in rented apartments into the 1950s or later. A comparatively larger Jewish proletariat might well have continued to exist in London's East End until 1939, probably outnumbering in relative terms New York Jewry's impoverished residuum in the Lower East Side and in such places as Brownsville, a slum area in Brooklyn; but this is not certain. Several important factors which he omits might be considered by Godley in a subsequent study: for example, the effect of the much greater availability in New York than in London of free secondary and tertiary-level education and the consequences of the Great Depression. The comparative preponderance of free education in New York might well have led many second-generation Jews away from entrepreneurship into the professions, while the Depression of 1929–39 almost certainly struck more fiercely in New York than in London.

Godley's book also contains a number of other significant and innovative insights which deserve a wide audience. He convincingly demonstrates (p. 82) that the Aliens Act of 1905 had 'a negligible impact on the restriction of Jewish immigration to Britain.' This finding contrasts with the accepted wisdom that the Aliens Act reduced the number of Jews coming to Britain during the period 1905–14 by about one-third of the expected figure. The author has also discovered that assisted passages, paid for by relatives already in the country, were far higher among immigrants to Britain than to the United States, with about 90 per cent of Jewish arrivals in Britain having addresses to go to, rather than simply disembarking and hoping for the best. That suggests an at least marginally solvent community willing and able to fund the immigration of relatives, but it seems somewhat inconsistent with the general conclusions of the book. Godley's impressive work merges history, sociology, and economics in an original and important manner, and points the way to other fruitful comparative studies of this kind.

HILARY L. RUBINSTEIN

ROBERT LEVY, *Ana Pauker: The Rise and Fall of a Jewish Communist*, xii + 407pp., University of California Press, Berkeley, 2001, $35.00 (paperback, $22.95).

Ana Pauker (1893–1960, born Ana Rabinsohn to Orthodox Jewish parents in a Moldovian village) was between 1945 and 1952

Romania's Foreign Minister, its head of agriculture, and a Politburo member in the Romanian Communist government. In September 1948, *Time* magazine in a cover story described her as 'the most powerful woman alive'. Nowadays, she appears to have been little more than one of the Stalinist slaves, robots, executioners, or local tyrants who came into Eastern Europe in 1944–45 with the conquering Red Army and dominated a totally unwilling population — until they themselves were purged just before or just after Stalin's death in 1953.

Many of these individuals (though certainly not most) were Jews; as Jews they were reviled by most of the local populace and a few years later they were denounced and often executed as 'Zionists'. Little or nothing was known of the private or inner struggles of the post-war Communists of the satellite states, while anything like a searching biography was impossible until the fall of Communism. Robert Levy's biography of Ana Pauker is thus genuinely novel; it is a very interesting and informative account of one of the most important of these figures. He has used previously unavailable Romanian and Russian sources extensively and has conducted dozens of interviews with survivors of Communist Romania.

Ana Pauker had joined the radical movement just before the First World War and had been repeatedly jailed by the Romanian government as a radical in the years preceding the Second World War. Her husband, Marcel Pauker, came from an assimilated Romanian Jewish family and was murdered before the Second World War in the Stalinist Purges. She had spent a good deal of time in the Soviet Union, where she was highly regarded, despite her unorthodox background. A few weeks before the Nazi invasion of 1941, she was sent from a Romanian jail to the Soviet Union. She returned to Romania in September 1944 and for the next few years she was one of the most dominant leaders in the Communist Romanian government — until she was inevitably purged in 1952. She was formally arrested in February 1953 and it is likely that she was saved from execution only by Stalin's death a few weeks later. She died in obscurity in 1960.

While most of the Jews who reached leadership positions in Eastern Europe in the wake of the Red Army were keen to deny their origins as comprehensively as they could, Ana Pauker remained surprisingly loyal to the Jews. She is probably best remembered for allowing hundreds of thousands to emigrate to Israel; that is the subject of an interesting chapter in Levy's biography. In 1946, her father Hersch [Zvi] Rabinsohn visited her; she was then a prominent official and he had come to ask her to help a group of Romanian Jews. She offered him coffee and cake and Levy relates (p. 181):

> Old Zvi exploded: 'How dare you offer me hot coffee on a Sabbath! Have you gone mad?' Ana, trying to calm her father, led him to the kitchen

and showed him the electric percolator. She explained that, since no one needed to strike a match, no religious law was violated.

Not many other Jewish Communists at that time are likely to have shown even an iota of such consideration for the religious feelings of Orthodox Jews. This anecdote shows that Ana Pauker was a bundle of contradictory reactions. The author of this book is clearly aware of this and has done his best to interpret them but much of Ana Pauker's life reveals elements which make her an elusive personality. She had remained a favourite of the Kremlin until about the late 1940s, in spite of her obvious deviant opinions — to say nothing of the fact of her Jewish origins and of her female sex. It is not clear how she managed to survive in a leadership position for several years and we do not know who were the friends in high places who must have been protecting her. But she was eventually denounced as the architect of the unpopular policy of land collectivization and of much of the terror. However, Levy shows that the reverse was true: she had been a moderate and had worked well in 1944–47 with non-Communist Romanians; she had welcomed a proposed American loan and was emphatically not a Stalinist stooge — although she had been assumed to have been one since she had managed to survive so long.

This biography leads one to wonder about other Eastern European famous Jewish Communists: for example, were Hilary Minc in Poland and Rudolf Slansky in Czechoslovakia more Jewish and humanitarian than Stalinist? Levy's fine study does not deal in much detail with Romanian Jewry after the Second World War. He states (on p. 163) that 353,000 Romanian Jews survived that war, constituting then the largest Jewish community in Europe after that of the Soviet Union. However, according to Tamas Stark (in *Hungarian Jews During the Holocaust and After the Second World War, 1939–1949: A Statistical Review*, Boulder, Colorado, 2000, p. 99), there were in 1947 in Romania's post-1945 boundaries, 445,624 surviving Jews — only slightly fewer than the 1930 total of 478,042. The Jews of Old Romania (Moldavia and Wallachia), including Bucharest — although heavily persecuted by the pre-war and post-war Romanian regimes — were not deported. They did not only survive the Second World War almost intact but were later joined by refugee Jews fleeing Poland and Hungary. The wartime massacres of Romanian Jews occurred for the most part in Bessarabia, separated from Romania in 1944, while those deported to their deaths by Eichmann were the Jews of Transylvania, which had been annexed by Hungary in 1940.

In 1945, much of Romania still had institutions and a communal structure which had prevailed some ten years earlier. That was also the case in Bulgaria and these two countries were then in a position which contrasted very sharply with the conditions in former Nazi-

occupied European countries. Was that a factor in Ana Pauker's relations with the local Jews — in contrast to (for example) the well-placed Polish Jews who were later to be found in a mass graveyard? That is an interesting field for study in a subject which Robert Levy has pioneered so well.

WILLIAM D. RUBINSTEIN

STEPHEN W. MASSIL, ed., *The Jewish Year Book 2002: 5762–5763*, xxxvi + 377pp., published by Vallentine Mitchell (London and Portland, Oregon) in association with the *Jewish Chronicle*, London, 2002, £26.00 or $37.50.

The Jewish Year Book continues to be ably edited by Mr Massil. The present volume follows the pattern of previous year books, with a set of introductory essays. The Preface by the editor summarizes the salient events of 2001 but starts with the 'launching of terror in the USA' on 11 September 2001. It then reports on the tragedy in Israel of the Palestinian *Intifada* and its repercussions with the failure of the Peace Process and the steep decline in tourism. There is a paragraph on the General Election of June 2001 in the United Kingdom, with a reference to the Jewish members of parliament (the same number as in 2000) and to 'Ian' Letwin as the shadow Home Secretary (but elsewhere Mr Letwin's first name is rightly given as Oliver). There are references to the new Holocaust memorial in Vienna and to the opening of the Jewish Museum in Berlin. 'Books of the year' are listed on pp. ix–x, as are films with a Jewish content shown during 2001. Another list gives the names of British and foreign Jews who died last year as well as the names of a Jordanian military chief, a PLO leader, and the Samaritan High Priest. The last paragraph of the Preface refers to Jewish cricketers. The Preface is dated 12 October 2001 and since then, alas, there has been a disastrous escalation of 'strife and retaliation across Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza'.

Mr Massil confesses that he is 'grappling with the population tables, which have been inaccurate for some years' and clearly looks forward to the findings of the last decennial census, which now includes a question on religion and ethnic origin. Meanwhile, the present volume has a section on Jewish Statistics (pp. 196–201) giving the Jewish population of the 'principal countries' from Afghanistan and Albania to Zimbabwe. However, we are warned that the figures are estimates, since there have been large migrations in recent years — especially the large exodus of Russian Jews in the 1980s and 1990s.

At the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, world Jewry was estimated at nearly 17 million: 10 million in Europe, 5,375,000 in the Americas (which is now thought to have been an overestimate); 830,000 in Asia; 600,000 in Africa; and under 33,000 in Oceania (p. 196). Estimates for world Jewry at the present time are said to give a total of about 13 million: six and a half million in the Americas; nearly five million in Asia ('including 4,847,000 in Israel'); 89,800 in Africa; and 101,900 in Oceania. On the other hand, in the section listing the various countries of the world, in alphabetical order, the Jews in South Africa are stated to number 90,000 and there are a few more Jews in other parts of the African continent: Algeria, 150; Morocco, 7000; and Tunisia, 3000 — about 10,000 in North Africa. The figure for Tunisia appears on p. 189; but on Table 1 on p. 197 Tunisia is stated to have 1500 Jews while Table 2 on p. 200 gives the populations of major centres in Africa, including Tunis with 2200. Clearly Mr Massil does indeed need to grapple further with his population tables. He has my full sympathy: cross checking figures is exhausting, and so is proof-reading of figures and tables. It is surprising that with all the claims made about the ability of sophisticated computers, the extent of spelling and printing errors in even the most respectable publications is being increasingly tolerated.

The total number of Jews in Muslim countries is given as 'about 71,600' (p. 196). Iran has the largest total: 27,000, followed by Turkey with 25,000 and Morocco with 5800. At the other extreme, there are said to be in Indonesia a total of 16 Jews: five families totaling 15 persons in Surabaya and one lone Jew in Jakarta. As for Pakistan, readers may not be surprised to learn that the Year Book lists only two Jewish families in Karachi and adds that an 1893 synagogue 'was reported closed in 1987' (p. 181).

The most detailed information in the volume is about the institutions of British Jewry and about local organizations in London and in the regions. Two pages (209 f.) give important information on 'listed synagogues, former synagogues and other Jewish sites in the UK'. Bevis Marks synagogue is a Grade I listed building in London, while the other listed Jewish buildings (synagogues, museums, etc.) are Grade II. Several Jewish cemeteries are cited under Grade II: in London, a Spanish and Portuguese cemetery in Mile End Road dating from 1657 and an Ashkenazi cemetery in Alderney Road dating from 1696–97. There are other listed cemeteries in England: in Bristol, Exeter, Liverpool, and Southampton. In Scotland, there is an 'A List' Glasgow necropolis and a 'B List' cemetery in Edinburgh.

The Republic of Ireland has almost twice as many Jews as Northern Ireland, the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man: Dublin has 1300 and Cork 30, while Northern Ireland has 550 in Belfast; the

Channel Islands, 120 in Jersey; and the Isle of Man, about 35. Moreover, there is 'a Progressive cemetery at Woodtown, Co. Dublin'. The section on 'Other Countries' (that is, other than the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland) starts with Afghanistan and ends with Zimbabwe. Some countries merit only one or two lines: Albania, Antigua, Burma, Fiji, Haiti, North Yemen (although it is estimated to have some 1200 Jews in Sa'ana), Slovenia, South Korea, and Sri Lanka.

On the other hand, the entry for Israel numbers many pages (pp. 158–176). Its population in September 1998 was close to five million: 4,850,000, which included 17,000 Druze on the Golan Heights but excluded the territories occupied after the Six-Day War — estimated at 1,381,000 (p. 161). There is a brief history of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, after the British Mandate, and summaries of 'key events' — such as the various conflicts with other Middle Eastern countries — and of the peace negotiations since the Yom Kippur War of 1973. This is followed by a section on the government of the country and on the various political parties and coalitions.

The extensive list of Israeli embassies and legations (pp. 161–165) will be very useful to Israelis and other Jews travelling the world; addresses and telephone numbers are given from Angola to Zimbabwe, usually citing the names of the ambassadors. Egypt and Jordan have Israeli ambassadors while Oman and Qatar have offices for 'Israel Trade Representation'. I was surprised to see on p. 144 that there is an Israeli embassy in Burma which is said to have only about '25 Burmese Jews' in the capital, Rangoon, where there is also a synagogue which was established in 1896.

There are three pages listing 'selected educational and research institutions' (pp. 167–169). The oldest institutions of higher learning are the Technion, established in 1924, and the Hebrew University, opened in 1925. The ORT Israel network, established in 1948, 'manages Scientific and Technological Colleges and schools for around 80,000 young and adult students yearly' (p. 169).

The section on British settlements in Israel lists those with large groups of immigrants from the United Kingdom and Ireland; there are 23 entries, mainly relating to kibbutzim and moshavim, and there is also information about the various societies or associations of British settlers which were merged in 1996 under the title of 'UJIA Israel'.

Who's Who (pp. 216–314) cites mainly Jews resident in the United Kingdom; but prominent Israelis (leaders of political parties, chief rabbis, and a handful of university professors) also figure, as do the Chief Rabbis of France and of Romania and some distinguished American professors. It would be wrong to assume that the absence

in that *Who's Who* section in the Year Book of Jewish eminent scholars in British universities or other distinguished professionals means that these individuals do not wish to be identified as Jews. Before Mr Massil was entrusted with editing the Year Book, for example, several British Jews, who had attained recognition in famous universities, resented the delay in being approached to fill in a questionnaire in order to be included in the Year Book's *Who's Who*; when asked why they had refused the invitation they replied that it had come too late.

Readers who had omitted to look at the Year Book's list of contents, preceding the Preface, may be very surprised not to find Lord Rothschild in the *Who's Who* section, or any other Jewish peers or Jewish members of the Cabinet. This is because they are listed in the pages preceding the *Who's Who* section under the title of 'Privy Counsellors, Peers, MPs, etc.' Jewish Fellows of the British Academy and Companions of Honour also figure in that section. When it comes to names of recipients of the Victoria Cross, the George Cross, and Nobel Prizes, many names have an asterisk because these Jews are dead; some of them have been dead for a long time — for example, Henri Bergson in 1941; Albert Einstein in 1955; while Otto Wallach (who was given the Nobel Prize for Chemistry) died in 1931.

This Year Book is excellent value at £26.00; it contains a wealth of data, apart from the four essays which are also informative (on Chaim Weizmann; on the Center for Jewish History in New York; on Liberal Judaism in Great Britain; and on the Jewish National Fund). Mr Massil writes clearly and concisely and his Preface ends charmingly with a reference to Jewish cricketers.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

MÉLANIE OPPENHEJM, *Theresienstadt. Survival in Hell*, 93pp., illus., translated by Dina Ullendorff, Menard Press in association with the European Jewish Publication Society, London, 2001, £8.99 (paperback).

The Menard Press has published a number of memoirs of Jewish life in Europe in the Second World War and this is a worthy addition to the list. It is unusual in that the author, Mélanie Oppenhejm, was a Dane, and an upper middle-class one; her husband was a senior member of the Danish judicial system. The memoir begins with a description of her pre-war efforts to rescue Jewish children from Germany — efforts which continued in the first part of the war, when she and others were able to send children to Sweden in the hope

that they would eventually get to Palestine. After the war she lamented that she had not been able to save more children. On two occasions in the first part of the war the author accompanied the children to Sweden, but in October 1943 the round-up of Jews in Denmark began. The author, her husband and two of her four children were arrested on the first day of October as they were trying to flee to Sweden and a few days later they were transported to Theresienstadt. Refugee children were also transported.

In many ways the story she tells is depressingly familiar. The squalor — she writes eloquently of the fleas and the bedbugs — the lack of food, the brutality of the guards, and the selections for transportation to the extermination camps, are described in a somewhat distant tone as though by an observer and not a participant. This gives verisimilitude to her account, not least the factual description of the farcical visit of two representatives of the Danish Red Cross. The occasion was used by the Germans to turn Theresienstadt into a model camp. It was cleaned up, much paint was used, there were flowers on the tables, and shops were mocked up with meat and fresh vegetables (the inmates' standard fare was a thin gruel); a bank was opened and money was issued, an incredible irony since they could not usually buy anything. The money was used to light fires, when wood was available, and to plug windows. As soon as the representatives finished their visit, all was returned to 'normal'. Some of the inmates who were more immediately involved in the farce were transported — including tragically many of the children who had been inveigled into playing and dancing for the film which was made of the visit. She tells the sad story of Dr Eppstein, who had been Rabbi Leo Baeck's right-hand man on the Jewish Representative Council in Berlin. He was obliged to select inmates for transporting to the death camps, something which caused him immense conficts of conscience, and he had to act as an official guide to the Danish Red Cross visitors for whose visit he was made mayor. Afterwards he was tortured and murdered, for allegedly organizing a self-defence group among the inmates and his wife was sent to an extermination camp; she told Mrs Oppenhejm that 'she was really proud to be following her husband' (p. 66).

Early in 1945, it became clear to the captives that the war was coming to an end. The guards began destroying records, the cardboard boxes containing the ashes of those who died were thrown into the river, but not all the records were burned. And drawings and sketches made by some of the inmates were hidden and survived. (Although it is not made clear, presumably some of the sketches in the illustrations section of the book were among those which were drawn in Theresientadt.) Then in April 1945 the Danes were rescued by the Swedish Red Cross, accompanied by members of the Danish

Red Cross. Among the Danes were the surviving child refugees from Germany who had been given Danish citizenship by the Danish Government. Most of the Danish inmates survived including the author, her husband and her two children, one of whom, her son Ralph, writes a brief Preface (following another brief Introduction by Professor Edward Ullendorff). The author died in 1982 but like many survivors had not spoken of her experiences for most of the remainder of her life. The book, it seems, originated in a series of radio talks broadcast a year before she died. They followed a reunion of the refugee children she had helped to rescue before the war and who had remained in Denmark. This book was the result — altogether a tragic and convincing story of experiences in a concentration camp, a story which cannot fail to move its readers.

HAROLD POLLINS

CHAIM I. WAXMAN, *Jewish Baby Boomers: A Communal Perspective*, vii + 221pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 2001, $19.95.

The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS), carried out by the Council of Jewish Federations and the North American Jewish Data Bank, is the most extensive and far-reaching investigation of the American Jewish community. It was a telephone survey of 2441 respondents; the findings were weighted by geographical area and other characteristics to make up a recognizable picture of American Jewry. The conclusions of the NJPS appeared disturbing to many: the survey highlighted very high rates of intermarriage and the existence of many persons who stated that they were born to Jewish parents but were, in 1990, active members of another religion. The NJPS has been criticized on a number of grounds. It was claimed that it under-counted Strictly Orthodox Jews — a claim seemingly confirmed in this book by its author who states (p. 57) that 'it seems reasonable to assume that the NJPS included few if any *haredi*, "Ultra-Orthodox" respondents'. The survey's reliance on telephone interviews and its weighting procedure have also been open to question. Nevertheless, it remains the most important and valuable of recent studies of American Jewry.

Jewish Baby Boomers is an analysis based only on NJPS data of 'baby boomers' interviewed in 1990 — that is, of Jews born between 1946 and 1964. Many of its findings are not surprising: high rates of intermarriage; continuing political liberalism (alongside the growth of more moderate opinion); generally small families; and a drift away from the North-East. However, there are also some rather surprising

conclusions: a decline (compared with Jewish cohorts before the Second World War) in the number of doctors and college professors; levels of marriage higher than among the general population; high rates of at least minimal Jewish education; and rates of synagogue attendance slightly higher than among the pre-1946 generations. The overall picture is rather blurred, providing little evidence for any strong return, in the 'third generation', to more fully Jewish lifestyles but, equally, little evidence for 'straight-line assimilation' in the third generation. However, it is fair to say that there has been a decline in many aspects of Jewish identity and an increase in non-traditional modes of Jewish consciousness.

Although Waxman cogently and clearly describes what the data reveal and although he provides useful references to a range of relevant sociological works, one is left with many questions about both the data and the findings. Neither Waxman nor, as far as I know, anyone else interviewed again any of the 1990 respondents — so that the findings are those from a decade ago. Today, in 2002, the oldest of the 'baby boomers' are in their late fifties and we cannot reliably assume that they have not changed their attitudes since 1990. The 'baby boom' generation covers an 18-year cohort and the life experiences of Jews who were children in the 1950s will certainly have differed from those who were children in the 1970s. I share the doubts about the NJPS's weighting procedure and the under-reporting of Strictly Orthodox Jews and, especially, I am concerned about how the survey organizers ascertained the accuracy of the religious identity offered by telephone respondents, other than self-definition. It may well be that the 1990 survey has drawn too pessimistic a picture of American Jewry. At least, there are some grounds for hoping that this might be the case.

WILLIAM D. RUBINSTEIN

ADI WIMMER, ed., *Strangers at Home and Abroad: Recollections of Austrian Jews who Escaped Hitler* (translated by Ewald Osers), viii + 181pp., McFarland and Co., Jefferson, NC and London, 2000, £22.50.

The Nazi take-over of Austria presented several unique features in the history of Hitler's persecution of the Jews. Although the *Anschluss* occurred in March 1938 — eight months before *Kristallnacht* — the force of pre-existing Austrian antisemitism, as well as the unremitting hostility shown to Austrian Jews by German and Austrian Gentiles alike from the moment that the German military forces marched in, ensured that most Austrian Jews were only too eager to

leave their native land as quickly as possible. Moreover, Nazi policy after the *Anschluss* immediately became one of uncompromising forced emigration of all Austrian Jews. That policy was organized and implemented chiefly by Adolf Eichmann, who showed the same ruthless efficiency then that he was to demonstrate later in Hungary and elsewhere, when Nazi policy had proceeded to genocide. Furthermore, an infrastructure for receiving Jewish emigrants was (however reluctantly) in place in most countries.

As a result of these factors, about two thirds of Austrian Jews (120,000 out of 185,000) managed to leave before flight became impossible; nearly all were middle-class Jews (90 per cent). That rate of escape is higher than for any other Nazi-occupied country — apart from the 'emigration' of nearly all the Jews of Denmark in 1943 who were given refuge in Sweden. It is worth noting here that the percentage of German Jews who fled Germany in the six and a half years between Hitler's advent to power and the outbreak of the war in September 1939 was smaller.

Strangers at Home and Abroad consists of 29 interviews with Austrian Jews who had managed to emigrate and who are, or were, recently living in the United States, Britain, Israel, and elsewhere. Several (including Sir Ernst Gombrich and Lord Weidenfeld) are internationally renowned; but most are not — they are 'ordinary Jews' like most of the others who constituted the large majority of Hitler's victims. The interviews start with a useful biography of each person and they follow the now almost universal technique of reporting only the interviewee's responses to questions as an unbroken narrative — omitting the interviewer's words. This gives an intensely realistic quality. (That technique apparently originated in a book published in 1966, *The Glory of Their Times*, by the American historian Lawrence Ritter; it consisted of 20 interviews with old American baseball stars of the 1895–1925 period. The book became a classic of sports history and has been imitated dozens of times; its 181 pages could easily have been expanded and still retain the reader's close attention.)

The venomousness of Austrian antisemitism before Hitler's rise to power is made crystal clear. Austria, Hitler's homeland, emerges as one area where Daniel Goldhagen's thesis of ubiquitous German 'exterminationist' antisemitism may have a measure of accuracy. On the other hand, the precariousness of refugee life, as well as the essential reservoir of goodwill encountered by most of those interviewed, is also conveyed — as are some very important insights. Walter Foster (né Fast), who came to England from Vienna in 1938 eventually joined the British army and in 1946 was serving as a 'de facto inspector of prisons' in the army of occupation in Germany. He comments, on p. 153:

> The first thing we did was to screen out the big Nazis from the small ones, the war criminals from the fellow travellers . . . . The most important detail was that anyone below a senior rank, anyone below major, at least, and anyone less than 35 was not even looked at; they were sent home.

This serves to explain why it took so many decades to trace the war criminals, now in their eighties, who had been of junior rank in the Nazi forces or in the concentration and extermination camps. Walter Foster is quoted as saying: 'First Lieutenant Waldheim would have been of no interest whatever to us'.

The editor of this volume is a non-Jewish Austrian; he was born in 1949 in Braunau (Hitler's birthplace) and states that he was christened 'Adolf', which was his father's Christian name. He has splendidly carried out the difficult and time-consuming task of locating and interviewing his subjects, scattered around the world. He started on this endeavour in 1987 and has produced a vivid and remarkable collection. However, he may be unduly pessimistic when he claims that the world is 'witnessing a relentless rise of right-wing violence' (p. 19) or when he compares today's ethnic problems with those of the Nazi period. The latter were surely unique in every respect.

WILLIAM D. RUBINSTEIN

CHRONICLE

The Jewish Agency released last February demographic data: There are 13.3 million Jews in the world; 5.1 million live in Israel. The United Kingdom has 273,000 Jews — the fifth largest after the United States of America, Israel, France, and Canada. There were 18 million Jews before the Second World War and 12 million immediately after that War.

*

Bar-Ilan University was founded in 1955. In the spring of 2002, it stated that it has now 'a modern 70-acre campus in Ramat Gan, outside Tel Aviv, with five regional colleges across Israel'. It started with just one building; it now has 63. In 1955, it had six classrooms, two laboratories, and one library; by 2002, there are 170 classrooms, 101 laboratories, and 15 libraries. There were 29,500 students enrolled in the 2001–2002 academic year and an academic staff of 1500. Its budget in 1955 was half a million U.S. dollars; in 2002, it is U.S. $150 million. Its alumni number some 54,000.

All Bar-Ilan University's students 'are required to complete a core curriculum, the equivalent of a minor, in *basic Jewish heritage courses*. The university offers more than 400 such courses for students to choose from'. Bar-Ilan claims that it is 'the largest Jewish studies faculty in the world' with more than 1,500 courses taught by 300 faculty members to more than 2000 undergraduate and graduate students, 'in 33 research and teaching disciplines'. There are formal academic co-operation agreements with some 40 'prominent universities around the world'.

> The Bar-Ilan *Research and Development Company* spearheads the transition from lab to marketplace of new technologies and pharmaceuticals.... Over the past year, two dozen applied scientific projects spawned at the university have been purchased by industrial concerns.

Apart from the many courses of studies leading to undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral degrees, Bar-Ilan University has 'diploma studies in Journalism and Communications, Librarianship, Hotel Management and Tourism, Optometry, Local Government, Music Therapy, Teaching, Translation and Interpreting' among its range of courses.

*

Bar Ilan University recently inaugurated a special programme for students who have severe learning disabilities in studying English as a foreign language. It is a joint project launched by the English as a Foreign Language Unit (EFL) and the Centre for Research on Dyslexia and Reading Disorders. Until then, such students 'could not function adequately in the

regular EFL classroom'. The individual tuition which has been developed has had remarkable success; all the students enrolled finished the course 'with a changed attitude about reading English and with an increased sense of self-esteem' — according to a *Bar-Ilan University News Brief* dated 15 April 2002. The Co-ordinator of the English as a Foreign Language Unit is quoted as commenting: 'This special program is one-of-a-kind in Israeli universities'.

*

The Fall 2001 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that 179 Ph.D. degrees were awarded that year — 'the largest number ever. Of these, 110 specialized in the natural sciences and 69 in the humanities. In keeping with a rising trend, women outnumbered men by 94 to 85. The oldest student to receive his degree was ... 79, who graduated in history, and the youngest ... 25, who completed her doctoral studies in chemistry with distinction'.

The Tel-Aviv–Jaffa Municipality and Tel Aviv University have established a joint scholarship fund of one million shekels (about U.S. $230,000) for the residents of the city.

> The fund will cover half the annual tuition fees of residents wishing to study at the university based on economic need and on criteria determined by the Dean of Students Office.
>
> Students up to the age of 30 who attended grades 10–12 at one of the city's schools will be eligible for a scholarship. Preference will be given to the residents of the distressed southern neighborhoods of the city and to those who have served in the IDF [Israel Defence Force]. The fund will be supervised by three representatives of the municipality and three from the university.

*

This issue of *Tel Aviv University News* also reports on a project on bird migration which 'acts as a bridge between Israeli, Palestinian, and Jordanian conservationists, academics and schoolchildren':

> The migrating birds — storks, birds of prey, pelicans and some 280 other species — are the focus of a unique educational project that brings together Israeli, Palestinian and Jordanian schoolchildren and provides a ray of hope for coexistence on an otherwise dismal horizon.
>
> The project, 'Migrating Birds Know No Boundaries: A Multidisciplinary Project in Post-Conflict Areas', is an initiative of the TAU's Department of Zoology, and the Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel (SPNI). The project has received funding from US-AID, MERC in the amount of $1.5 million, in recognition of its potential in advancing the peace process by bringing together experts and schoolchildren in the region.
>
> A network linking centers in Israel, the Palestinian Authority and Jordan allows students to follow migrating birds. ... Students also learn additional subjects including biology, the ecology of migration, weather, geography, and computer skills.

The project will now be expanded by joining forces with the nesting ground countries in Europe and Western Asia and the wintering ground countries in Africa. The expansion is the result of an international conference . . . entitled "Wings Over Africa", which was attended by experts from 20 African countries, including Muslim states like Djibouti that have no formal links with Israel.

*

The Report of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies for the Academic Year 2000–2001 states (p. 27) that the Centre's students 'came from Australia, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom and the United States of America'. Of the 24 students enrolled for the Diploma in Jewish Studies, 17 were awarded the Diploma, two of them with Distinction.

*

It was reported in March 2002 that New Zealand's 2001 Census showed a noticeable increase in the country's Jewish population: 6636 'confirmed an affiliation to Judaism — a rise of 1827 over the previous census. A further 1854 defined their ethnic background as Israeli, Jewish or Hebrew'. The Auckland region has the largest concentration of Jewish residents, 'with 3132 people registering a Jewish religious affiliation'. The Wellington area was the second largest Jewish centre, with 1188, followed by Canterbury with 642.

Communal leaders have commented that the increase has occurred largely because of the still rising levels of immigration from South Africa and Israel.

*

The January 2002 issue of *Les Cahiers de l'Alliance israélite universelle* notes that the Alliance's Mikveh-Israel campus is remarkable for housing side by side a school in the secular stream and a school in the religious stream, the latter known as *mamlakhti-dati*. A new refectory serves food to all pupils and thus allows possibilities of communication and personal friendships across the divide. The religious segment includes a boarding school, which helps to integrate pupils from different geographical origins — mainly those from Ethiopia and from the former Soviet Union. It is largely for the benefit of such groups that an intensive programme of Jewish studies and Judaism has been organised for a second year; its aim is to facilitate formal conversion for those new immigrants whose Jewish identity is doubtful in the view of Israel's Chief Rabbinates. The special *ulpan* allows such pupils to prepare for a 'return' to Judaism while pursuing their secondary studies.

The Alliance founded a school for the Sourds-Muets (deaf and dumb, literally) in 1932 in Jerusalem; it has presently 40 per cent Arab and 60 per cent Jewish children. Recently, the school inaugurated a new programme to allow the Arab pupils to meet once a week pupils from another Arab school to allow the handicapped children to participate in cultural and artistic activities which would help them to integrate more successfully in their

community in Jerusalem while making the other pupils aware of the difficulties which their handicapped fellow-pupils have to surmount.

*

Salonica had before the Second World War a thriving Jewish community numbering about 75,000, with dozens of Jewish schools and some forty synagogues; today there are barely one thousand Jews in the city. An Alliance school was established in 1978 as a primary school and today has six forms and a kindergarten; three schoolteachers give tuition in Judaism, Hebrew, Jewish history, and Jewish music and art. The school also aims to develop in the pupils links with the State of Israel.

Some 46,000 Salonica Jews were deported from 1941 to 1943; fewer than 2000 survived the death camps. The present Jewish community has a new cemetery and maintains two synagogues, one school, a home for the aged, and organizes community events. A new Jewish Museum of Salonica has been established in the city centre; it records recipes of Judeo-Spanish cuisine, shows large reproductions and murals depicting sections of the old cemetery destroyed by the Nazis and displays some gravestones and remnants of old synagogues. There is a water fountain in the courtyard and the staircase leading to an upper floor is decorated with postcards showing some of the more beautiful Jewish villas which had been demolished.

There is an exhibition created in a kibbutz in 1993 which traces the history of Salonica since its creation in 315 before the Common Era until the Nazi destruction in the Second World War; that exhibition is entitled in English: 'The Simon Marks Museum of the Jewish History of Thessaloniki'. Another room shows objects loaned or donated by families of Salonica origin now living in Israel: ritual objects, books, clothes, embroideries, lace, and family photographs. After a room depicting examples of the Jewish press of Salonica and portraits of leading former inhabitants (including old teachers and pupils of Alliance schools) one reaches the last room which depicts Nazi atrocities: an Auschwitz prisoner uniform; a yellow star, and numerous photographs of the humiliations endured by the Jewish inhabitants before their deportation. The Museum also has a small centre of documentation and research which it is planned to expand; there are several hundred books and a collection of Hebrew works purchased from the National Library of Bulgaria.

*

That same issue of the *Cahiers* of the Alliance has an article on the *ketubah* (Jewish marriage contract); it is illustrated with a reproduction from a 1747 *ketubah* in Bordeaux; a 1783 *ketubah* from the Rhineland; and an engagement contract in 1929 from Tunis. The future bridegroom's surname was Chemla; a large department store of that name flourished in Cairo for several decades before the Second World War.

*

Studia Judaica VIII (dated 1999 but received in London in 2001) publishes in English papers delivered at an international conference which took place in Romania in October 1998 on 'Fifty Years of Jewish Scholarship in

Israel'. The contributions deal with the Hebrew language and its development; the Dead Sea Scrolls; Biblical scholarship; the Jews of Romania in Israeli literature; East-European Jewish politics; demography in Israel; education in Israel (several papers on that subject, including 'The Humanities on the decline in Israeli higher education' by Ernest Krausz); and a paper on the image of the *shtetl* during 50 years of collective memory in Israel.

*

There have been many reports in newspapers of antisemitic and anti-Israel attacks in several European countries and in Canada, in the first months of 2002. The Community Security Trust reported last April on violence against Jews in Britain. There were 32 incidents between January and March and 15 in the first 10 days of April. A police community-safety unit in London is reported as stating that 'several attacks have been against men in kipot or other visible signs of Orthodoxy going to and from synagogues'. Two girls were assaulted in a central London thoroughfare; one of them was wearing a Star of David which was ripped from her neck.

The Community Security Trust report on 2001 recorded more than 300 antisemitic incidents during that year, including 40 physical attacks. More than a third of the total number of attacks were directed against synagogues, rabbis, and congregations. There were attacks on synagogue buildings which led to 90 cases of damage and desecration of property — compared with 73 such instances in 2000. There were 19 incidents against Jewish schools or schoolchildren and there were also cases of mezuzot ripped from the doors of Jewish homes. On the other hand, a welcome development has been a sharp decrease in the distribution of antisemitic literature in Britain; this is believed to have been the result of successful prosecutions and of swift reactions by the police.

In Sweden, Jewish leaders sent an open letter last April to the leading national daily newspaper, accusing the press of encouraging antisemitism and of a massive anti-Israel campaign. In Greece, there was a large pro-Palestinian demonstration in Salonica which was followed the next day by the city's Holocaust memorial site being daubed with red paint and another act of vandalism occurred in a Jewish cemetery in Ioannina. Greek police were quoted as commenting that these incidents had been sparked off by Israel's military occupation in the West Bank, while the Greek Foreign Ministry said in response to appeals by the Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece that the government would act to try to prevent antisemitic incidents.

In Canada, the Toronto Jewish Film Festival cancelled a screening last April in view of 'a more explosive year security-wise'; the screening was to have been based on a BBC documentary on Ariel Sharon's role in the 1982 Lebanon War.

In France last April there were reports of cars being rammed into synagogues, Jewish classrooms set on fire, and a Lubavitch bus, carrying young children, being stoned. Teenagers training and playing football (who were members of a Maccabi club) were attacked in a municipal stadium by a masked group brandishing truncheons, metal bars, and baseball bats. The 16-year-old goalkeeper was badly injured and had to be hospitalized.

In Los Angeles, Jewish tourists were advised to exercise 'extreme caution' when visiting Belgium or France; Jewish cemeteries had been daubed with swastikas last April.

There was alarm also in Ukraine. In Kiev, the Central Synagogue was stormed by a mob last April; almost all the windows were smashed and worshippers beaten — including the rabbi and his teenage son. In Istanbul last April, 10,000 persons were reported to have joined an antisemitic demonstration with posters stating 'I understand Hitler better now'. However, the spiritual leaders of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity issued a statement condemning terrorist acts and urging all sides in the Middle East conflict to work for peace.

*

The Spring 2002 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* has a report on that university's efforts to raise funds 'to assist outstanding immigrant students pursue doctoral degrees'. It states:

> One of the greatest challenges still facing Israel is the continued absorption of talented newcomers into Israeli society. Although immigration from the former Soviet bloc has declined during the past few years, the number of doctoral degrees at TAU is on the rise. Approximately 15% of TAU's 1521 doctoral students are immigrants from the former USSR — a higher number than at any of Israel's other universities. TAU is the only institution of higher learning to have appointed a Dean of Absorption and created a special Absorption Fund dedicated to helping immigrants.

That dean is quoted as commenting on the great importance for such financial help: the Ministry of Absorption gives grants to immigrants for those registering for bachelor and master's degrees — but not for doctorates. 'The University fills the gap by funding 50% of the costs of their studies. . . . For the other 50% we are actively seeking support from our friends.'

There are 198 immigrant students enrolled at Tel Aviv University. Native Israelis can count usually on their kinship links but many immigrant doctoral students are the only wage earners in their household and may be responsible financially not only for their young children but sometimes also for aged parents. Moreover, they may need to follow intensive courses in the Hebrew and English languages as well as meeting the 'constant challenge of integrating into Israel's unfamiliar way of life'. There is the case of a single parent who came from the former Soviet Union seven years ago, with a daughter aged seven. The young girl 'did well at school, was popular with her peers, and was receiving excellent grades' but she was killed during the terrorist attack at Tel Aviv's Dolphinarium nightclub in June 2001. Her mother is alone in Israel now but she had been the curator of a Museum of Asiatic Arts in Uzbekistan and she hoped to continue with that line of work in Israel, but with no advanced degree

she could not secure a good post and TAU therefore 'was recently pleased to accept her for doctoral studies'.

*

Eight doctoral students at Tel Aviv University were awarded Fulbright scholarships in 2001: two in Cultural Studies and two in law; one each in Biotechnology, Jewish History, Medieval Islamic History, and Nursing. Seven doctoral students were awarded Wolf Foundation scholarships: two in Clinical Biochemistry and two in Computer Science and one each in Cultural Studies, Biochemistry, and Physiology and Pharmacology.

*

The ISEF Foundation was established in New York 25 years ago 'to help reduce educational gaps in Israeli society'. That same issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states:

> The foundation supports outstanding students of limited means who repay society by participating in special educational outreach projects. The foundation allocates 500 scholarships a year, of which 50 are awarded to TAU students and jointly supported by TAU. To date, about 32,000 elementary and high school pupils have benefited from ISEF's programs.

Pupils at three high schools 'in run-down Tel Aviv neighbourhoods' recently improved greatly as a result of that tuition in an ISEF project at the Center for Advancing Achievements in the Ha'tikva neighbourhood of Tel Aviv. At the end of the school year, mathematics grades improved by 18 per cent, English by 12 per cent, and Hebrew grammar by seven per cent. The Executive Director of the ISEF Foundation in Israel is quoted as saying that the students who participated in the project 'are themselves from inner-city neighbourhoods and development towns in Israel's periphery. They served as positive role models by inspiring the youngsters to succeed. This is social leadership at its best.'

*

Israel has one of the highest rates of child violence in the world. Discipline problems and unruly behaviour are causing growing concern for those involved with educational and health matters. The School of Social Work of Tel Aviv University has established a project, *Otzma* (power) to modify violent behavior in children. 'Teachers learn how to talk with children about violent behaviour in the classroom, and how to be aware of the unconscious messages they may be transmitting to aggressive children. . . . The goal . . . is to teach children that inner strength comes from controlling their reactions and planning their responses'. Another programme, 'Empowering

Children and Adolescents', is based on this same approach and is operated by students specializing in child welfare.

> Traditionally, professionals in the field have treated child violence within an environmental context, in the belief that changes in a child's surroundings can improve behavior. The TAU program, by contrast, involves direct intervention and provides children with a step-by-step approach to acquiring self control. . . . The program imparts techniques for "self-speak" — issuing self-reinforcements and positive instructions such as "a person who controls himself is strong", rather than "I have to show that I'm the strongest". The researchers believe that the program will provide a valuable model for treating children suffering from trauma, emotional and sexual abuse, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

*

Another item in that issue of *Tel Aviv University News* entitled 'From Playground to Battleground' (pages 18–19) deals with the 'distressing consequences of the prolonged conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians': the children's exposure to violence. A doctoral student in the Department of Psychology is carrying out research on the impact of war and terror on Palestinian children in the West Bank and on Jewish children in high risk areas, 'such as the Gilo neighborhood in Jerusalem and settlements in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The research is based on a sample of 1300 Palestinian and Israeli children between the ages of 13 and 15.'

A distinction is drawn 'between experiencing war and experiencing a single acute trauma such as assault or natural disaster, when children are usually able to assimilate such events into their existing worldview'.

> An unremitting state of war and terror, however, creates a sense of anticipation and engages the victim in attempts to preserve the self. The defences used for these purposes, such as denial, dissociation, and identification with the aggressor, may result in major personality changes . . . varying degrees of anti-social behavior, suicidal tendencies, criminal activities or substance abuse. . . . Schools are closed for long periods and the children are often deprived of enjoying outdoor play simply because playgrounds are no longer safe. They are unable to visit friends and family outside their own towns either because they are not allowed to or because they fear being targeted by snipers. They even undergo intense feelings of insecurity and fear within their own homes. In the Palestinian homes this may be due to Israeli soldiers conducting searches or the fear of being hit by missiles. In the case of Israeli homes, it is the fear of being hit by mortars or gunfire . . . children also frequently experience the actual injury or loss of family and friends — casualties of the conflict.

Preliminary analysis indicates that the greatest distress is caused by fears for a loved one, such as a mother who is late coming from work on a dangerous road or for a friend travelling by bus who may

be the subject of a terror attack. The questionnaires which children were asked to complete showed that both Palestinian and Jewish children endured horrific events: witnessing the shooting of relatives, schoolmates 'murdered and mutilated in the caves near Beth El' or friends 'who were passengers on a bus that was blown up. Some of them had their legs amputated'. As for the Palestinian children, 70 per cent of them 'demonstrate the full range of symptoms required for a diagnosis of clinical PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder).'

Adolescents may be more vulnerable than younger children in such situations, reacting with rebellious and anti-social behaviour or resorting to substance abuse or variant sexual behaviour; they were also more secretive than younger children and likely to feel more guilt and shame. They may choose to become a warrior, a peace supporter, or a martyr of Islam and suicide bomber. Planning for the future can thus contribute to the breeding of more violence, and helplessness.

The *Intifada* (Palestinian uprising) has had a profound influence on Palestinian kinship relations. Fathers and older brothers who are arrested or unable to find work to provide for their household may experience a diminution in their position and witness the fracture of the traditional patriarchal structure. The increasing power of the younger members as well as of the girls 'has undermined the traditional authority of the elders. The loss of an authority figure for the children may have psychological repercussions since they are not forbidden from exposing themselves to danger, yet there is no one to shield them from trauma'.

*

An International Conference on 'Romanian Jewry During the Communist and Post-Communist Era' took place in Tel Aviv; 24 scholars attended — coming from the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, Israel, Romania, and the United States of America. There were discussions about collecting and processing archival material in Eastern Europe, mainly in Romania. New co-operative projects were established between Israeli and Romanian institutes aiming to gather data on minority groups in Romania during the Communist era.

*

The July 2001 issue of *Les Cahiers de l'Alliance israélite universelle* includes a section of several pages on Judaism in several European countries: France, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Austria, Spain, and Portugal. The oldest synagogue in Europe is to be found in Prague: it is said to date from the thirteenth century and it is still used for worship. There are records of a Jewish presence in Poland also in the thirteenth century, with a Jewish community in the town

of Plock and a Jewish district in Cracow in the fourteenth century (p. 10). In Austria, records of a Jewish community can be found as early as 1194, for Vienna, where exactly a century later, in 1294, a synagogue was established; the number of Jewish inhabitants continued to increase, in spite of anti-Jewish legislation since the end of the fifteenth century (p. 13).

Jews are recorded to have lived in Portugal as early as the fifth century and by the twelfth century when Portugal was established as a separate nation, several Jewish communities were found in the towns reconquered by the Christians. They continued to remain and to achieve some autonomy until the 1496 Expulsion Decree (pp. 13–14). That is when the term 'Marrano' (pig) was widely used to designate the Jews who formally converted to Christianity while retaining their Jewish beliefs and rituals secretly. Their exodus led to the establishment of crypto-Jewish or 'new Christian' communities in south-west France (Montpellier, Bayonne, Avignon, Bordeaux); in Italy (Ferrara, Venice, Rome, and Ancona); and further North, in Amsterdam and in London. However, it is in Spain that the earliest Jewish presence in Europe was recorded — as early as 587 years before the Common Era (p. 14). After the Muslim conquest in 711, Jews and Christians were allowed to practise openly their own religions.

From the tenth century, since the Cordova Caliphate, the Jews flourished in Spain until the middle of the twelfth century while in northern Spain under Christian rule, they were subjected to discriminatory measures. By the middle of the thirteenth century, the whole Iberian Peninsula, with the exception of Granada, had been reconquered by Christianity.

Toledo had become the most important Jewish community in Castille but most of its synagogues and talmudic academies were destroyed in 1391. Since the end of the thirteenth century, there had been massacres of Jews throughout the land — especially in Cordova, Toledo, Barcelona and Gerona. But in 1995 these towns and six others (Caceres, Hervas, Segovia, Oviedo, Ribacavis, and Tortosa) decided to reclaim their Jewish heritage and institute what the *Cahiers de l'Alliance* translates as "Chemins de *Sefarad*" as a network of Spanish Jewries; each year one of the towns is chosen to represent the network (p. 15).

*

In April 2002, in the main community event to mark the Holocaust and the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews declared:

> If there are calls in Britain — from street demonstrators to respected academics — saying 'kill the Jews'; if synagogues and schools in France

> are being fire-bombed; if our enemies hate us so much they are training children to seek their own death to kill our children; if large parts of the world can now openly deny the right of Israel to exist, we must not forget where that kind of rhetoric led 60 years ago. . . . The fate of the Jews of Israel and the fate of the Jews of the Diaspora are inextricably intertwined.

The Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations noted:

> This year, it is happening again . . . five shuls in France over Pessah, one of them burned to the ground; . . attacks on shuls in Brussels and Antwerp and Canada; . . . a lorry filled with explosives that crashed into a shul in Djerba, killing 13 people.

He referred to incidents when a young Jewish boy and when two Jewish girls were attacked and commented: 'These were not Israeli targets, they were Jewish targets. This is antisemitism'. He added: '. . . in the past 12 months the floodgates have opened to everything we have fought against . . . a wave of hate has filled the world.' Holocaust survivors had identified with the Bosnian Muslims in 1991 and later with the Kosovo Albanians (also Muslims) and had made it clear that remembering the Holocaust did not only mean fighting for fellow Jews, 'it means fighting the inhumanity that transcended our differences'.

*

Last February, young boys were charged with race-hate crimes in the Czech Republic. More than 50 gravestones were damaged in a Prague Jewish cemetery; other boys involved in the desecration were not charged because they were under the age limit of 16 for legal prosecution for race crimes. There has been an increase in the number of Czech teenagers joining Nazi skinhead groups.

*

There were sixty participants in the April-May 2002 Jewish National Fund car rally (London-to-Jerusalem). One of them, who is the JNF's president in the United Kingdom, commented that they had encountered roadside anti-Israel demonstrators in France and in Italy, with shouts of 'Vive Arafat' but there were also anti-Le Pen demonstrators shouting support. The Jewish Agency reported that last April at an aliyah fair in Marseilles, there were more than 4,000 who attended; 700 new personal files were opened and 40 families wished to emigrate immediately. The number of Jewish Agency staff in Marseilles was being increased because there had been a six-fold increase in the numbers enquiring about emigration to Israel. The Jewish Agency is giving special consideration this year to those wishing to settle in Israel from Argentina, France, and South Africa.

*

It was reported last January that two teachers in a religious school near Jerusalem had been suspended by the Education Ministry of Israel after they were alleged to have set fire to a Hebrew copy of the New Testament in the school's playground in front of a class of 11-year-old pupils. The book had been given to one of the pupils by a missionary; proselytising minors is a criminal offence in Israel. The headmaster of the school expressed regret that the incident had occurred and said that when he learnt of it, he consulted a local rabbinic authority who declared that missionary publications should be burnt, but in private. The head of the Anti-Defamation League in Jerusalem condemned the incident, as had the Education Ministry which specified that 'book-burning of any kind' was not permissible.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

Ernest L. Abel, *Jewish Genetic Disorders. A Layman's Guide*, vi + 242pp., McFarland & Co, Jefferson, North Carolina, and London, 2001, distributed in Britain by Shelwing Ltd, 4 Pleydell Gardens, Folkestone, Kent CT20 2DN, £42.75.

Steven Beller, ed., *Rethinking Vienna 1990*, xi + 292pp., Berghahn Books, New York and London, 2001, £17.00 (hardback, £47.00).

David Berger, *The Rebbe, the Messiah, and the Scandal of Orthodox Indifference*, ix + 195pp., The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, London and Portland, Oregon, 2001, £19.95 or $29.50 (hardback).

Larry Eugene Jones, *Crossing Boundaries: The Exclusion and Inclusion of Minorities in Germany and the United States*, v + 266pp., Berghahn Books, New York and Oxford, 2001, £17.00 (hardback, £47.00).

Ernest Krausz and Gitta Tulea, eds., *Starting the Twenty-First Century: Sociological Reflections & Challenges*, vol. 8 of *Sociological Papers*, xvii + 231pp., Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and London, 2002, for The Sociological Institute for Community Studies of Bar-Ilan University, n.p.

Tzvi C. Marx, *Disability in Jewish Law* (Jewish Law in Context series, edited by Neil S. Hecht) xii + 260pp., Routledge, London and New York, 2002, hardback, n.p.

Sophia Richman, *A Wolf in the Attic: The Legacy of a Hidden Child of the Holocaust* (with a Foreword by Spyros D. Orfanos), xxi + 240pp., The Haworth Press, New York, London, and Oxford, 2002, £15.80 (hardback, £53.20).

Leonard Rogoff, *Homelands: Southern Jewish Identity in Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina*, x + 398pp., University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa and London, 2001, $39.95 (hardback).

Lisa Tessman and Bat-Ami Bar On, eds., *Jewish Locations: Traversing Racialized Landscapes*, iv + 247pp., Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford, 2001, £17.95 (paperback).

Tanya Schwarz, *Ethiopian Jewish Immigrants in Israel: The Homeland Postponed*, x + 288pp., Curzon Press, Richmond, Surrey, £40.00 (hardback).

Oliver Valins, Barry Kosmin, and Jacqueline Goldberg, *The future of Jewish schooling in the United Kingdom. A strategic assessment of a faith-based provision of primary and secondary school education*, xix + 167pp., Institute for Jewish Policy Research, London, 2001, n.p.

Zvi Zameret, *The Melting Pot in Israel. The Commission of Inquiry Concerning the Education of Immigrant Children During the Early Years of the State*, xiii + 337pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 2002, $25.95 ($75.50 hardback).

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

LISA R. KAUL-SEIDMAN is Cadbury Research Fellow in the Department of Theology of the University of Birmingham.

HAROLD POLLINS is a retired Senior Tutor at Ruskin College, Oxford.

HILARY L. RUBINSTEIN is a former Research Fellow in History at the University of Melbourne. She has taught Modern Jewish History in Australia and in the University of Wales.

WILLIAM D. RUBINSTEIN is a Professor in the Department of History and Welsh History at the University of Wales in Aberystwyth.

WILLIAM SHAFFIR is a Professor in the Department of Sociology of McMaster University.

AARON TAPPER is a graduate of the Masters degree program of the Divinity School of Harvard University and is studying Arabic in Cairo on a CASA fellowship.

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR: Judith Freedman

VOLUME FORTY-FOUR, 2002

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

CONTENTS

BOOKS REVIEWED

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS