THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XLVIII : NUMBERS 1 and 2 : 2006

CONTENTS

Changes in the Geographic Dispersion and Mobility of American Jews, 1990–2001
UZI REBHUN AND SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN

Herbert Martin James Loewe in Oxford
HAROLD POLLINS

J. L. Magnes and the Promotion of Bi-nationalism in Palestine
RORY MILLER

The Renaissance of Hassidism
WILLIAM SHAFFIR

The Baal Shem Tov
NORMAN SOLOMON

Book Reviews

Chronicle

Editor: Judith Freedman

ISSN 0021-6534

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY Volume XLVIII Numbers 1 and 2 2006

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 XLVIII : Numbers 1 and 2 : 2006

CONTENTS

Changes in the Geographic Dispersion and Mobility of American Jews, 1990–2001
UZI REBHUN AND SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN 5

Herbert Martin James Loewe in Oxford
HAROLD POLLINS 34

J. L. Magnes and the Promotion of Bi-nationalism in Palestine
RORY MILLER 50

The Renaissance of Hassidism
WILLIAM SHAFFIR 69

The Baal Shem Tov
NORMAN SOLOMON 75

Book Reviews 80

Chronicle 93

Notes on Contributors 98

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

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

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

PRODUCED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY 4WORD LTD, BRISTOL

BOOKS REVIEWED

Authors	*Titles*	*Reviewers*	*Page*
J. Cooper	*Pride Versus Prejudice. Jewish Doctors and Lawyers in England*	J. Freedman	80
L. Gyémánt	*The Jews of Transylvania*	E. Krausz	83
Y. M. Rabkin	*Au nom de la Torah. Une histoire de l'opposition juive au sionisme*	G. Alderman	84
C. Rapoport	*Judaism and Homosexuality: An Authentic Orthodox View*	H. Pollins	88
M. Shilo	*Princess or Prisoner? Jewish Women in Jerusalem, 1840–1914*	J. Freedman	90

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.

CHANGES IN THE GEOGRAPHIC DISPERSION AND MOBILITY OF AMERICAN JEWS, 1990–2001

Uzi Rebhun and Sidney Goldstein

Introduction

In the 350 years since Jews first settled in the colonies of North America, migration has served as a key factor in explaining changes in the concentration of Jews across the American continent. The types of Jewish relocation have varied — including local movements, intrastate mobility, long-distance migration between states and between regions, repeat movements, and bilocal residence. The patterns and trends reflect wider social and economic processes characterizing American society; the growing integration of the Jews into the American mainstream; and the changing nature of ethno-religious identification.[1]

Given the lack of information on religious identity in the United States census and other official statistical sources, only an indirect assessment of Jewish migration was possible for many years through reports made by Jewish local communities on the size of their Jewish populations.[2] With the increasing number of such communal surveys since the 1960s, a few of which were conducted several times in the same locality, and the growing number which included information on population movement, these surveys cumulatively have come to cover a large proportion of the total American Jewry. However, because each community is unique in some respects, the community data cannot easily be used to generalize to the national Jewish scene. Moreover, because of their focus on current population, communal studies are mainly concerned with new in-migrants, and do not provide information on those who moved out.[3] Only national data — which first became available from the results of the 1970/71 National Jewish Population Survey and again two and three decades later with the completion of the 1990 and 2000/01 NJPS respectively — enable a comprehensive and direct assessment of national patterns of Jewish internal migration and Jewish population redistribution across the United States of America.[4]

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 48, nos. 1 and 2, 2006

Among the findings which have emerged from the first two national studies,[5] there is evidence of a continuous decline within the total U.S. Jewish population of the relative share of Jews in the Northeast — which was the preferred destination for Jewish immigrants to the U.S. at the turn of the twentieth century; a drop in the proportion of Jews in the Midwest; and considerable growth in the South and the West. While differences remain, the stronger pace of Jewish migration (as compared to its total American counterpart, including that of non-Hispanic whites) largely realigned the spatial distribution of the two populations.[6] Important determinants of the levels of mobility among Jews are their educational achievements and concentration in the professions.[7] Movement associated with changes in career, marital status, and retirement (as well as temporary or seasonal movements for those who maintain multiple residences in different parts of the country) also help to explain the heightened overall mobility. Thus, although the highest rates of migration are to be found among young adults, migration is also salient among middle-aged and elderly Jews. Within localities, Jews have followed the tendency of Americans in general to move from central cities to suburban neighbourhoods, while remaining within metropolitan areas.

As with human migration in general, Jews are also affected by macro-structural conditions in areas of origin and destination. Geographic inequality in employment opportunities and income, as well as non-monetary environmental factors (whether cultural or climatic), push people out from, or pull them into, different areas. Ethnicity, in terms of group residential concentration or as a form of location-specific social capital, is yet another explanatory factor for differentiation in migration.[8]

Local amenities, economic depression or prosperity, and to a somewhat lesser extent, lifestyles, are fluid and may change over time and vary between different geographical areas. Technological innovations, including remote communication which diminishes the importance of distance between home and work, affect living and working styles and have important implications for spatial mobility. Similarly, settlement of new immigrants may bring about competition for employment opportunities with native-born residents, mainly among the lower economic strata, inducing the latter to migrate to a different (often adjacent) state.[9] Finally, satisfaction and happiness are temporary feelings: 'As one want is satisfied, another often rises to take its place', and satisfying this new want may lead to a change of locale.[10]

All these suggest that processes of internal migration are dynamic and require periodic follow-up. Such follow-up after 1970/71 and 1990 has recently become possible with the completion of a new national sample survey of American Jews (NJPS 2000/01) covering, inter alia, census-type questions on socio-demographic, economic,

and household characteristics.[11] This article makes use of the 1990 and 2000/01 surveys to trace changes in the geographic distribution of Jews across the country, the types and levels of migration, and the directions of their spatial movements. We focus mainly on five-year migration, but also direct attention to documentation of longer-term migration throughout the life-cycle of the respondents, as well as metropolitan/non-metropolitan characteristics of residential areas and bilocal residence. Some comparisons are made with the geographic characteristics of total whites. Shifting residential patterns are central to understanding the demography of American Jews and therefore have relevance for communal planners who must consider the size and composition of potential constituencies for various social, welfare, cultural, and religious services for both migrant and non-migrant populations.

Methodology

The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey used a three-stage data collection process.[12] First, a national sample of households was reached by random digit dialled (RDD) telephone interviews as part of the twice-weekly general market-research surveys conducted by ICR Survey Group of Media, PA. Respondents (adults aged 18 and over) were asked to state any attachment to Judaism for themselves and for each member of their household. In the second stage, the inventory stage, attempts were made to contact again households containing at least one Jewish member to verify the identity of potential respondents and to solicit participation for the final sample. During the inventory procedure, several potential respondents dropped out of the sample pool owing to changes in household composition or disqualification upon further review of the Jewish credentials. The third interview stage of the survey of earlier-identified Jews was conducted from May through July 1990 and yielded a total sample of 2,441 completed interviews.

The 2000/01 study, conducted by RoperASW, was also a random sample of telephone numbers attained using RDD procedure in all 50 states, as well as the District of Columbia.[13] The U.S. was divided into seven strata according to an early estimate of Jewish population distribution. To achieve greater sampling efficiency, strata with higher estimated levels of Jewish density were over-sampled as compared to strata with lower estimated levels of Jewish density, and the differences among strata in the chance of being called were adjusted by a weighting process. A series of screening questions was introduced to verify any current or past connection to Judaism. If only one person qualified as a Jewish adult, that person was assigned the full interview; in households with two or more such adult Jews, the interviewed person

was randomly selected. The complete sample constituted 5,148 respondents, representing Jews as well as non-Jews of Jewish background.[14]

The present analysis focuses on respondents who at the time of the survey defined themselves as Jewish. This includes respondents who indicated Jewish as their current religion (Jews by 'religion'), as well as respondents who reported no religion but who considered themselves Jewish ('ethnic' Jews). For 1990, these definitions encompass the entire 'core' Jewish population;[15] in 2000, however, the 'core' Jewish population includes a third group of 'Jewish connected'[16] which has no parallel in 1990, and who have been excluded from our analysis because they were not asked key demographic and Jewish behavioural questions. This means that our samples from the two surveys are not strictly comparable. The 2000/01 NJPS sample of Jews which we are using is defined more narrowly than the core sample from 1990. Since group identity is an important reason for moving or not moving, and given previous evidence that the peripheral segment (persons of Jewish background) tends to be slightly more mobile than those who consider themselves Jewish,[17] it can be assumed that our findings for 2000 slightly underestimate the 'true' levels of migration of the entire core population as defined in 2000. Nevertheless, since the 'Jewish connected' are a comparatively small percentage of the overall Jewish sample, the bias resulting from these unknown cases is likely to be very small.

Application of the above criteria resulted in a sample of 1,804 respondents in 1990 and 4,147 respondents in 2000. Data in both surveys were weighted to account for their differential selection probability.

Regional Distribution

We begin by examining the changing distribution patterns of American Jews over the period 1990–2000.[18] This is evaluated in light of earlier changes and their implications for the continuation of longer-term processes and suggestions of new directions. The regional redistribution of Jews is also compared with that of the total U.S. white population to assess the spatial dimension of Jewish integration into America's social mainstream.

Table 1 shows that the last decade has witnessed the continuation, although at a slower pace, of the long-term decline in the proportion of American Jews located in the Northeast, from 43.5 per cent of the national total in 1990 to 42.7 per cent in 2000. The pace of the decline, however, seems to be significantly slower than in the preceding two decades (from 60.7 per cent in 1970 to 43.5 per cent in 1990). This overall decline reflects opposite trends in the two divisions which comprise the region: the percentage of Jews who live in New England increased from 6.1 per cent in 1970 to 8.1 per cent in 1990, and then

Table 1.

Distribution of Total United States Whites and Core Jewish Population, by Regions, 1900, 1930, 1970, 1990, and 2000

	1900		1930		1970		1990		2000	
Region[a]	Jewish[b]	United States[c]	Jewish[d]	United States[e]	Jewish[f]	United States[g]	Jewish[h]	United States[i]	Jewish[j]	United States[k]
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number (in 1000's)	(1,058)	(66,809)	(4,228)	(108,864)	(5,420)	(177,612)	(5,515)	(199,686)	(5,200)	(211,461)
Northeast	56.6	30.9	68.3	30.5	60.7	24.9	43.5	21.1	42.7	19.6
New England	7.4	8.3	8.4	7.4	6.1	6.4	8.1	6.0	6.8	5.7
Middle Atlantic	49.2	22.6	59.9	23.1	54.6	18.5	35.4	15.1	35.9	13.9
Midwest	23.7	38.6	19.6	34.1	16.3	29.1	11.3	26.0	12.4	25.5
East North Central	18.3	23.5	15.7	22.3	14.1	20.4	9.3	17.9	9.3	17.4
West North Central	5.4	15.1	3.9	11.8	2.2	8.7	2.0	8.1	3.1	8.1
South	14.2	24.7	7.6	25.5	11.9	28.3	21.6	32.8	22.6	34.4
South Atlantic	8.0	10.0	4.3	10.4	8.9	13.6	18.1	16.7	18.2	17.6
East South Central	3.3	7.6	1.4	6.7	1.7	5.7	1.0	6.0	1.1	6.2
West South Central	2.9	7.1	1.9	8.4	1.3	9.0	2.5	10.1	3.3	10.6
West	5.5	5.8	4.6	9.9	11.1	17.7	23.6	20.1	22.3	20.5
Mountain	2.3	2.4	1.0	3.0	1.2	4.4	4.5	5.9	3.8	6.9
Pacific	3.2	3.4	3.6	6.9	9.9	13.3	19.1	14.2	18.5	13.6
Index of Dissimilarity[l]										
Jews-Jews[m]			12.1		11.5		24.9		2.6	
Jews-Total U.S. Whites	26.6		37.8		36.1		28.7		26.4	

a) States included in each division are as follows: New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut; Middle Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania; East North Central: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin; West North Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas; South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, D.C., Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida; East South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi; West South Central: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas; Mountain: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada; Pacific: Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii. *b*) 'Jewish Statistics'. *American Jewish Year Book, 1900*, vol. 1, pp. 623–624. *c*) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1931. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, No. 53, p. 13. *d*) Linfield, H.S. 1931. 'Statistics of Jews'. *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 33, p. 276. *e*) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1931. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, No. 53, p. 12. *f*) Our own data analysis of the 1970/71 NJPS. *g*) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1971. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, No. 92, p. 27. *h*) Our own data analysis of the 1990 NJPS. *i*) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1992. *1990 Census of Population and Housing: Summary Population and Housing Characteristics, United States*, p. 59. *j*) Our own data analysis of the 2000/01 NJPS. *k*) U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau, 2002. *2000 Census of Population and Housing, United States: 2000, Summary Population and Housing Characteristics*, Part 1, p. 4. *l*) $\Delta = \sum |X_i - X_j|/2$ where X_i is the relative weight of each region among population i, and X_j is the relative weight of the same regions among population j. *m*) Comparison of successive decennial points in time.

declined to 6.8 per cent in 2000. At the same time, the sharp drop between 1970 and 1990 in the proportion of Jews in the Middle Atlantic states (that is, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey) stopped, giving way to a very slight increase. Among the total white population, the comparative share of both divisions has declined, suggesting continuation of earlier processes.

After a gradual decline through the earlier decades of the twentieth century, from 23.7 per cent of the national total in 1900 to only 11.3 per cent in 1990, the proportion of Jews in the Midwest has recently experienced a modest revival to 12.4 per cent in 2000. This is mainly attributed to growth in the West North Central division. Nevertheless, the Midwest continues to encompass the smallest regional percentage of Jews in the nation. These redistribution patterns differ from those characterizing total whites, whose proportion living in the Midwest continued to diminish throughout the century.

The two sunbelt regions exhibited rather different patterns of change over the last decade. The percentage of Jews living in the South increased slightly (from 21.6 to 22.6 per cent), while the percentage of Jews in the West declined (from 23.6 to 22.3 per cent). The growing presence of Jews in the South Atlantic division, with its attraction for retirees (that is, Florida) and, to a lesser extent, the West South Central division, are jointly responsible for the overall percentage increase in the South. In the West, both the Mountain and Pacific divisions have undergone a decline in their proportion of the national Jewish population — for the first period since 1930. Thus, by 2000 the South and West each had very similar proportions of Jews. Total whites continued to increase their concentration in the South (with the region having the largest net migration gain among the four regions[19]) as well as in the West.

Overall, between 1990 and 2000 the spatial distribution of Jews across the nine divisions of the U.S. underwent only modest changes. This is summarized by the index of dissimilarity, which reflects the percentage magnitude of differences between two distributions (Table 1). When the distribution of Jews in 2000 is compared to that of Jews in 1990, the index of dissimilarity is only 2.6. This is in sharp contrast to an index of 24.9 for 1970 compared to 1990. When the Jewish distribution is compared to that of U.S. whites, the index changed minimally between 1990 (28.7) and 2000 (26.4). This suggests that Jews have maintained comparatively stable patterns of distribution during the last decade vis-à-vis the larger U.S. population. This is quite different from earlier periods of the century, when the index rose from 26.6 in 1900 to 37.8 in 1930 and then declined to 28.7 in 1990.

American Jews are not cut of one cloth: there are substantial differences in regional distribution by type of Jewish identity; these differences, however, cannot be accounted for solely, or even mainly,

by the effects of selective migration, and may have stemmed from historical developments, socio-economic factors, and localized cultural norms each of which can directly impinge on group identity and belonging.[20] Data not shown here (owing to space limitations) suggest that in a comparison of core Jews with the peripheral population, in 2000 the core Jews in the U.S. are more heavily concentrated in the Northeast (42.7 per cent), while under one-third of the peripheral population (that is, people of Jewish background) reside in this region. At the same time, compared to the core Jews, more of the total U.S. peripheral Jewish population live in each of the three other regions. Concurrently, sharp differences characterize the two sub-segments comprising core Jews: whereas almost half (45.8 per cent) of Jews by religion and ethnicity live in the Northeast, only about one-quarter (27.1 per cent) of Jewish-connected are located there. The largest concentration of Jewish-connected is in the West, suggesting that this area either attracts a substantial number of marginal Jews, or that conditions in this region weaken consciousness of religio-ethnic identity. Thus, the emerging patterns of redistribution have particular implications for a cohesive and vital national Jewish community.

Recent Migration Patterns

A more direct assessment of the migration behaviour of American Jews is gained through examination of the levels and types of internal migration (Table 2). In 1990, about half of the Jewish population aged 18 and over were residentially stable: that is, they were living in the same house as in 1985, while one-quarter had relocated within the same city or town. Of the remaining quarter, almost 12 per cent had moved to a different location within the state, and an additional 11.1 per cent had moved to a different state (among which 6.8 per cent remained in the same region and 4.3 per cent moved to a different region). A high level of mobility continued to characterize American Jews in the late 1990s, but the inclinations for local versus long-distance mobility had changed somewhat: while over half (56.6 per cent) of the population remained stable between 1995 and 2000, among those who did move a slightly higher percentage in 2000 compared to 1990 chose to relocate outside their 1995 town of residence in the same state (12.7 per cent), to a different state (12.5 per cent), or, particularly, to another region.

Migration is often related to life-cycle. Events such as enrolment in higher education, marriage, entrance into the job market, and retirement help to explain variations in movement by age cohorts. The general and consistent age patterns characterizing both the 1990 and 2000 data-sets point to the high propensity of young adults to move,

Table 2.
Five-Year Migration Status by Age: American Jews in 1990 and 2000[a]

Age	Same House	Same Town	Same State	Different State		International	Total %	Total Number in the Sample
				Same Region	Different Region			
				1990				
18–29	20.1	32.6	21.3	15.6	8.3	2.1	100.0	(350)
30–44	38.4	32.5	15.9	6.7	5.4	1.1	100.0	(730)
45–64	69.6	18.2	5.4	3.4	2.7	0.7	100.0	(430)
65+	81.4	10.4	3.9	3.5	0.8	—	100.0	(450)
Total	51.8	24.3	11.8	6.8	4.3	1.0	100.0	(1,960)
				2000				
18–29	22.5	21.5	24.0	11.5	15.1	5.4	100.0	(622)
30–44	38.8	22.5	17.3	6.4	10.5	4.5	100.0	(976)
45–64	70.6	11.7	8.5	3.8	4.0	1.4	100.0	(1,453)
65+	76.7	9.9	6.5	2.0	3.8	1.1	100.0	(1,048)
Total	56.6	15.5	12.7	5.2	7.3	2.7	100.0	(4,099)

a) In this and succeeding tables, the data for 1990 refer to the entire 'core' Jewish population; for 2000, data refer to Jews by religion and ethnic Jews excluding Jewish-connected. For a detailed explanation, see *Methodology* section in the text.

with a gradual decline among older cohorts. Thus, whereas in 1990 only 20.1 per cent of Jews aged 18–29 lived in the same house as in 1985, this was true of fully 81.4 per cent for the elderly population; the parallel levels for 1995–2000 are 22.5 and 76.7 per cent, respectively. Moreover, from one decade to the next, mobile Jews in each age group were less inclined to remain in the same town or state and more were likely to move to other states and especially other regions. For example, 23.9 per cent of the Jews aged 18–29 in 1990 were recent interstate migrants and this rose to 26.6 per cent in the same age group in 2000; within this overall increase, the proportion of those who had moved to another state in the same region declined from 15.6 per cent for 1985–1990 to 11.5 per cent for 1995–2000, while the percentage reporting inter-regional moves had almost doubled from 8.3 to 15.1 per cent, respectively. The proportion of inter-regional migrants also just about doubled in the 30–44-year-old group, but increased somewhat more modestly among those aged 45–64; the sharpest comparative increase in inter-regional migration characterized the elderly Jewish population — rising from 0.8 per cent in 1990 to 3.8 per cent in 2000.

Another important finding is the substantial increase of the proportion of new immigrants in the total adult population from 1.0 per cent in 1990 to 2.7 per cent in 2000, largely reflecting the large waves of Jews who arrived from the Former Soviet Union. This population

is structurally heterogeneous in age but, as compared to other age groups, those in the two youngest age groups have comparatively more immigrants.

Overall, more Jews in 2000, as compared to 1990, recently made a long-distance move in the five years preceding the respective surveys, whether internally or internationally. Many of these migrants entered new physical and social-cultural environments away from families and places of origin. Such moves present increased challenges, but also new opportunities for receiving communities to integrate and engage the newcomers in local Jewish institutions and activities.

Directions of Recent Migration

Migration status varies further by area of residence in the U.S. at the survey dates, reflecting the 'retention' and 'push-pull' factors operating in each of the nine divisions of the country and how they have changed over the course of the last decade. The data in Table 3 show a high level of geographic stability among Jewish adults in the Northeast: approximately 60 per cent resided in 1990 in the same house as in 1985; under half of the Jewish population in the other three regions had not moved in the previous five years, especially in the South and West. These data make clear that the overall growth in the percentage of the residentially-stable Jewish population between 1990 and 2000 was common to all regions of the country. However, this was mostly salient in the South and to a somewhat lesser extent in the Midwest and the West.[21]

On the other hand, three regions have experienced some increase in interstate migrants among their residents. In 1990, 9 per cent of the Jewish adults in the Northeast had moved from another state, either intra- or inter-regionally, in the preceding five years, whereas in 2000, 10.9 per cent had moved to a different state since 1995. Similarly, the Midwest and West experienced increases in the proportion of interstate migrants (from 12.7 to 14.3 per cent, and from 8.5 to 10.2 per cent, respectively). Only in the South did the proportion of interstate migrants decline slightly (from 17.6 to 16.9 per cent), although in both 1990 and 2000 this region had the highest percentage of Jews who had changed their state of residence during the previous five-year interval.

A closer examination suggests that the general increase in the proportion of interstate migrants in the Midwest is due solely to the growing attractiveness, or retention, of the West North Central division (which, as discussed earlier, experienced a growth in the percentage of Jews out of the total American population). In the South, the change in the proportion of interstate migrants resulted from contradictory trends of a decline in the South Atlantic states and a twofold increase in East South Central states. According to Table 1, however,

Table 3.
Five-Year Migration Status, by Area of Current Residence: American Jews in 1990 and 2000

Area of Residence	Five-Year Migration Status					Total %	Total Number in the Sample
	Same House	Same Town	Same State	Different State	International		
			1990				
Northeast	59.6	18.9	11.7	9.0	0.8	100.0	(859)
New England	53.5	15.3	18.5	11.4	1.3	100.0	(157)
Middle Atlantic	61.1	19.8	10.2	8.3	0.6	100.0	(702)
Midwest	49.0	29.5	8.8	12.7	—	100.0	(211)
East North Central	49.5	26.9	9.7	13.9	—	100.0	(172)
West North Central	46.7	41.1	4.6	7.5	—	100.0	(39)
South	43.9	28.9	8.3	17.6	1.2	100.0	(433)
South Atlantic	41.8	29.4	7.9	19.2	1.7	100.0	(361)
East South Central	59.4	25.9	11.6	3.1	—	100.0	(19)
West South Central	52.7	27.1	9.2	11.1	—	100.0	(53)
West	45.7	27.6	16.9	8.5	1.3	100.0	(457)
Mountain	39.7	34.1	8.5	16.0	1.6	100.0	(81)
Pacific	47.2	26.1	18.6	6.9	1.2	100.0	(376)
			2000				
Northeast	61.2	14.2	11.6	10.9	2.2	100.0	(2,252)
New England	52.4	12.6	16.9	16.9	1.3	100.0	(274)
Middle Atlantic	63.1	14.5	10.4	9.6	2.4	100.0	(1,978)
Midwest	55.6	16.0	11.5	14.3	2.5	100.0	(320)
East North Central	55.4	15.2	12.6	14.1	2.6	100.0	(258)
West North Central	56.3	18.4	8.0	14.9	2.3	100.0	(62)
South	54.9	16.2	9.9	16.9	2.0	100.0	(871)
South Atlantic	54.5	15.3	9.3	18.3	2.5	100.0	(788)
East South Central	39.4	33.3	21.2	6.1	—	100.0	(21)
West South Central	63.6	16.2	9.1	11.1	—	100.0	(62)
West	51.5	16.5	17.8	10.2	4.4	100.0	(691)
Mountain	51.3	15.1	11.8	18.5	3.4	100.0	(83)
Pacific	51.1	16.8	19.0	8.5	4.6	100.0	(608)

these divisions did not undergo any significant change in their comparative shares of the national total, suggesting either a near-balanced migration flow with the remaining part of the country, and/or trends in the level of interstate migration within the division.

New immigrants tend to settle in different parts of the country (Table 3). All four regions experienced a growth in the proportion of Jews who moved from outside the U.S. over the earlier five-year interval. Most noticeable is the increasing share of immigrants in the total adult Jewish population in the Middle Atlantic, the East North

Central, West North Central, and Pacific divisions. While in 1990, several divisions had a percentage of immigrants higher than the national average (of 1.1 per cent), by 2000 only the two Western divisions had a percentage higher than the national. Still, NJPS-2000 suggests that the Northeast had attracted more immigrants in absolute numbers than any other region of the country.[22]

For those individuals who reported having made interstate moves, we cross-classified the region of origin with the region of destination (current residence) in an attempt to evaluate the direction of long-distance moves, and the overall pattern of gain or loss of each region as a result of these movements (Table 4). For both periods, the largest single migration stream was intra-regional; approximately one-quarter to one-half of the interstate migrants moved within their region of residence. Two interesting developments over time are the increasing percentage of interstate migrants in the Midwest and South, who moved within their respective regions, and the decline in the proportion of intra-regional movements in the West.

The above trends help to explain, either as a cause or a result, the changes in the proportion of inter-regional migrants among all those who moved between states. Among other findings, the proportion of interstate migrants from the Northeast to the West has increased (from 10.8 per cent in 1985–1990 to 18.2 per cent in 1995–2000), but at the same time the reverse flow, from the West to the Northeast, increased even more (from 13.1 to 31.3 per cent, respectively, of the total interstate migrants out of the West), in effect reducing the percentages from the other two regions.

These overall trends are seen more clearly if only inter-regional migrants are considered. The lower panel for each period in Table 4 shows that the proportion of out-migrants from the Northeast who moved to the West increased from 18.4 per cent in 1985–1990 to 32.7 per cent in 1995–2000, while the percentage of all out-migrants from the West who settled in the Northeast more than doubled — from 22.2 to 50.0 per cent. By contrast, the percentage of out-migrants from the Midwest and South to the Northeast had declined. Like the 'counterstreams' from the West and Northeast, those from the Midwest to the South and from the South to the Midwest have also increased over time. The out-migration from the South to the West, and the counterstream, point to a decline in the attractiveness of the two sunbelt regions to each other. However, the overall distribution of out-migration (shown in the last column of Table 4) reveals an increasing proportion of migrants originating in the Northeast (from 36.8 per cent in 1985–1990 to 44.2 per cent in 1995–2000) and slight declines in the other three regions; on the other hand, only the West has experienced an increase in the relative share of in-migrants out of the total inter-regional movements from 18.1 to 24.1 per cent.

Table 4.
Region of Residence Five Years Ago by Region of Current Residence, for Persons who Moved between States, and Gain or Loss Owing to Inter-regional Five-Year Migration: American Jews in 1990 and 2000

	Region of Residence at Time of Survey					Distribution by Region of Residence 1985/95
	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total %	
			1990			
Percent Distribution of Interstate Migrants						
Region of Residence, 1985						
Northeast	42.0	8.7	38.5	10.8	100.0	39.1
Midwest	36.2	24.6	25.8	13.4	100.0	16.0
South	35.0	10.5	38.7	15.8	100.0	29.4
West	13.1	12.2	28.9	45.8	100.0	15.5
Total U.S.	34.5	12.3	35.1	18.1	100.0	100.0
Percent Distribution of Regional Out-Migrants						
Region of Residence, 1985						
Northeast	—	14.3	67.3	18.4	100.0	36.8
Midwest	48.2	—	33.3	18.5	100.0	20.3
South	56.4	17.9	—	25.7	100.0	29.3
West	22.2	22.2	55.6	—	100.0	13.6
Total U.S.	29.3	13.5	39.1	18.1	100.0	100.0
Net Gain or Loss as Percent of 1990 Population	−0.1	−4.3	+3.0	+1.3		
			2000			
Percent Distribution of Interstate Migrants						
Region of Residence, 1995						
Northeast	44.2	6.1	31.5	18.2	100.0	46.6
Midwest	25.0	32.8	25.0	17.2	100.0	16.5
South	29.5	15.8	43.2	11.6	100.0	24.5
West	31.3	10.4	20.8	37.5	100.0	12.4
Total U.S.	35.8	13.4	32.0	18.8	100.0	100.0
Percent Distribution of Regional Out-Migrants						
Region of Residence, 1995						
Northeast	—	10.9	56.4	32.7	100.0	44.2
Midwest	37.2	—	37.2	25.6	100.0	18.9
South	51.8	27.8	—	20.4	100.0	23.7
West	50.0	16.7	33.3	—	100.0	13.2
Total U.S.	25.9	13.6	36.4	24.1	100.0	100.0
Net Gain or Loss as Percent of 2000 Population	−3.3	−3.5	+4.0	+3.7		

The overall effect of these inter-regional movements was a net loss of migrants by the Northeast and Midwest regions (Table 4). The very small loss for the Northeast in 1985–1990 of 0.1 per cent of its end-of-period adult population had increased to 3.3 for the 1995–2000 interval, while the net loss of the Midwest slightly diminished from 4.3 to 3.5, resulting in an almost total convergence of the amount of the effect in these two regions. By contrast, the South and even more so the West experienced substantial growth in the net gains — from 3.0 to 4.0 for the South and from 1.3 to 3.7 for the West — of their total adult populations. Thus, these data point to the strengthening of the westward and southward shifts of American Jews, but, perhaps more important, to fairly substantial turnovers and counterstreams among all regions.

Types of Mobility: Primary, Repeat, and Return

Migration may increasingly be seen as a complex and multi-stage process involving for many individuals several movements during a typical lifetime with different time intervals between the events. Thus, for some people migration will be a matter of new biography, while for others it can be the continuation of an old biography.[23] The different types of migration jointly contribute to the overall effect of internal mobility and to the redistribution of the population.

Integrating data on place of birth and place of residence five years preceding the specific survey in conjunction with residence at the time of the survey allows one to distinguish between five migration-status categories.[24] This typology is restricted to native-born persons who were also living in the U.S. in mid-decade, that is 1985 or 1995. These categories are defined as follows:

- **Non migrants**: persons who were living in the same state at all three reference points: birth, five years before the survey and at the time of the survey.
- **Early migrants**: persons who five years before the survey were living in a state different from their state of birth, but who were in that same state at the time of the survey.
- **Primary migrants**: persons who were living five years before the specific survey in the same state in which they were born, but who had moved since then to another state.
- **Repeat migrants**: persons who were living in different states at all three reference points — namely, birth, five years before the survey, and at the time of the survey.
- **Return migrants**: persons who five years before the survey resided in a state different from their state of birth, but who, at the time of the survey, were found back in the state in which they were born.

Table 5.
Distribution of Interstate Migration Type, by Age: American Jews in 1990 and 2000 (U.S.-Born Only)

Age	Migration Type					Total %	Total Number in the Sample
	Non-Migrant	Early Migrant	Primary Migrant	Repeat Migrant	Return Migrant		
				1990			
18–29	49.1	26.8	9.8	11.2	3.2	100.0	(323)
30–44	43.6	44.3	4.2	6.9	1.0	100.0	(669)
45–64	47.9	46.3	1.0	4.3	0.7	100.0	(396)
65+	44.0	52.1	1.1	2.8	—	100.0	(376)
Total	45.7	43.3	3.9	6.1	1.1	100.0	(1,764)
				2000			
18–29	48.6	38.2	4.6	5.3	3.3	100.0	(495)
30–44	45.0	45.0	3.6	4.5	2.0	100.0	(818)
45–64	44.7	49.1	2.1	3.5	0.5	100.0	(1,248)
65+	35.4	60.0	3.1	1.2	0.4	100.0	(827)
Total	43.8	47.8	3.2	3.7	1.4	100.0	(3,388)

Among the Jewish population of 1990, 54.3 per cent had made some interstate move between birth and the time of the survey (Table 5). The largest number of these had moved between birth and 1985 (early migrants) and since then remained in the same state. Of the total adult sample, 11.1 per cent moved over the 1985–1990 period: 3.9 per cent as primary migrants, 6.1 as repeat migrants, and 1.1 per cent as return migrants. By 2000, the extent of migration had changed only modestly, with the proportion of people who moved during their lifetime having increased to 56.2 per cent. More significant are the changes in the distribution of the different types of mobility; they show a higher percentage of people who moved between birth and 1995 and a lesser tendency to move during the period 1995–2000. Further, the decline in the proportion of those who moved during the most recent interval reflects declines in primary and mainly repeat migration, while the proportion of people who returned to their state of birth grew somewhat. For both the 1985–1990 and 1995–2000 periods, however, a disproportionate part of the overall recent migration is attributed to repeat and return movements of people who had already experienced an interstate move earlier in their lives rather than to the initiation of a first-time interstate move.

Types of migration are strongly associated with age, reflecting the greater opportunities to move during the life-course.[25] This is most evident among early migrants, among whom the percentage of

migrants increases as the span of time between birth and five years prior to the specific survey becomes longer (Table 5). The actual act of migration, however, often occurs at an early stage of the life-cycle, as evidenced by the high proportion of interstate migration (including primary, repeat and return) among the youngest age group; this then decreases with rising age. This pattern is interrupted, especially for primary migrants, as people reach retirement age and tend to relocate to another state, whether guided by climatic considerations or by the desire to be closer to family who had moved earlier.

A comparison of the two surveys reveals that the youngest cohorts in 2000 had been more likely to experience interstate mobility than their counterparts had in 1990. Whereas in 1990, 26.8 per cent of those under the age of 30 had made an interstate move between birth and five years prior to the survey, this was true for 38.2 per cent of their counterparts in 2000. If we combine these migrants with all those who five years before the survey were living outside their state of birth (that is, early, repeat, and return migrants), the respective proportions among the youngest age cohort are 41.2 per cent and 46.8 per cent. By contrast, fewer young Jews moved during the 1995–2000 period than in the years 1985–1990, with the percentages for primary and repeat migration in 1995–2000 (4.6 and 5.3, respectively) being less than half what they had been in 1985–1990 (9.8 and 11.2). Quite similar patterns, though at a much lower level, characterized the 30–44 age groups. Despite these changes, the two youngest age groups displayed the highest percentage of all age cohorts for these two types of five-year migration. Elderly Jews (aged 65 and over) are those who experienced the most substantial increase in the proportion of interstate migrants from 56.0 of the 1990 population to as high as 64.6 per cent of the 2000 population. This was mainly accounted for by the increase in early migrants. Similarly, the increase in return migration of Jewish elderly might be part of a developing trend among sun-belt retirees who, as they get older, realize that they do not have the informal support needed to remain independent; 'Then the option of moving back to a place where they have long-established ties and perhaps family becomes very appealing'.[26]

Another way of examining the relationship between type of migration and age is through the age profile of five-year migration rates in which the probability of moving is based first on the total population at risk of migration (that is migrants per thousand population), and second the population eligible to make a given type of move (at 'risk': Table 6). These findings confirm previous conclusions, and show that in both periods the peak rates of all types of migration were among the youngest age cohort (18–29). These relationships largely also hold true when migration rates are calculated in regard to the population eligible to make a given type of move (at 'risk'),

Table 6.
Rates of Primary, Repeat, and Return Interstate Migration, by Age: American Jews in 1990 and 2000 (U.S.-Born Only)

Age	Rate per 1000 Population[a]				Rate per 1000 Population at 'Risk'		
	Total	Primary	Repeat	Return	Primary[b]	Repeat[c]	Return[c]
				1990			
18–29	242	99	111	31	168	273	76
30–44	121	42	69	11	88	131	20
45–64	56	10	40	5	21	79	10
65+	40	11	29	—	24	53	0
Total	111	39	61	11	78	121	21
				2000			
18–29	132	46	53	33	86	114	70
30–44	101	36	45	20	74	87	38
45–64	62	22	35	5	46	66	9
65+	47	31	12	4	80	19	6
Total	83	32	37	14	67	70	27

a) Out of total population in age cohort.
b) Out of sum of non-migrants and primary migrants.
c) Out of sum of early migrants, repeat migrants and return migrants.

according to which primary migration refers to the population who resided in their state of birth in 1985/95, and repeat and return migration refers to those who by 1985 and 1995, respectively, resided outside their state of birth. However, on the basis of these calculations (which can also be interpreted as probabilities),[27] we must reverse our previous conclusions and suggest that the rate of return migration among young adults has declined somewhat rather than increased. This potentially reflects the longer time it takes for young migrants to reach a point at which they decide to return to area of origin. Also noted is the substantial increase of primary migrants among the elderly Jewish population.

It is interesting to examine the extent to which the different types of migration vary among the different regions of the country. To this end, region rather than state is the geographic unit for measuring migration. According to this definition, an individual who moved between states within a given region during the specified time intervals will not be considered a migrant. The expansion of the geographic units diminishes the levels of migration and lowers the number of primary, repeat, and return migrants. However, the volume of return migration will be less affected than that of primary or repeat migration because the expansion of geographic units enhances the probabilities of returning to the region of birth.[28] Somewhat in contrast with interstate

Table 7.
Distribution of Inter-regional Migration Type, by Region of Birth: American Jews in 1990 and 2000 (U.S.-Born Only)

Region of Birth	Migration Type					Total %	Total Number in the Sample
	Non-Migrant	Early Migrant	Primary Migrant	Repeat Migrant	Return Migrant		
			1990				
Northeast	60.5	32.6	3.4	1.4	2.2	100.0	(1,109)
Midwest	45.4	46.0	4.9	1.3	2.4	100.0	(287)
South	63.3	28.3	5.0	0.5	2.9	100.0	(173)
West	81.1	15.6	2.5	0.8	—	100.0	(194)
Total U.S.	60.6	32.5	3.7	1.2	2.0	100.0	(1,764)
			2000				
Northeast	61.2	32.6	3.6	1.0	1.5	100.0	(2,339)
Midwest	46.9	48.1	2.5	1.2	1.3	100.0	(476)
South	65.2	30.9	2.0	1.2	0.6	100.0	(295)
West	81.4	16.0	1.2	0.6	0.8	100.0	(303)
Total U.S.	62.1	32.8	2.8	1.0	1.2	100.0	(3,413)

migration, the proportion of Jewish adults who made at least one inter-regional move during the course of their lifetime diminished slightly from 39.4 per cent in 1990 to 37.9 per cent in 2000 (Table 7). This suggests an increasing tendency on the part of interstate migrants to stay in their region of birth. More consistent is the decline in the proportion of recent migration (the sum of primary, repeat, and return migration) from 6.9 to 5.0 per cent. This tendency characterized both those who had moved for the first time during the five years preceding the survey and those for whom this was the second documented move over their life-cycle.

The extent of movement is largely associated with region of birth. Consistently over time, the highest level of stability characterized those born in the West, with eight out of every ten living in the region at all three points of time. Those born in the Northeast and the South had a very similar proportion of non-migrants, slightly more than six out of every ten, with a very modest increase between 1990 and 2000. The least stable population was that born in the Midwest, among whom slightly less than half made no move from their region of birth. For all four regions, inter-regional moves largely occurred at a fairly early stage of the life-cycle (as shown by the percentage in the early migrant category). The most significant changes in type of recent migrations were: (1) the increase in the percentage of primary migrations of those born in the Northeast relative to the

Table 8.
Distribution of Inter-regional Migration Type, by Current Region of Residence: American Jews in 1990 and 2000 (U.S.-Born Only)

Region of Current Residence	Migration Type					Total %	Total Number in the Sample
	Non-Migrant	Early Migrant	Primary Migrant	Repeat Migrant	Return Migrant		
			1990				
Northeast	87.0	8.0	1.7	0.3	3.1	100.0	(771)
Midwest	67.7	23.2	3.1	2.4	3.6	100.0	(193)
South	27.7	61.1	8.8	1.2	1.3	100.0	(397)
West	39.0	55.6	2.9	2.4	—	100.0	(404)
Total U.S.	60.6	32.5	3.7	1.2	2.0	100.0	(1,764)
			2000				
Northeast	86.4	10.0	1.0	0.4	2.2	100.0	(1,809)
Midwest	69.3	25.7	1.7	1.4	1.9	100.0	(283)
South	37.3	55.5	5.5	1.4	0.3	100.0	(756)
West	49.4	45.7	3.1	1.4	0.5	100.0	(565)
Total U.S.	62.1	32.8	2.8	1.0	1.2	100.0	(3,413)

declines in the other regions, resulting in the Northeast assuming first rank among the four regions in the level of primary migrants; (2) an increase in the proportion of repeat migrants among those born in the South; and (3) an increase in return migration among those born in the West.

An examination of the lifetime regional mobility from the point of view of current region of residence provides, as expected, a different perspective (Table 8). The less attractive destination regions identified earlier, namely the Northeast and Midwest, have the highest proportion of persons who were born in the region and also lived there five years before the specific survey and at the time of the survey (non-migrants). In both these regions, the proportion of non-migrants remained almost unchanged over time. By contrast, the two sunbelt regions (which are preferred areas for Jewish migration) had much lower proportions of Jews in 1990 and in 2000 who had lived in these regions for their entire lives. But over time, a growing proportion of the adult Jewish populations in these two regions were lifetime residents there, probably reflecting the growing number of children born in these regions. The proportion of non-migrants is higher in the West than in the South, probably reflecting its stronger holding power for locally-born population, while the South attracts more people born in other parts of the country. By 2000, just under one-half of the adult Jews in the West were non-migrants.

As a consequence of the above growth, the proportion of both early migrants and those who moved during a five-year interval among the Jewish population in the West has declined. By both 1990 and 2000, the South attracted more five-year migrants from other parts of the country than did the West (sum of the last three columns in Table 8). Yet these differentials significantly converged from 11.3 per cent for the South and 5.3 per cent for the West in 1985–1990 to 7.2 and 5.0 per cent, respectively, in 1995–2000. This resulted from contrasting processes in the two regions, with increasing shares of primary and return migrants in the West and a decline in repeat migrants, while the South became more attractive to people who were already living outside their region of birth and less so to primary and return migrants. While these changes are likely to derive from individual demographic characteristics and structural socio-economic conditions relevant for different segments of the population, they also have implications for communal planning because each group of migrants requires a somewhat different strategy for its integration into Jewish life and local institutions.

Metropolitan/Non-metropolitan Residence

American Jews have traditionally displayed a preference for residence in large cities and metropolitan areas.[29] Despite their migration patterns and high rates of dispersion across the country, they were always overwhelmingly concentrated in such areas. This concentration is probably associated with the higher educational attainment and professional qualifications of Jews, and the associated job opportunities and cultural tastes which are more easily satisfied in an urban/metropolitan environment.

Over time, however, reflecting their wider distribution across the U.S., an increasing number of metropolitan areas need to be included in order to encompass a given proportion of the national Jewish population.[30] Also important is the fact that the high percentage of immigrants among earlier cohorts of the Jewish population led many to settle in the cities in which they had initially arrived, such as New York, although when they migrated elsewhere in the U.S., they also tended to prefer an urban residence.

Interestingly, over the period 1990–2000 the proportion of Jews living in metropolitan areas has declined slightly from 95.6 to 92.9 per cent (Table 9). This tendency characterized Jews in all four regions of the country, but mainly in the Midwest, where metropolitan residence in 2000 declined to 87.3 per cent. Other regions changed 1–4 percentage points. Given previous evidence which indicated that peripheral Jews showed lower tendencies to live in metropolitan areas,[31] it is likely that if NJPS-2000/01 had collected complete data

Table 9.
Metropolitan/Non-metropolitan Residence, by Region: American Jews in 1990 and 2000

Metropolitan Residence	Region of Residence				Total
	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	
	1990				
Metropolitan	96.8	94.6	93.7	94.5	95.6
Non-metropolitan	3.2	5.4	6.3	4.5	4.4
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number in the Sample	(743)	(172)	(368)	(380)	(1,662)
	2000				
Metropolitan	96.0	87.3	90.0	92.8	92.9
Non-metropolitan	4.0	12.7	10.0	7.2	7.1
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number in the Sample	(2,259)	(320)	(874)	(694)	(4,147)

for all people with Jewish backgrounds, this tendency to favour non-metropolitan residence would have been even more substantial. It should be noted that during the same time the proportion of total Americans living in metropolitan areas has increased slightly.[32] The slight shift by Jews to non-metropolitan residence may reflect a growing preference for residence in smaller towns and outlying areas, resulting possibly from greater concern with environmental issues and facilitated by computer technology.

Further insights into the redistribution patterns of American Jews can be gained through examination of the relationships between metropolitan/non-metropolitan residence and five-year migration status. Data not presented here (owing to limitations of space) reveal that in both 1990 and 2000, more of the Jews living in metropolitan areas than those living in non-metropolitan areas were residentially stable over their lifetimes. Consistent with this pattern, a small shift has taken place between 1995 and 2000 from metropolitan to non-metropolitan areas: 29.4 per cent of the Jews living in non-metropolitan areas in 2000 had changed community of residence within the U.S., whereas this was true of only 27.0 per cent in 1990. In 2000, more people who migrated to non-metropolitan areas were increasingly coming from different states (16.7 per cent) than from within the state (11.8 per cent) suggesting that the recent increase in non-metropolitan residents is more attributable to longer-distance migrants. The joint characteristics of being both an interstate migrant and a resident of a non-metropolitan area, presumably further away from

Jewish facilities and institutions, presents a double challenge for the individual's Jewish identity and communal ties. Our data also show that at the end of the twentieth century, international migrants, as in the past, are strongly inclined to settle in metropolitan areas, and this tendency has grown even stronger in the late 1990s.[33]

Bilocal Residence

In addition to permanent movements, a large number of people in America, including Jews, circulate among two or even more places of residence, often at specific times of the year and for defined (and not necessarily short) durations of stay. Bilocal residence may derive from labour needs, marriage dissolution and movement of children between the different homes of two separated parents, seasonal migration such as that of retired people between the northeast and sunbelt areas ('snowbirds'), and annual vacations to their homeland by immigrants and their descendants. Hence, 'second homes' can be in different places of the country or even overseas.[34] Bilocal residence may raise serious dilemmas regarding location-specific connections, loyalties, and involvement in a given Jewish community. At the same time, institutions and communal services must periodically adjust their activities to a changing number of constituents.

In 1990, approximately 12 per cent of all Jewish respondents reported a bilocal residence — that is, being away from their current residence for more than two months during the year (Table 10). The highest percentage of bilocal residence was found among the youngest age group, which comprises a large number of students, first-career

Table 10.
Dimensions of Bilocal Residence:
American Jews in 1990 and 2000

	Percent Bilocal Residents	
	1990	2000
	Age	
18–29	15.9	21.2
30–44	7.0	5.6
45–64	15.1	9.2
65+	13.9	16.4
Total	11.9	12.1
	Five-Year Migration Status	
Non-migrant	13.0	12.9
Intrastate	10.2	10.1
Interstate	11.6	11.6

seekers, and recently-married persons, all of whom may reside part-time in two or more communities. The group with the lowest rates of bilocal residence was that aged 30 to 44 which is typically at a critical stage of career and family development, limiting (both financially and socially) movements between localities. As these younger cohorts move to the next stage of their life-cycle, which is likely to involve more stable employment, higher income, and the 'empty nest' resulting from the departure of children, their level of bilocal residence increases. The higher rate of bilocal residence in the case of Jews aged 45–64 resembles the tendency in the total U.S. population among whom 'the 35 to 64 age group owns by far the greatest number of second homes'.[35] For Jews in 1990, the propensity for bilocal residence slightly declined after age 64, probably owing to the preference of elderly Jews for permanent relocation upon retirement rather than seasonal movement.

By 2000, the proportion of total bilocal residents remained fairly unchanged at 12 per cent.[36] This overall stability, however, does not reflect stability in levels between 1990 and 2000 among the various age groups. Both the youngest and the oldest populations experienced an increase in bilocal residence, while the rates of the two intermediate groups in 2000 were lower than in 1990. For young Jews this might reflect more prolonged academic education, caused by a desire to acquire advanced degrees and perhaps also by the difficulties graduates faced in finding suitable jobs. Economic considerations of different types, such as diminished assets, might explain the decline in the level of bilocal residence among the 30–44 and 45–64 age groups. The higher levels among the elderly may result from greater concerns about environmental amenities in retirement and also perhaps their desire to spend more time with children and grandchildren who reside far away from them.

Consistently in both 1990 and 2000, those who had not moved in the preceding five years had the highest rates of bilocal residence (bottom panel, Table 10). These people presumably are satisfied with their current location, have intensive social relationships, and enjoy economic well being, but also spend at least two months of the year elsewhere. It may also reflect short-term moves back to place of origin to be with old friends and relatives. A somewhat lesser tendency toward temporary movement characterizes recent interstate migrants, and the least inclined to bilocality are people who migrated from one area to another within the same state; recent permanent moves diminish the likelihood of prolonged absence and temporary residence elsewhere.

In 1990, a majority of the bilocal residents in each region spent most of their time away from home within their region of permanent residence (diagonal in Table 11). The highest retention rate characterized the South (70.7), while the lowest rate was found in the Midwest (54.7).

Table 11.
Region Where Bilocals Spent Most Time When Away from Home, by Region of Current Residence: American Jews in 1990 and 2000

Region of Current Residence	Region Where Bilocals Spent Most Time When Away from Home				Total %	Total Number in the Sample	Distribution of Residents at Time of Survey
	Northeast	Midwest	South	West			
			1990				
Northeast	63.2	1.3	32.9	2.6	100.0	(76)	41.5
Midwest	5.3	54.7	12.3	27.8	100.0	(17)	9.3
South	16.0	8.0	70.7	6.0	100.0	(50)	27.3
West	15.7	1.8	17.9	64.7	100.0	(40)	21.9
Total U.S.	34.6	8.3	37.9	19.2	100.0	(183)	100.0
			2000				
Northeast	59.1	1.7	27.8	11.3	100.0	(239)	39.4
Midwest	2.9	37.1	20.0	40.0	100.0	(40)	12.0
South	20.2	7.1	57.1	15.5	100.0	(125)	28.8
West	22.4	10.3	5.2	62.1	100.0	(76)	19.9
Total U.S.	33.9	9.2	30.8	26.0	100.0	(480)	100.0

For the country as a whole, the South was the main destination for temporary movers: while only 27.3 per cent of the bilocal residents resided in the South, as many as 37.9 per cent reported spending most of their absence from home there. Each of the other three regions was 'home base' to a larger proportion of bilocal residents than it was a temporary residence. For Northeastern Jews who moved temporarily from their region of residence to another region, the preferred destination was the South, attracting one-third of the bilocals. For Jews in the Midwest, however, the West was the most popular destination outside their own region. Southerners who moved away from their own region mainly favoured the Northeast over the West and Midwest; Westerners, by contrast, were attracted almost equally to the South and the Northeast.

Interestingly, by 2000 the Northeast, not the South, was the destination of more bilocal movers (33.9 per cent) than any other region, a percentage only a little lower than the Northeast's share of the total Jewish population. The South and West had a higher share of temporary movers coming to the region than they had permanent residents who lived within the region, attesting to the strong attraction of the two regions to people spending two or more months away from home. But the South lost some of its holding power; the proportion of southern Jewish bilocals who chose to spend most of their time away from their permanent home in their own region declined from 70.7

per cent in 1990 to 57.1 per cent in 2000. Similarly, by 2000 more of the bilocals who resided in the Midwest reported spending most of their absence from home in a different region — with the West being by far the favoured destination. Another change has been the increase in the proportion of Westerners who travel to the Northeast and the Midwest, which accounts for the largest components among those who temporarily migrated outside the region. While these shifts require closer examination, we speculate that to some extent they reflect cumulative permanent migration in the respective regions, so that in recent years more are returning to place of origin for temporary stays.

Summary and Implications for Research and Policy

This comparative analysis of the 1990 and 2000/01 NJPS data on the internal migration patterns among Jewish Americans suggests both continuity and new directions. At the end of the twentieth century American Jews were still on the move, presumably reflecting their high socio-economic status concomitant with their cultural preferences and lifestyles. The high rates of internal mobility in 1995–2000 coincide with a large influx of international migrants, each of these groups having needs and expectations somewhat different from those of the organized Jewish community. Immigration was not as salient in the late 1980s.

The continuing redistribution of American Jews points to an increasing share of Jews living in the Midwest while diminishing that of the West. At the same time, internal migration continued to draw heavily from the Northeast and the Midwest towards the South and the West. This apparent inconsistency between the changing regional distribution of the Jewish population and the migration flows reflects at least one of two reasons: (1) regional redistribution refers to the entire period 1990–2000, while the migration patterns refer only to the second half of the decade, the five-year period between 1995 and 2000 covered by the survey; or (2) demographic determinants other than internal migration shape the geographic distribution of the Jewish population, including fertility, assimilation, and settlement of new immigrants; and the impact of these factors varies across the different regions of the United States.

In 2000, a higher percentage of Jews had remained geographically stable over the preceding five years than had been the case in 1990. Those who did migrate tended to move greater distances to another state or another region. From the perspective of lifetime mobility, in 2000 compared to 1990, fewer Jews were repeat migrants, while more had recently returned to their state of birth. Compared with the Jewish population of 1990, fewer Jews in 2000 had over their lifetime

ever moved between regions, and within this overall trend, the South and West experienced an increase in the proportion of Jews who were lifetime residents.

Migration is, inter alia, associated with metropolitan/non-metropolitan residence. In 2000, over the previous five years, non-metropolitan residents had been more mobile than people living in metropolitan areas. Over time, the relationship between long and short distance moves and metropolitan versus non-metropolitan living has strengthened somewhat. A growing number of the people who moved to non-metropolitan areas have been coming from a different state, suggesting that the overall observed increase in non-metropolitan residents disproportionately derives from long-distance migration.

Finally, our findings reveal that in both 1990 and 2000, bilocal residence was most characteristic of the geographically-stable Jews — namely, those who had not moved over the preceding five years. The stable group was followed by the recent interstate migrants, and the least inclined to bilocality were intrastate migrants. In 2000, a larger proportion of the bilocal residents spent their time away from their usual home living in the same region of permanent residence than was the case in 1990. While in 1990 the South was the most preferred region of destination for bilocal movers, by 2000 it had been replaced by the Northeast. We speculate that this is partly explained by people who had migrated earlier to the South where they established permanent residence and are now visiting their former home.

The high levels of migration re-emphasize the challenges, at both the local and national levels, to find appropriate means of outreach for newcomers in order to ensure their integration into Jewish social networks and activities in their communities of destination. These must include, among other things, the strengthening of mutual ties between local communities; the exchange of information on people who leave one area to settle in another; the adjustment of existing, and development of new, programmes to integrate the different types of internal migrants into their communities of destination; and finding additional financial resources, or re-allocating fixed budgets, to cope with both the absorption of internal migrants and the increasing share of arrivals from abroad. Perhaps we also need to recognize that the national community should take some responsibility for the integration of mobile Jews at their new places of destination. At the same time, our findings point to new opportunities in areas which, while they are comparatively new to Jewish settlement, do already have the prerequisite critical mass of lifetime residents and other veteran members to establish the strong infrastructure and services necessary to embrace newcomers into the Jewish community.

Further research (on such issues as the changing determinants of Jewish internal migration, changes in the relationships between

mobility and identification, as well as inter-community variations in Jewish identification) is required for a better assessment of the multi-faceted nature of Jewish migration within the United States and the resultant communal policies.

Acknowledgements

The data files of the 1990 and 2000/01 National Jewish Population Surveys were provided by the North American Jewish Data Bank of the University of Connecticut. Preliminary results from this study were presented at the 2004 annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies, held in Chicago. We wish to thank Dalia Sagi for her helpful assistance in data analysis, and Judith Even for editorial assistance; both of them are in the Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics of the A. Harman Institute of Contemporary Jewry of The Hebrew University. We are grateful to Alice Goldstein for kindly reading earlier drafts of this article and making valuable suggestions. Part of the research and preparation for this paper was carried out during Uzi Rebhun's sabbatical year, as a Visiting Scholar at the Center for Demography and Ecology of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

NOTES

[1] See William M. Newman and Peter L. Halvorson, 'American Jews: Patterns of Geographic Distribution and Changes, 1952–1971', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 18, June 1979, pp. 183–193; Sidney Goldstein, 'Population Movement and Redistribution Among American Jews', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 24, June 1982, pp. 5–23; Paul Ritterband, 'The New Geography of Jews in North America', *New Insights on a Changing Jewish Community*, Occasional Paper no. 2, North American Jewish Data Bank, New York, 1986; Sidney Goldstein and Alice Goldstein, *Jews on the Move: Implications for Jewish Identity* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1996); Uzi Rebhun, 'Changing Patterns of Internal Migration 1970–1990: A Comparative Analysis of Jews and Whites in the United States', *Demography*, vol. 34, no. 2, 1997, pp. 213–233; and Uzi Rebhun, *Migration, Community and Identification: Jews in Late 20th Century America* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 2001, in Hebrew). The present article covers only the analysis of population redistribution; later analyses shall treat the relation between migration and identity in some depth.

[2] See the *American Jewish Year Book*, which has been published annually since 1900.

[3] Sidney Goldstein, *A 1990 National Jewish Population Study: Why and How*, Occasional Paper no. 1988-04, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Uzi Rebhun, 'Similarities and Dissimilarities

in National and Community Surveys: The Case of American Jews', in Sergio DellaPergola and Judith Even (eds), *Papers in Jewish Demography 1993* (Jerusalem: Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997), pp. 55–78.

[4] See Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1; Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1; and Rebhun, op. cit. 1997 in Note 1.

[5] See Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1; and Rebhun, op. cit. 1997 in Note 1.

[6] See Rebhun, op. cit. 1997; and Rebhun, op. cit. 2001 in Note 1.

[7] Sidney Goldstein, 'Profile of American Jewry: Insights from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey', *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 92, 1992, pp. 110–116.

[8] Uzi Rebhun, 'The Changing Roles of Human Capital, State Context of Residence, and Ethnic Bonds in Interstate Migration: American Jews 1970–1990', *International Journal of Population Geography*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2003, pp. 3–21.

[9] William H. Frey, 'Immigration and Internal Migration "Flight" from U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Towards a New Demographic Balkanization', *Urban Studies*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1995, pp. 733–757.

[10] Ben-Chieh Liu, 'Differential Net Migration Rates and the Quality of Life', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 57, no. 3, 1975, p. 329.

[11] Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz *et al.*, *The National Jewish Population Survey 2000–01: Strength, Challenge and Diversity in the American Jewish Population* (New York: United Jewish Communities, 2003).

[12] Barry A. Kosmin *et al.*, *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey* (New York: Council of Jewish Federations, 1991); and Joseph Waksberg, 'The Methodology of the National Jewish Population Survey' in Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1, pp. 333–359.

[13] Kotler-Berkowitz *et al.*, op. cit. in Note 9.

[14] For criticism on the methodology of NJPS-2000, see C. Kadushin *et al.*, 'National Jewish Population Survey 2000–01: A Guide to the Perplexed' in *Contemporary Jewry*, vol. 25, 2005, pp. 1–32.

[15] See Sergio DellaPergola, 'World Jewish Population, 2003', *American Jewish Year Book*, 103, pp. 588–612; and Uzi Rebhun, 'Jewish Identities in America: Structural Analyses of Attitudes and Behaviors', *Review of Religious Research*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 43–63.

[16] This group includes people with no religion (or a religion theologically compatible with Judaism) who also do not consider themselves Jewish, but have a Jewish mother and/or father; they account for approximately one-fifth of the 'core' Jewish population (Kotler-Berkowitz *et al.*, 2003).

[17] Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1.

[18] Data in this section refer to the entire 'core' Jewish population in each of the decennial points in time, including Jewish-connected for 2000.

[19] See Jason P. Schachter, *Migration by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2000: Census 2000 Special Reports (CENSR-13)* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, 2003), p. 4.

[20] Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1, pp. 42–43.

[21] As the title of Table 3 indicates, the data refer only to those living in a given region in 1990 or 2000, but not to those who had lived there earlier and moved by the end of the respective decade.

[22] Some caution is called upon since the nature of NJPS migration data does not allow us to distinguish between movers from abroad and secondary migration of immigrants — that is, persons who immigrated over the past five years but first settled in one place and then moved to another location during the five-year period. For a more general discussion on this issue see Schachter, op. cit. in Note 16, p. 4.

[23] Calvin Goldscheider, *Population, Modernization, and Social Change* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971).

[24] This typology was first suggested by Hope T. Eldridge, 'Primary, Secondary and Return Migration in the United States, 1955–60', *Demography*, vol. 2, 1965, pp. 444–455. It should be emphasized that such a classification, based on three reference points, does not cover the entire migration history of the individuals whose movements might have taken place during the intervals between birth and five years before the survey, and between the latter and the time of the survey; 'to the extent, however, that most persons do not reside in more than three states over the course of their lifetime, the coverage is relatively complete' (Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit in Note 1, p. 114).

[25] For general literature on age-selective migration, see Eldridge, op. cit. in note 22 above; and Anne S. Lee, 'Return migration in the United States', *International Migration Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1974, pp. 283–300.

[26] Ruth La Ferla, 'Retirees come full circle', *The New York Times*, 28 November 2004, section 9, p. 1 (continued p. 6).

[27] Horace C. Hamilton, 'Practical and Mathematical Consideration in the Formulation and Selection of Migration Rates', *Demography*, vol. 2, 1965, pp. 429–443 and Ralph Thomlinson, 'The Determination of a Base Population for Computing Migration Rates', *Milkbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 3, 1962, pp. 356–366.

[28] For example, an individual who was born in Mississippi but lived in New York five years before the survey, and at the time of the survey is found in Alabama, will be classified as a repeat migrant if the defining unit is state but as a return migrant if the defining unit is region, since both Mississippi and Alabama belong to the same region (South). The rates of primary and repeat migration decreases with the expansion of the geographical units, while rates of return migration increase. See Larry H. Long, *Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988).

[29] U.S. Bureau of the Census, 'Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States, March 1957', *Current Population Reports*, series P-20, no. 79 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1958).

[30] Newman and Halvorson, op. cit. in Note 1; and Ritterband, op cit. in note 1.

[31] Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1, pp. 50–51.

[32] Marc J. Perry and Paul J. Mackun, *Population Change and Distribution, 1990 to 2000*, Census 2000 Brief (Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau, 2001), p. 5.

[33] Immigrants in the United States are more likely to live in metropolitan areas and in the central city in metropolitan areas. See Barry R. Chiswick and Paul W. Miller, 'Where immigrants settle in the United States', *Journal of Comparative Analysis*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2004, pp. 185–197.

[34] See Curtis C. Roseman, *Multiple Residence and Cyclical Migration in Western Societies: A Bibliography (P1712)*, (Monticello, Illinois: Public Administration Series: Bibliography, June 1985).

[35] Ibid, p. 2.

[36] It is possible, however, that in the findings for 2000 bilocal residents are somewhat over-represented, since previous evidence (Goldstein and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1, pp. 64–65) suggests that peripheral Jews have a somewhat lower level of bilocal residence.

HERBERT MARTIN JAMES LOEWE IN OXFORD

Harold Pollins

One of the catalogues of the Hartley Library (at the University of Southampton) has the surprising entry: 'MS 175 Oxford Minister's Fund Papers, 1913–41'. It is surprising because after Rev. Moses H. Segal (who had become the minister of the Oxford Jewish congregation in 1901) left the city in 1909, there was no resident minister for the next thirty years.[1] The resident Jewish population was tiny, a mere handful of families, and it is unlikely that they could have afforded to pay a minister. It was only after the expansion of the community — because of evacuation from the major cities during the Second World War — that a minister came into residence. It proved to be a temporary appointment and he left in 1948. There has been no resident minister since.[2] However, while the resident Jewish population for the first four decades of the twentieth century was small, the number of undergraduates increased and it was for these students that the 'Oxford Minister' was intended.

The entry in the library catalogue covered a number of separate files of which one (MS 175/19/2) was headed 'Correspondence of the Fund 1913–30'. This file referred to the fund which was raised to supplement the small college stipend for Herbert Loewe who was appointed in 1914 Lecturer in Hebrew at Exeter College, Oxford. He proved to be the 'minister', but Loewe made it clear that he did not consider himself such. The file of letters forms the core of this article. In addition, another file (MS 175/19/1) is entitled 'Minutes and account book of the Oxford Fund 1914', although in fact the accounts go up to 1941. This second document details some of the activities of the fund's trustees, concentrating on the financial aspects.

The background to Loewe's filling 'an unofficial Jewish chaplaincy' (as his son Raphael Loewe called it)[3] is quite clear. The second MS, 'Minutes and account book...', begins with a short section headed 'History', which is useful although not completely accurate and to which other material can be added. It starts: 'It had long been felt that the Jewish congregation at Oxford was sorely suffering from the

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 48, nos. 1 and 2, 2006

lack of a permanant(*sic*) Jewish influence such as has existed at the sister university'. A comparison with the situation at Cambridge University is indeed instructive. In both universities, the number of Jewish undergraduates was growing but in both the resident Jewish community was equally small and neither had a minister. The 'History' noted: 'It was found that there were at Oxford between forty & fifty Resident Jewish undergraduates, and that without a leader, their spiritual needs were being greatly neglected'.[4] The religious and social needs of the students at Cambridge were, on the other hand, to some extent catered for by dons such as Israel Abrahams as well as by others, whereas Oxford (once Segal had left in 1909) was bereft of such ministrations.[5]

It is necessary, at first, to establish the background to the appointment of Herbert Loewe.[6] After Moses Segal left Oxford, and in the absence of a minister, there was an intense discussion (to some extent publicly in the *Jewish Chronicle*) about this fear that in their formative years the undergraduates would be estranged from Jewish influence. In addition, there were developments relating to the form of religious services in the Oxford synagogue. As to the latter, it was thought necessary to incorporate elements from the new Liberal Judaism (the brainchild of Claude Goldsmid Montefiore). It was noted that at a meeting of the University Section on 16 June 1912, attended by three men (Harold Laski, Victor Gollancz, and Basil Henriques), 'Nothing was decided but it was felt to be of the greatest importance to make the synagogue services more attractive and Judaism as a whole a greater reality in Oxford'.[7] In future it was the Friday evening services which were to be concentrated on — Saturday morning services were suspended. The first part of the service was to be read in Hebrew while the second was to consist of prayers in English, including some from the Liberal synagogue.

As to the vexed question of the lack of Jewish influence on undergraduates, six of them had written a joint letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* — published on 10 May 1912 — which David Lewis paraphrases in his book on Oxford Jewry; they suggested that to remedy the problem of these young men 'being deprived of strong and continuous Jewish influence', 'either a chair in some branch of Jewish learning be endowed, to be filled by a scholar of distinction, or provision be made for the residence of a Jewish minister' (p. 48). There followed an exchange of letters and other items in the newspaper in which the question was raised of whether the weak position of the Jews in Oxford — both resident and undergraduates — should be strengthened by improvements to the environment (the physical aspects of the synagogue building) or by a change of personnel. For example, B. Liebermann (a graduate of Jews' College who was then at Worcester College, Oxford) suggested that an appointment be made of a Lecturer or Reader in Rabbinics.[8]

At the same time Basil Henriques, still an undergraduate, wrote:[9]

> I am going to bring in a very big reform and hope to get an endowment for a resident minister which will mean at least £10,000... I simply long to achieve my object which is to make religion an attractive reality among the Jews up here. At present it is far from being a reality or in the smallest degree attractive.

David Lewis concludes (p. 52) this episode as follows:

> The Chief Rabbi had by now found his solution, with which others helped, notably A. H. Jessel, formerly of Balliol, Vice-President of the United Synagogue. By means which are not at all clear, Herbert Loewe, from Queen's College, Cambridge, steeped in the traditions which Solomon Schechter and Israel Abrahams had established there and with varied experience in travel, archaeology, Semitics, and Rabbinics, was found a post as Lecturer in Hebrew at Exeter.

Loewe had been at Queen's but was in fact then at St Catharine's College. The reference for the rôle of Albert Henry Jessel is the *Jewish Chronicle* (12 January 1917, p. 10) which printed an account of Jessel's funeral — he died on 6 January 1917, aged 52 — as well as eulogistic messages. One of the latter was from Lt. B. L. Q. Henriques, who wrote that Jessel 'saw the need of a permanent Jewish influence in the University, and was one of the first to join the movement which ultimately led to the appointment there of Mr. Herbert Loewe'. In the absence of other sources about the origins of Loewe's appointment which were then available to him, David Lewis inevitably referred to Henriques's encomium, natural in a eulogy. But Jessel's rôle appears to have been minimal: it was others who got the scheme going. Thus the biography of Basil L. Q. Henriques, in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, includes this statement:

> He showed his capacity for persuasion by joining with Claude Montefiore and the chief rabbi to promote the establishment of an academic post in rabbinical studies. The first holder of this post was Herbert M. J. Loewe, who became Henriques's brother-in-law.

[Herbert Loewe's sister Rose married Basil Henriques on 19 July 1916.] This account is paralleled by that given by Lionel Louis Loewe, in his life of Henriques (p. 16):

> Basil had been at work at the centre of things. He and C.G.M. [sc. Claude Goldsmid Montefiore] and the Chief Rabbi had moved some of the lay leaders of the Jewish Community to endow an academic post at Oxford independently of the Oxford Hebrew Congregation but with a gentleman's agreement that the holder would act as guide, philosopher and friend to that body.

There is no doubt that Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz and Claude Montefiore were major players along with Henriques. A very great many of the

letters in the 'Correspondence of the Fund' file in the Hartley Library were between Hertz and Montefiore. One of the contributors to the fund, Julia Matilda Cohen (the widow of Nathaniel Louis Cohen, 1847–1913), in a letter of 15 February 1914 in which she promised £50 a year, added: 'It is a good augury that its bulwarks should be on the one hand the Chief Rabbi & on the other the President of the Liberal Synagogue — so that every Oxford Israelite should man the ship and feel "dans son assiette" in it'. The significance was the association between the Chief Rabbi, the leader of religious Orthodoxy, and (as Julia Cohen had noted) the head of the newly-formed Liberal movement, which was anathema to many Orthodox Jews.

The letters in the Hartley Library demonstrate that A. H. Jessel, who was given a major rôle by David Lewis, was not in fact greatly involved, at least during the period covered by the documents in the file up to his death in 1917: he appears merely as a contributor to the fund to support Loewe, to the extent of £5 annually. It was indeed one of the first of the Chief Rabbi's ventures; Dr. Joseph Herman Hertz (1872–1946) had been elected to the post on 16 February 1913 and formally installed two months later, on 14 April.

Although the MS 'History' states: 'A meeting of the four gentlemen who are now trustees of the fund was held in January 1914', the first reference to the creation of the fund, in fact the practicality of putting in place in Oxford someone to minister to the needs of Jewish undergraduates, began earlier, at least twelve months before Loewe was due to take up his position in the Michaelmas Term, 1914. The first two letters in the file are both dated 11 November 1913 and refer to previous activities. One of the letters was from Lord Swaythling — addressed to the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Hertz (spelled Herz) — and the other was from Hertz to Swaythling. Swaythling enclosed a letter from 'Mr. Liebermann' (not included in the file of letters) and added:

> I also would be much obliged if you would let me know how you got on in sounding Mr. Loewe, naturally, without committing us. Mr. Montefiore thought that Mr. Loewe's was a most excellent suggestion, and would agree to take part under certain conditions, which I think I could arrange quite easily with Mr. Loewe, if you find that he would consider the position.

The Chief Rabbi's letter stated that he had had 'a most satisfactory interview with Mr. Herbert Loewe' and added: 'I am anxious to meet you and other friends of this Oxford Scheme'. The project quickly got under way.

The MS 'History', referring to the meeting of the four trustees[10] in January 1914, stated:

> Although they unanimously felt that Mr. Herbert Loewe, then fellow(*sic*) of St Catharines College, Cambridge, would be able to fill the post, it would be

> almost impossible to raise a capital sum, sufficient for providing him with a reasonable salary. It was agreed, therefore, not to make a public appeal, but privately to ask certain members of the community to bind themselves & their heirs to pay annually subscriptions towards the salary of Mr. Loewe so long as he should continue to hold the post to the satisfaction of the Trustees.

In fact, the fund-raising had begun earlier: on 12 December 1913, Swaythling in a letter to Basil Henriques mentioned the first promised contributions each of £10 per year from three men: Arthur Franklin, Ernest Franklin, and the Hon. Gerald Montagu. Arthur and Ernest Franklin were cousins of Lord Swaythling, members of the 'Cousinhood' of inter-related families who were in effect the lay leaders of Anglo-Jewry. The letter reported on a suggestion which had been made that 'the College that takes the Lectureship should pay a small sum, say £50, and we pay the balance, in order to have him more directly under the control of the College'.

Although no appointment to Oxford had yet taken place, fund-raising continued for the next few months. Generally, either or both of the Chief Rabbi and Claude Montefiore would write to a prospective donor proposing a visit, hoping the result would be positive. Sometimes they were unsuccessful. One person wrote on 16 February 1914 turning down such a visit: his son-in-law had explained the Oxford scheme to him but the writer did not feel 'sufficiently moved by it to contribute'.

Apparently the first formal association with Exeter College came in March 1914. Montefiore wrote to Hertz that he had had a card from the Rector of Exeter (Lewis R. Farnell) 'to say he would be glad to see Loewe'. Three days later Montefiore wrote that he [Montefiore] had just seen Farnell and the interview had been 'satisfactory on the whole'. The Lectureship at the College, he explained, was tenable for a year and the holder had to be re-elected: 'Burney is the present holder, but he does not particularly want it'. If the College elected Loewe in October it would be on the understanding that he be re-elected. Moreover, the Lectureship was worth only £22 per year. Montefiore warned that Farnell had said that he was speaking unofficially and he was not sure that the Fellows would carry out or approve of the plan. Farnell added: 'we should all hold our tongues', so that when he would mention the matter to the Fellows they would not have heard of it. Montefiore told Hertz that he had written to Farnell saying: 'we will hold our tongues', and that as soon as Lord Swaythling returned they would have a meeting and would write to Farnell officially. However, speaking for himself Montefiore could see no objection to the annual re-election, 'provided the College says it is understood that, if Loewe suits them, they will reelect(*sic*) him annually as a matter of course'. Farnell wrote on April 25, acknowledging the receipt of communications (presumably from Montefiore)

and saying, somewhat strangely: [they were] '*authorising* me finally to bring the question of Mr. Loewe's appointment as our Hebrew Lecturer before our College meeting', to be held on 1 May (my italics). After the interview, Farnell said in a letter to Herbert Loewe (dated 6 May) that he had delayed writing, 'until I could deal with a certain difficulty to which I alluded in my telegram'. He reported that Loewe's application to join the college had been discussed at a formal college meeting and had been warmly received, 'and we were all very much impressed with your testimonials'. The 'difficulty' arose from the fact that the Hebrew Lecturer at Exeter was Dr. Burney of St John's College, and they did not want to act in a way 'that might seem unfriendly or unappreciative to him'. Burney had received Farnell's statement about the situation and Burney had replied in 'the most genial & sympathetic way', not wishing to stand in the way. But the college's action would be all the easier if Burney were elected, as he was expected to be, to the recently-vacated Oriel Professorship. That would probably be known within three weeks and Farnell suggested that 'the question might stand over till then'.

However, Loewe wrote to Montefiore on 15 June: 'The election of Burney seems to be protracted' and he was worried because he wanted to be settled by October — the start of the Michaelmas Term. He had given notice to leave his post at Cambridge and wanted to move soon. He asked if it could be possible 'to arrange the *Jewish* part of the scheme now'. In fact arrangements had been put in hand by Elkan Adler, solicitor, who had been drawing up a contract for the subscribers.

Two copies of a draft agreement exist, both dated 1 August 1914, between 'the subscribers' of the one part, and on the other part the Chief Rabbi, Lord Swaythling, C. G. Montefiore, and Basil Henriques ('the present trustees'). It went on that 'WHEREAS HERBERT LOEWE has been recently appointed Lecturer in Hebrew to Exeter College in the University of Oxford AND WHEREAS the subscribers are desirous of providing a yearly fund of Three Hundred & ninety two pounds [in the "Minute and account book..."] [or £250 in the "Correspondence..."] for the purpose of supplementing the salary of the said Herbert Loewe so long as he holds the said post of Lecturer or any similar post in the University of Oxford or any College thereof' [added in the 'Correspondence...' — 'and also the post of Minister to the Oxford Hebrew Congregation']. A second draft agreement (dated only 1915) increased the yearly sum to be paid to Loewe to £400 and, as to his duties, changed them to 'WHEREAS the said Herbert Loewe has been requested by the Trustees to use his best endeavours to promote the interests of Jewish Students at the said University which the said Herbert Loewe has agreed to do'. No mention is made of 'the post of Minister to the Oxford Hebrew Congregation'. Yet it appears

that the word 'Minister' continued to be used. Thus, in a letter dated 22 July 1917 to Dr. Hertz, Julia M. Cohen, enclosing her annual cheque 'for the Oxford Minister's Fund', went on to ask, 'By the way, isn't "Minister" a misnomer? ... would not the "Oxford Jewish Social Worker" or some such paraphrase of that epithet be more appropriate — perhaps the "Oxford Jewish Sociologist?" '.

Meanwhile Loewe had engaged rooms in July 1914, 'technically' having been in residence at Exeter College since his appointment, as he explained to Lord Swaythling in a letter of 17 September. However, a month earlier, on 18 August, he had addressed (from Brondesbury Road in London) a somewhat exasperated letter to the Chief Rabbi in which he said that since he might be called any moment for military service he could 'no longer postpone making arrangements for leaving Cambridge and settling in Oxford'. He had a number of expenses to meet but had received no money from either Exeter or from 'the Jewish authorities'. He had given notice at Cambridge and had to remove his goods; he needed also to say whether he would definitely take the rooms he had engaged in Oxford 'which I require until I am able to marry and take a house'. The agreement dated 1 August was a little premature.

After Burney was elected to the Oriel professorship, Loewe's position became clearer. What appears to have been the first public announcement of his new rôle came in an interview with him, published in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 9 October 1914 (p. 12): 'From Cambridge to Oxford. Interview for the Jewish Chronicle with Mr. Herbert M. J. Loewe, M.A.'. It stated: 'The appointment of Mr. Herbert Loewe as Lecturer in Oriental Languages at Exeter College, Oxford, is an event of more than passing significance'. Loewe described his appointment thus:

> I am going to Oxford to take up a College appointment. Owing to the death of Dr. Driver, who was succeeded by Dr. Cooke, a vacancy occurred in the Oriental teaching staff of the University. Dr. Burney, who was Hebrew and Arabic lecturer at Exeter College, succeeded Dr. Cooke, and I was invited by the Rector of Exeter to fill the vacancy caused by Dr. Burney's appointment. I shall shortly enter upon my duties.

The draft agreement of 1 August stated that the first payment to Loewe would be made on 1 September and in fact it was only slightly delayed. Just before the *Jewish Chronicle* interview, Loewe received from the fund his first payment, of £100. The second draft agreement said that the first quarterly payment had been made on 14 September. On 17 September Loewe sent Dr. Hertz a letter of thanks and enclosed a receipt. He was effusive in his gratitude to the Chief Rabbi: 'May I once more thank you most emphatically for all your efforts on my behalf and assure you of my deep sense of gratitude. I quite realize

that without your constant labours, the affair would long ago have come to an end'.

There were two other preliminary matters. First, the agreement with the subscribers included their obligation to bind their heirs to continue to subscribe to the fund, but two subscribers decided to subscribe only in their lifetime. Second, in a letter of 31 August, addressed from St Catharine's College, Cambridge, Loewe wrote formally to Dr. Hertz that if all four trustees were unanimously of the opinion that he was not fulfilling his duties at Oxford he would 'resign all claim to the salary for which the Trustees are responsible'.

He started work on the project straight away. His academic duties were light, as he explained to Hertz in a letter of 1 November 1914. He had two courses of lectures and two pupils (presumably for tutorials), one taking Arabic Pass Moderations and another who had to read Rashi on Bereshith for a scholarship. Most of the letter was devoted to his religious work. He had 'unconsciously produced revolutionary changes'. There had been problems because of the need to accommodate the non-Orthodox undergraduates. Services were held on Friday evenings and increasingly many of the prayers were said in English. Loewe told Hertz: 'On Fridays, you know, the Hebrew & English portions used to be rendered in Anglican plainsong — à la Church of England curate only more so — it only needed a touch of the Holy Ghost to make you fancy you were in church'. Loewe had suggested 'that if the Hebrew were read like the litany, then it would only be fair to "dawwen" & chant the English prayers'. They had seen the humour of it and reversed his suggestion so that the last Friday evening service was rendered 'in a more civilised way'. Moreover, he had revived Saturday morning services although so far attracting only half a minyan,[11] and the Adler Society [the Jewish students' society], to which he had given a paper, was proposing to start a synagogue choir. He believed that there was a deep religious feeling 'dormant in orthodox & liberal alike and it will fructify in the future'. But he thought less of other members of the congregation. The townsfolk, he said, were 'rather aloof. The trouble is that Mrs A, who won't visit Mrs B, complains that Mrs C won't visit her. I hope that when I am married my wife will be able to draw them together'. His 'unaided bachelor efforts' could not deal with the Jewish women students.

Two events led to a change in his life. First, in the autumn of 1915 he married Ethel Hyamson (who had been born in Oxford during the temporary residence of her family in the city), and he then volunteered for the army.[12] He was commissioned into the South Staffordshire Regiment, later the Lincolnshire Regiment, despite the fact that he had a bad arm and poor eyesight. He was sent to India where he was joined by his wife and he was appointed an Inspector of a Clothing

Factory. His son Raphael was born in India in 1919. (His brother Lionel Louis was commissioned in the Royal Sussex Regiment and later the Gordon Highlanders and saw active service.)

Herbert Loewe's decision to join the army caused some little disturbance, since apparently he did not officially inform the trustees. Lord Swaythling wrote to Dr. Hertz on 22 December 1915 that although he had signed the quarterly cheque for Loewe, 'for our protection we ought to inform the subscribers that Mr. Loewe is not now in Oxford'. According to an unsigned copy of a letter to Basil Henriques, dated 9 February 1916 — presumably from Dr. Hertz since Montefiore is referred to in the letter — 'Lord Swaythling refuses to sign any cheques unless all the subscribers are notified that no actual teaching is at present being done by Loewe at Oxford, as he has enlisted and is now in India. I am strongly against this proposal of Lord Swaythling. Under present conditions you know what the answer of many of the subscribers would be, and as Fellows, for example, of Universities are not penalised for enlisting I fail to see why we should act otherwise'. Henriques, who was in the army, replied that he agreed with Hertz and Montefiore:

> I feel that Loewe served the Oxford Congregation best by taking the lead in applying for a commission. When he did so, there were few only of the Oxford Jews who were serving, and I think his example had an important effect. Although I think that he should have officially informed us before taking the step, yet our answer would without the smallest doubt have been to assure him of the continuance of his salary.

The subscribers were informed of the position after the trustees had considered the matter, taken legal advice, and had had communication from Exeter College. (In an undated letter Farnell told Montefiore that while Loewe was serving in the army, he 'is still our official Hebrew Lecturer, receiving the stipend & being published as such in the University Calendar'.) This was explained by the Chief Rabbi in a letter of 10 September 1916 to Julia M. Cohen in reply to one she had sent him on 6 August 1916 telling the Chief Rabbi that her son Charles, on leave from Salonika, had told her that 'none of the university posts that have temporarily fallen into abeyance owing to the War are continuing their payments to men who for the moment have left their work to become officers in the Army'. She thought that this was applicable to 'the gentleman who undertook the post *not* of minister but of, as it were, religious don to Jewish undergraduates at Oxford — inasmuch as there are practically no Jewish undergraduates at Oxford!' and she asked Hertz whether he thought the Fund should be maintained.

He discussed the matter with Montefiore who answered, in a letter of 12 September, that the only modification might be to give Loewe his

£400 less his army pay: 'That is what a lot of the Universities are doing to their Professors, Lecturers etc.'. However, it is clear that the full amount of the fund's 'salary' was paid to Loewe while he was in the army. Normally this was paid in four instalments, amounting to £392 — although slightly less in 1917, and in the following three years.

There had been a slight hiccup in 1917. Herbert Loewe, described as 'Asst. Superintendent, Army Clothing Factory, Alipore', wrote from Calcutta to Hertz on 25 August 1917, thanking him for his help and his efforts, and hoping to build up 'a true Jewish environment at Oxford'. But he was uneasy about his future as 'if the Trustees had informed me six months ago that there would be no salary in March, I could have prepared to some extent for the contingency'. He was worried that if, on his return, the trustees did not wish to proceed with the Oxford scheme he would be in a great difficulty, having cut his ties with Cambridge. He ended: 'I cannot lose the feeling that I am being regarded as a nuisance and a Schnorrer, instead of a salaried official and that my salary is a dole dependent on the inclination of my employers'. The matter was apparently settled to Loewe's satisfaction when he returned to Oxford in 1920 after his release from the army and resumed his academic and pastoral duties. The letters in the file then become rarer, and are largely taken up with Loewe's complaints about the size of his salary and the trustees' efforts to deal with them.

Thus a copy letter (unsigned, but undoubtedly from Hertz) of 10 February 1925, addressed to Montefiore, referred to a letter received from Loewe (not included in the file) and commented: 'There is a terrible drain on his slender purse due to the fact that he is the United Synagogue and Jewish Board of Guardians in one of the Oxford Jewish community. He cannot turn away the Jewish beggars that pester him and throw them on the hands of the public authorities. It would render his position impossible. The fact of the matter is, his salary is hopelessly inadequate. Something should be done. I am sure there must be half a dozen people who, if they receive a letter signed by the two of us, would consent to become contributing members to the fund'.

Montefiore's initial response, on 11 February, was not encouraging. He was 'very sorry for Loewe, but I am not clear that he is a very good manager. I am not clear that he ought to give money to the schnorrers... After all we don't give money to L that L may give money to endless beggars... I quite admit that L's salary is not large, but certainly Dr. A has managed for years on a very small salary'. Since he thought that 'Dr. A' was a much better manager than Loewe he concluded by asking what would be a reasonable salary and added: 'I think he has 2 children?'. Montefiore must have

softened as a circular letter appealing for funds, signed by Hertz and Montefiore and addressed from Montefiore's house, was sent to nine people on 17 March 1925 (another copy is dated 14 June 1925): Sir Phillip Sassoon; Lady Sassoon; Frank D. Benjamin; Lord Bearsted; Samuel Samuel; B. Baron (Brighton); Sir Edward Stern; Gustave Tuck; and Charles Sebag-Montefiore. The letter gave the background to Loewe's appointment: 'Mr. Loewe has fulfilled the work entrusted to him with zeal and enthusiasm, and while the Jewish undergraduates have in him a valuable friend and helper, it is also a real advantage that a Jewish scholar of mark has been added to the University'.

The letter then explained that the annual £400 was no longer a reasonable salary, in view of the rise in the cost of living. However, there is little record of responses to this appeal or to others made later. A letter to Lord Bearsted of 21 May 1929 mentioned that his late father, when appealed to in 1925, gave £100 as an annual donation of £25 for four years, and asked him to continue it. To some extent the new appeal was successful and from 1925 Loewe's sum from the fund rose to £473 per year. There was also some help for Loewe from Montefiore who wrote to Hertz on 2 June (presumably 1929), telling him 'in *strictest* confidence' that Loewe had helped him in 'some Rabbinic material for a new book of mine... and I induced him in 1928 & 1929 to accept £100 each year for this help. Of course any time given to me means less time for *some other* remunerative work; still I hope that in '28 & '29 he has been the *gainer*. But of course, that will not go on — in 1930 at the outside'. [This may have been Montefiore's book, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*, published in 1930.]

But Herbert Loewe's financial situation remained difficult. Montefiore wrote to Hertz on 20 February [1930] that he had seen 'H. Loewe today and he spoke to me about his Private Affairs which have filled me with very deep concern. It is most painful to hear that he is heavily in debt'. The point was forcefully made by Herbert Loewe, in the last letter in the file, dated 23 February 1930, to Hertz. He thanked the Chief Rabbi for taking 'prompt steps' when the position had been put to him earlier, and an extra £70 yearly was added, making the annual amount £470(*sic*). But it had not been increased since. In the meantime Loewe had supplemented his income by undertaking 'hack work' and by limiting his expenditure. (The extra work he undertook included, after the death of Israel Abrahams in 1925, driving to Cambridge for some teaching, going to Wellington College, Berkshire, on Sundays to teach some Jewish pupils there, and some teaching at other places.)

Despite these measures his overdraft had continued to rise and a limit had been reached. First he had had to give up some of his work because his health had deteriorated; and his bankers had just called a halt to his overdraft. 'It has reached a point that it will take me years to wipe off

and if I were to die tomorrow, the provision I have made for my wife and children would be practically absorbed'.

Loewe compared his situation with that of others in a similar position. The University Commission for teachers in university positions fixed the minimum salary for such as he at £800–£850. He commented that he had 'to represent the Jews in Oxford and my social calls are heavy; moreover the cost of an isolated Jewish household is obviously heavier than that of one in a Community. Not only are the dietary laws more expensive to carry out, but I have to bear all the obligations of a Community without the aid of any Communal funds. All eleemosynary burdens fall on me alone, though occasionally you and Mr. Archer have given me sums for the charity box'. He compared his economic position with that of the beadle of a London synagogue, recently advertised, offering a salary of £350, free of income tax, a house and a pension. He looked back to his time at Cambridge, when he was earning a 'comfortable competence and I would have had the next vacant Fellowship at my College, together with an independent career, freedom from anxiety and liberty to devote myself to research'. He concluded: 'I hope that the Trustees will succeed in re-organising this post so that in dignity and emolument it will be equal to an ordinary non-Jewish academic position. As I have already stated the letter from my Bankers this week admits of no delay'.

In the academic year 1930–1931 the annual sum paid to Loewe amounted to £693, but in 1931 he returned to Cambridge where he became University Reader in Rabbinics, and in 1933 he was elected to an Honorary Fellowship at Queen's College.[13] In practice, the 'Oxford' fund continued to be paid to him while he was at Cambridge although reduced to annual sums varying from £316 to £378. He died in October 1940, at the age of 58,[14] and the last payment was made to his widow in January 1941.

There are several accounts about several aspects of Herbert Loewe's time at both Oxford and Cambridge, and of his work and influence. First is the evidence of his sons. A substantial article by Michael Loewe (who had been University Lecturer in Chinese at Cambridge) is supplemented by a short note by his other son, Raphael Loewe.[15] Michael Loewe deals essentially with his family's home life but his article includes material on his father's attitudes and activities. First, it was a religiously Orthodox household but while his father 'taught us that he chose to obey the traditional rules out of a love for their holiness... For him there was no conflict between a reverent and ever deep love for the Torah and the full force of textual criticism where this was needed... This combination of a heartfelt faith and an open mind was rare'. Thus Michael Loewe and his brother Raphael 'were deeply privileged to be brought up in a home that was in many ways exceptional; that of a practising Jewish household

where members of other faiths, or Jews who did not observe all the pronouncements of the Rabbinic law, could express their views with full confidence that they would be received on terms of equality and with respect'.

To this openness was added Herbert Loewe's duties towards the University undergraduates. Michael Loewe referred to freshmen arriving in October who might be homesick, or some might fall into debt or fall into a romantic attachment. 'Such an emergency would call for careful handling from a senior man or woman who shared the young person's faith and whose judgement would be acceptable'. He instances the case of a student who came from an Orthodox home but would be exposed to ideas in archaeology or anthropology which cast doubt on the Hebrew scriptures. Moreover, Herbert Loewe was able to explain to college tutors, on behalf of students, the intricacies of Orthodox observance.

The Loewe home was open on Saturday afternoons for undergraduates, for 'tea, cakes and good cheer'; or as Raphael Loewe put it, Herbert Loewe 'made his home in Beaumont Street a focus for Jewish undergraduate activity. It was here that on Sabbaths and Festivals he dispensed a generous hospitality in the tradition which he himself had witnessed, when a student, in Israel Abrahams' home in Cambridge'. And he would act as a prison visitor in the case of a Jewish prisoner in the Oxford jail, would visit the sick in hospital, or would arrange a Jewish funeral. In all he was acting, in these capacities, as — in the words Julia Cohen used in 1917 — the 'Oxford Jewish Social Worker'.

Edgar Duschinsky (later Duchin) came to Oxford as an undergraduate in 1928 and remembered Herbert Loewe:[16]

> Undoubtedly the great Jewish personality of my period was Herbert J. Loewe... He and his wife kept open house in their beautiful residence in Beaumont Street where they lived with their two sons, Raphael and Michael... His great strength was... his tolerance. He steadfastly refused to listen to the complaints of the more orthodox students and also their parents and insisted that the services should hold a fair balance between the claims of the orthodox and the progressives or liberals. I remember he was particularly annoyed when a group of Jewish mothers, prompted by the *B'nai Brith* of which they were members, descended once in term-time to check that the arrangements for *kashrut* for their dear sons were satisfactory. Herbert and Mrs. Loewe kept open house especially on Friday evenings and were careful to invite students to dinner or lunch in rotation.

Sydney Brookfield recalled the last major act which Loewe performed in 1931 before leaving for Cambridge. He realized that the year was the centenary of Adolf Neubauer, a considerable scholar, and a special memorial service was arranged for 21 June

1931 with a printed order of service.[17] 'The undergraduates formed a choir, especially trained by the organ scholar at Exeter College'.[18]

There is, however, another side to the Neubauer celebration. It concerns the relationship between the Chief Rabbi (J. H. Hertz) and Herbert Loewe. Despite the cordiality between them at the start of Loewe's connection with Oxford, it is clear that relations between them became increasingly frosty. Hertz was given no rôle in the Neubauer celebration because (as Loewe told Hertz) the service would be conducted by undergraduates or those with Oxford degrees. However, he had added that if Hertz did not attend (as he had intimated) then his absence, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor of the University and other dignitaries, would certainly be noticed. Hertz reluctantly attended but subsequently wrote to Loewe expressing his indignation at having been persuaded to attend a ceremony at which he had been slighted by not being given the recognition and respect to which he was entitled as the Chief Rabbi. He added that he now regretted the effort he had made to establish the Oxford fund.[19]

To conclude, it must be stressed that in both Oxford and Cambridge, Herbert Loewe greatly influenced a generation of students. Through his friendship and intellectual openness, a number of them came to attain positions of prominence in the Anglo-Jewish community: for example, Robert Carvalho, Judge Alan Mocatta, and Leon and Cecil Roth. He also made a great impression on Donald Coggan, a future Archbishop of Canterbury: in the inaugural Donald Coggan Lecture, 'Jewish–Christian Relations — from Holocaust to Hope' (delivered by George Carey, then Archbishop of Canterbury, in Washington, D.C. on 24 April 2001), Carey said:[20]

> It is no exaggeration to say that his [Coggan's] entire ministry was grounded in a love of the Hebrew scriptures and by implication a love of the Jewish people. In a moving address a few years ago he said: 'I found myself, as a Christian to be in debt, everlastingly in debt, to the people of the book, the people of the Land, the people of Israel'. Not for him an 'Old Testament' detached from the faith and history of a real people. At Cambridge as an undergraduate he sat at the feet of Herbert Loewe and 'learned to explore with him the treasures of later Judaism, vibrant with a faith of its own'.

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to Professor Raphael Loewe for his encouragement and advice, and for providing much useful information and many insights. I should also like to thank the Librarian of the Hartley Library, University of Southampton, for making available documents in his care and for giving permission to quote from them.

NOTES

[1] David Lewis, *The Jews of Oxford*, 1992, p. 48, says that after Segal left in June 1909 there was talk of appointing visiting ministers during term time. Nothing came of it, but 'some help was given by B. Liebermann(*sic*), a Jews' College graduate, who was up at Worcester reading Oriental Languages from 1910 to 1912'. However, this was reported in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 28 October 1910, p. 12, as Mr. B. Liebermann, BA, having been appointed *minister* of the Oxford Hebrew Congregation. David Lewis does not, however, include him in a list of ministers to the congregation, op. cit., p.106.

[2] A major reason for the absence of a minister, in the latter part of the 20th and the early 21st centuries, despite the growth of the community, is the fact that the synagogue caters for all types of Judaism, Orthodox, Liberal, and Masorti. It would be impossible for one minister to deal with all of them. However, there is a resident Lubavitch rabbi who ministers to Habad of Oxford.

[3] Raphael Loewe, 'The evolution of Jewish student feeding arrangements in Oxford and Cambridge', in Dov Noy and Issachar Ben-Ami (eds), *Studies in the Cultural Life of the Jews in England*, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Folklore Research Center Studies, V, 1975, p. 172.

[4] The figure of 40–50 Jewish undergraduates is too high and was perhaps used in order to stress the need for the new post.

[5] See Raphael Loewe, op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 171–2. Ephraim Lipson was a graduate of History at Cambridge in 1910, but finding no employment there, had moved to Oxford as a freelance tutor and researcher. He appears not to have been active at first in the Oxford Jewish community, but in 1916 he became President of the congregation. Later he was Reader in Economic History in the University, but in the early 1930s he left Oxford, not having been elected to the chair of Economic History. He became a freelance writer and cut himself off from economic history.

[6] This section is based on Lewis, *Oxford*, op. cit. in Note 1 above, pp. 48–52; and L. L. [Lionel Louis] Loewe, *Basil Henriques: A Portrait* (1976), pp. 15–16.

[7] Lewis, op. cit. in Note 1 above, p. 49.

[8] Ibid., p. 50.

[9] Loewe, *Basil Henriques*, p. 15.

[10] The four trustees were the Chief Rabbi (Dr. J. H. Hertz), Lord Swaythling, Claude Goldsmid Montefiore, and Basil Henriques.

[11] In a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle*, 19 October 1917, p. 20, Ephraim Lipson, writing in his capacity as president of the Oxford Hebrew Congregation, drew the attention of undergraduates to the services held every Friday night and Saturday mornings.

[12] He had started army training at least in May 1915 when he wrote to the Chief Rabbi saying that he wanted to know if he could use a bicycle on the Sabbath in order to undertake military training since there was limited time for training; but if not allowed, he would walk. The Chief Rabbi replied that during the war he could be exempt from strict observance. From Papers of Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz, Hartley Library, MS 175/30/11. Referred to in www.art.man.ac.uk/HISTORY/research/workingpapers/wp_51.pdf, p. 19. The writer, however, refers to Loewe as 'an upper class Jewish student at Oxford University'.

[13] *The Times*, 11 December 1933, p. 14.

[14] Obituary in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 18 October 1940.

[15] Michael Loewe, 'A Jewish home in Oxford and Cambridge in the 1920s and 1930s', *Cambridge*, no. 45, Winter 1999–2000, pp. 40–44; and 'Raphael Loewe remembers his father', in Freda Silver Jackson (compiler), *Then and Now. A Collection of Recollections*, 1992, p. 21.

[16] Edgar Duchin, 'Reminiscences, 1928–1932', in Silver Jackson, op. cit. in Note 15 above, p. 26. In fact, as Michael Loewe wrote, the family kept a kasher house.

[17] 'Order of Service on the occasion of the reception of two scrolls of the Law from the Canterbury Jewish Congregation... and of the celebrations of the Centenary of the birth of Adolf Neubauer, Ph.D. Hon. MA, sub-librarian of the Bodleian Library, Reader in Rabbinics in the University and Honorary Fellow of Exeter College. The historian of the Jews of Oxford, born 11 March 1831 died 6 April 1907', Oxford University Press, 1931. See also H. M. J. Loewe, *Adolf Neubauer 1831–1931*, 1931, Bodleian Library, Heb.e.499.

[18] Sydney Brookfield. 'Memories of the Thirties', in Silver Jackson, op. cit. in Note 15 above, pp. 27–8.

[19] Private communication from Raphael Loewe.

[20] www.msgr.ca/msgr-8/holocaust_inaugeral_donald_coggan_lecture.htm. The spelling of 'inaugeral' is necessary to access the website.

J. L. MAGNES AND THE PROMOTION OF BI-NATIONALISM IN PALESTINE

Rory Miller

As hostility to Israel has intensified in the Western world in recent times (especially within the Trade Union movement, academia, intellectual circles, and the political elite) there has been a noticeable increase in the call for a bi-national solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict as a viable alternative to a two-state solution. The Palestinian commentator Ahmad Samih Khalidi explained in a 1998 article in *Prospect* magazine[1] that bi-nationalism entails

> an agreed equal sharing of the whole land [of Palestine] between two peoples... on the basis of equality between its citizens rather than ethnicity or national/religious origin.

In 2003, Tony Judt expanded on that idea in a controversial article in *The New York Review of Books*. The late Edward Said of Columbia University had also championed 'a bi-national state, a federal union'[2] because it seemed to him to be

> the only reasonable solution for the Israelis, who cannot continue to live in this part of the world basically as an occupying, bullying, aggressive force which is the language of [Israeli Prime Minister Ariel] Sharon and all those who preceded him.

These (and numerous other) proponents of a bi-national solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict differ on the details of how exactly such a state would come about and function effectively in the Holy Land. For example, Said believed only that the Jews had a right to 'self-determination' as opposed to 'national self-determination', and it is unclear how this could be achieved within a 'federal union'. Nevertheless, all share a fundamental belief that as long as there is a Jewish majority in a Jewish State, there can never be an end to the Israel-Palestine conflict. In this, at least, they share the view of Judah L. Magnes, the leading proponent of bi-nationalism during the era of the British

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 48, nos. 1 and 2, 2006

Mandate in Palestine (between 1922 and 1948). However, it must be stressed that Magnes differed from present-day bi-nationalists in his deeply-held conviction that Jews had a right to live in Palestine, whereas many bi-nationalists see it as a way of dismantling the State of Israel which they view as an anachronistic, indeed as an illegitimate, entity.

Magnes, the Zionists and Bi-nationalism

Magnes was born in San Francisco in 1877. After training as a Rabbi, he served as secretary of the American Zionist Federation from 1905 to 1908. In 1909 and until he emigrated to Jerusalem in 1922, he was the representative of the influential American Jewish Committee in New York. Following the opening of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in April 1925 (seven years after its first cornerstone was laid on the Gray Hill estate at the top of Mount Scopus), Magnes was appointed the university's first chancellor. In 1935 he became president of the Hebrew University, a post which he held until his death in 1948.

Magnes had a distinct view of what Zionism meant. He was convinced that the Zionist endeavour must take into account the interests of the Jewish community of the Diaspora and should not lead to a 'negation of the Galuth'. He declared at the annual meeting of the American Zionist Federation in 1908: 'Our Zionism must mean for us Judaism in all its phases; Zionism is complete and harmonized Judaism'.[3] Moreover, for him Palestine was neither 'just an Arab land . . . or just a Jewish land'.[4] He believed in the 'indissoluble historical association of the Jewish people and of Judaism' with Palestine and he also believed that Arabs had 'natural rights' in Palestine. Zionism therefore could only thrive, both practically and morally, if it was committed to peaceful co-operation and co-existence with the Arab community of the country.[5] This necessitated an abandonment of political Zionism. In 1929 Magnes told Sir John Chancellor, British High Commissioner in Palestine, that the 'only hope for future peace of the country lay in the repudiation by the Jews of political Zionism'.[6]

He summed up his outlook in *The New York Times* of 18 July 1938,[7] declaring that the Jewish people were

> faced with a threefold destiny in its return to Zion. First, the forming of a living, creative center for the Jewish people and for Judaism. Second, helping to maturity the slumbering spiritual and intellectual forces of the whole Semitic world. Third, helping Jerusalem to become the true sanctuary of the three great Semitic religions... These are the tasks worthy of the People of the Book. They are within the realm of practical possibility on one condition — understanding between Jew, Arab and British.

The Hebrew University was the most prestigious academic and cultural institution in the Jewish world; its first board of governors included the veteran Zionist leader, Chaim Weizmann, and such renowned figures as Sigmund Freud, Martin Buber, and Albert Einstein. His position as Chancellor of that university provided Magnes with the platform to champion the bi-national cause, though he refused to join officially B'rith Shalom (an association founded in 1925) to promote bi-nationalism.

In his 1930 pamphlet *Light Unto All the Nations*, Magnes set out the fundamentals of the bi-national position, as he saw it. He desired the establishment in Palestine of an entity based on the Swiss model, where each nationality (Jews and Arabs) had its own canton, in which the majority group could outvote the minority. However, ethnic rivalries and tensions would be kept in check by a federal superstructure which controlled key areas such as foreign affairs, communications, and transport — thus providing parity between the two national groups.[8]

In its earliest form this proposal also envisaged free Jewish immigration into Palestine and opposed legal restrictions on Jews buying land on the basis of their religion. However, by the mid-1930s, as Arab opposition to the Zionist programme intensified, Magnes became convinced that for the sake of real peace in Palestine, Jewish immigration would have to be significantly curtailed. He proposed that it be restricted to 40 per cent of the total population for a period of 10 years, and even suggested that some Jews travelling to Palestine to start their new life might be diverted to neighbouring Arab countries.[9]

Though Magnes gained support for his proposals from many within the Jewish intellectual elite, including such notable figures as Martin Buber, Pinhas Ruttenberg, Gad Frumkin, Moshe Smilansky, and Moshe Novomeysky,[10] there was little support for a bi-national settlement in the Yishuv (the pre-state Jewish community of Palestine) or in the Jewish Diaspora. Raphael Patai, who had been a doctoral student at the Hebrew University during these years, recalled in his memoirs that support for Magnes's bi-national proposals was 'miniscule'.[11] Moreover, he was vilified in some quarters. In 1932 he received death threats from extreme right-wing Zionist groups,[12] an experience which would recur sporadically for the remainder of his life; in 1946, after testifying at the Jerusalem hearings of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine, he had to be placed under police protection.[13] This threat of violence emanated only from the extreme margins of the Zionist movement; mainstream Zionists were horrified that his life might be endangered because of his beliefs. In December 1942, the British Embassy in Washington reported to Whitehall that 'more responsible Zionists' were actively avoiding criticism of Magnes in public out of fear that he might be the victim of a violent attack.[14]

However, mainstream Zionists did dismiss his proposals as impractical and argued that his call for Jews to be settled outside Palestine failed to take into consideration their ardent desire to settle in the Yishuv, while his willingness to accept restrictions on Jewish immigration was anathema to the Zionist movement, whose programme was based on the presumption that free Jewish immigration would result in a Jewish majority in Palestine. As early as 1925, Zionist leader David Ben-Gurion had made it clear to leading bi-nationalists that he categorically opposed giving up any right to strive for a Jewish majority in Palestine;[15] in a 1936 letter to Magnes, Ben-Gurion repeated this and explained that the main difference between them was that Magnes was 'ready to sacrifice immigration for peace' while he was not.[16] Moreover, Zionists were particularly incensed that Magnes was using his status at the Hebrew University to promote his bi-national proposals; Ben-Gurion pointed out to him in 1938: 'you stand at the head of the supreme cultural institution of the Jewish people and political circles do not regard you as an individual but a representative'.[17]

Attitudes to Magnes and Bi-nationalism in Britain 1930–1945

Magnes was isolated within the Yishuv and faced relentless criticism from the world Zionist movement but, at least in the 1930s, he found a far more receptive audience among the British Arabists who opposed the commitment to Zionism made by the British government in the Balfour Declaration of 1917.[18] They became increasingly hostile to the British commitment to the Jewish National Home following the 1922 decision of the League of Nations to grant Britain a mandate for Palestine, into which the key clauses of the Balfour Declaration were incorporated. In 1922, for example, anti-Zionists in the House of Lords succeeded in having a motion passed (by 60 votes to 29) against the Palestine Mandate. The following year, 111 Conservative MPs signed a pro-Arab 'memorial' calling on the government to 'reconsider the Palestine question in the light of the Arab demands'.[19]

Thus, in 1930, the year of the publication of the Passfield White Paper and the Hope-Simpson report on Palestine (both of which were highly critical of the Zionist programme) the leading British Arabist Harry St John Philby told Magnes that his advocacy of the bi-national scheme had significant support among Englishmen like himself.[20] This was encouraging as Magnes considered Philby to be the 'greatest living Arab authority'[21] and the previous year both men had worked together to draw up draft proposals which they hoped would gain, in the words of Magnes, 'sufficient approval on the part of Arabs and Jews to justify the Labour government's putting them forward as a basis for a round table conference between Arabs and Jews'.[22]

This, of course, did not occur and the Magnes-Philby negotiations fizzled out by early 1930, but the key points that the men put down on paper highlighted Magnes's thinking on bi-nationalism by this time. They agreed, for example, that Palestine should be 'administered as a democratic constitutional republic', in which legislative authority would reside in a representative assembly of Arabs and Jews selected by persons of Palestinian nationality (defined as those who had resided continuously in Palestine for two years up to that point) in proportion to their number of the population. Executive authority would reside in a Palestine Council which would be elected on the same basis.[23]

Apart from Philby, Colonel Stewart Newcombe also became a supporter of Magnes in England at that time. Newcombe had been a colleague of Lawrence of Arabia during the First World War and was treasurer of the Palestine Information Office, the leading anti-Zionist lobby group in England during the 1930s. In 1937 he looked for Magnes's endorsement of a Palestine plan which he had jointly drafted with Albert Hyamson, a member of the Anglo-Jewish community who had earned the ire of the Zionists in his rôle as director of the Immigration Department in Palestine between 1926 and 1934. The Newcombe-Hyamson proposals envisaged the founding of a sovereign independent State in Palestine where all Palestinian nationals had equal rights and where complete autonomy existed for all communities, including complete municipal authority for all Jewish towns, villages, and districts. However, the plan also made clear that there could be no possibility of the creation of a Jewish State in any part of Palestine at any time in the future, that the existing majority (the Arab population) would rule, and that Jews could at no time constitute more than 50 per cent of the population.[24]

The plan was rejected by the Zionist leadership and David Ben-Gurion sent a letter to Magnes, warning him that it was a 'deception'.[25] But as Israel Kolatt has noted, Magnes welcomed the Hyamson-Newcombe proposals as the 'portals to an agreement'[26] and his support for this proposal came at a time of rising tension in Palestine, following the outbreak of the Arab Revolt the previous year and the decision of the Royal (Peel) Commission on Palestine to recommend the partition of Palestine in its July 1937 report as 'the best and most hopeful solution of the deadlock'. Specifically, the Peel Commission called for the establishment of two sovereign independent States — an Arab State composed of Trans-Jordan and that part of Palestine allotted to the Arabs, and a Jewish State consisting of the part of Palestine allotted to the Jews. Jerusalem and Bethlehem, with a corridor to the sea, would form part of a small enclave to be reserved under a new British mandate, while Jaffa would form an outlying part of the new Arab State.[27]

Magnes had argued against partition in his evidence to the Peel Commission and in July 1938 he submitted a subsequent memorandum

to the chairman of the Palestine Partition Commission [the Woodhead Commission] which had been set up by the British government to examine the feasibility of the Peel Commission's partition recommendation. In this document Magnes argued that even if Palestine were ultimately partitioned the 'principle of bi-nationalism would be applied to the new Palestinian [that is, Jewish and Arab] states'. He then raised the example of Switzerland; though he acknowledged that 'the details of the Swiss pattern cannot automatically [be] applied anywhere', he argued that there were 'at least two basic lessons' which could be drawn from the Swiss case. The first was that the cantonal system had a number of in-built advantages, since the sovereignty of the canton gave the majority population a 'wide field for self-determination and self-expression'.[28] However, for Magnes, the 'chief lesson' of the Swiss model was that '... equal nationalities ... constitute and administer the State upon the basis of equal political rights without regard to who is the majority and who is the minority'. Thus, he hoped that the 'principle of a bi-National state in Palestine — two politically equal nationalities regardless of majority and minority' be adopted. Finally, he argued that if such a mechanism were to be applied to a partitioned Palestine then the 'chief conditions are given for the eventual reunion of the dismembered parts of the Holy Land'.[29]

In September 1938 Magnes met in Jerusalem Sir Harold MacMichael (British High Commissioner in Palestine) to discuss his bi-national proposals. He told him that he believed that 'partition was doomed if not dead' (and indeed two months later the Woodhead Commission rejected the partition recommendation as unworkable) and that the only solution was a 'bi-national state, without any partition'. He added that for this to succeed the British government had to play an 'essential rôle' in two areas — safeguarding the Holy Places of Palestine and facilitating the 'building up of a bi-national state'.[30] Later in that month Magnes wrote directly to the British Colonial Secretary, Malcolm MacDonald, urging him to give serious consideration to his bi-national proposals as an 'alternative to the partition of Palestine', and repeated what he had previously told MacMichael, that for this plan to work the British would have to play a key rôle in the 'protection of the Holy Places of Palestine' and in the 'establishment of a Palestinian state with two nationalities of equal status'. He then urged that the British government make this 'its declared policy and put its full strength behind it', and he offered to travel to London to discuss the proposal despite his 'reluctance to leave here [Jerusalem] in these days of stress'.[31]

MacDonald replied that it was not necessary for Magnes to 'make a special journey for this purpose'.[32] This lacklustre response was due to the widespread belief within official circles in Britain that while

Magnes was (in the words of MacMichael) 'a gentleman of scholarly attainments, great ability and acknowledged honesty',[33] he had little influence over the Zionist leadership and limited support within Jewry. John S. Bennet of the Colonial Office commented that although Magnes was 'genuine . . . it has always been doubtful whether he carries much influence in Jewish circles. In fact he typifies the aloofness of the Hebrew University from the National Home'.[34] This view was confirmed by Bennet's senior colleague, Sir John Shuckburgh, who believed that though Magnes was 'an attractive man' and that he was 'convinced of his bona fides', he was 'out of sympathy with the official Zionists and I am afraid that his views carry no weight with them'.[35]

There was moreover scepticism over the content of his proposals. In 1929, Sir John Chancellor, British High Commissioner in Palestine, described Magnes as an 'idealist altogether out of touch with reality'.[36] A decade later Shuckburgh also challenged the validity of the Swiss analogy, noting that although 'German, French and Italian Swiss may differ in race, language, traditions' unlike the Jews and Arabs in Palestine, 'at least they all belong to the same general level of progress and civilisation'.[37] More importantly, by this time politicians and mandarins in Whitehall — in the face of the bloody Arab Revolt in Palestine and worsening relations with the Zionist leadership — were not persuaded that Arab-British-Jewish co-operation was achievable. There was equally little sympathy for similar idealistic proposals emanating from other sources. In February 1939, a Paris-based group called the Committee for the Defence of the Rights of Jews in Central and Eastern Europe (whose patrons included Edouard Daladier, Paul Reynaud, and a number of French academics and religious leaders, and members of the Jewish community) submitted a memorandum to the British Foreign Secretary (Lord Halifax), setting out suggestions for what they called the 'Arab-Israelite State of Palestine' which they believed would bring a 'reconciliation between Arabs and Jews in the Holy Land'.[38] This was dismissed by the Foreign Office on the grounds that the Committee was 'completely Utopian in its approach'.[39]

The British government was concerned about anti-British sentiment in the Arab world at a time of increasing rivalry with Nazi Germany and fascist Italy in the region, and it introduced the Palestine White Paper in May 1939. This document, which became the basis of Britain's Palestine policy for the duration of the Second World War, limited Jewish immigration levels into Palestine and was supplemented by accompanying Land Transfer Regulations which restricted the sale of land to Jews in Palestine.[40] This led to an outcry in the Jewish world, even among Jewish opponents of political Zionism, like Magnes, who shared the Zionist view that the document was a subversion of the

Jewish national revival in Palestine and signalled the abandonment of European Jewry to their Nazi persecutor. Nevertheless, Magnes did welcome the fact that the war had frozen any decision on the final status of Palestine and, ever the optimist, he hoped that Jewish and Arab support for the British war effort would serve as a new basis for Jewish-Arab co-operation.[41]

In May 1942, 600 American Zionists and 60 Zionist leaders from around the world, including Chaim Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion, attended a meeting at the Biltmore Hotel in New York, where they adopted the Biltmore Declaration, which made the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine the official policy of the mainstream Zionist movement. The following August, Magnes established the Ihud (Unity) Association, to replace the defunct B'rit Shalom. Like its predecessor, Ihud advocated an Arab-Jewish bi-national state in a self-governing, undivided Palestine, based on equal political rights for the two peoples of Palestine. British officials dealing with the Palestine issue were preoccupied with defending the White Paper policy in the United States, where Zionists and their supporters in Congress were pressuring the Roosevelt administration to oppose the document, but they continued to monitor Magnes's efforts to promote his bi-national plans during the war. There were, for example, sporadic reports to Whitehall from British embassies in the Middle East on the Arab attitude to Magnes's proposals.[42] In December 1942 the British Embassy in Washington sent a report to the Foreign Office on the influence of Magnes in the United States, as well as a summary of newspaper stories on Magnes's ties to Jewish anti-Zionists in the country which they believed to be of 'some interest'.[43]

In 1943, as Britain's White Paper policy came under increasing attack from supporters of Zionism in the United States, the Foreign Office even considered sending Magnes on a 'moderate' Jewish mission to America in order to shore up support for Britain's Palestine policy. But the British Embassy in Washington advised against this on the grounds that it would only lead to 'increased controversy' since a visit by such a 'prominent and controversial figure as Dr. Magnes would probably do more harm than good, and would lead to violent Zionist counter-propaganda'.[44] By 1944 a high-level committee — which included many of the leading British military and diplomatic officials in the Middle East — was being briefed by Lord Moyne (British High Commissioner in Palestine) that the Cabinet Committee on Palestine had completely rejected the future implementation of that 'failure of a policy of bi-nationalism' since 'twenty five years of working experience had shown that this could not be hoped for'.[45] And while a number of committee members (such as Lord Killearn and Sir Kinahan Cornwallis) expressed their preference for a bi-national

solution in theory, they acknowledged the validity of the Cabinet's argument that this was not possible because the Arabs had 'hardened their hearts' and the Jews 'would never now be content with less than complete control'.[46]

The Arab Response to Magnes's Bi-national Proposals

That acknowledgement by British officials that the Arabs had 'hardened their hearts', and, therefore, were not interested in a bi-national solution, is rarely mentioned in contemporary discussions on bi-nationalism. For example, Philip Collier writing in the *Journal of Palestine Studies* in 1982 completely focused on the fact that 'Magnes and those in Israel today who are true to his ideals and beliefs, should be so utterly rejected by their people' without referring to the fact that opposition towards bi-nationalism was even more widespread among Arabs than Jews during the Mandate era.[47] Raphael Patai noted that the bi-national proposals 'never evoked any response whatsoever from the Arab side'.[48] In his 1938 letter to Colonial Secretary Malcolm MacDonald, Magnes was compelled to admit that as far as bi-nationalism was concerned the 'effective Palestinian Arab leadership is intransigent at the present time'.[49] By the end of the war little had changed and Magnes was acknowledging that although the Arab press did publish his writings, the Arabs were for the most part hostile to him.[50]

This widespread Arab antipathy to the Magnes proposals can be seen most clearly in the response to his evidence at the 1946 crucial hearings of the Anglo-American Committee. That committee was established by the British and American governments in late 1945 to examine conditions in Palestine as they related to the issues of Jewish emigration and settlement and to study the position of Europe's Jewish population which had survived the Holocaust.[51] In his evidence, before the committee's Jerusalem hearings in 1946, Magnes reiterated his arguments in favour of bi-nationalism based on 'parity' between Jews and Arabs in Palestine and the principle of free Jewish immigration (although this was subject to limits in any negotiated settlement).[52] Arab representatives at these hearings rejected his proposals out of hand; in his statement on behalf of the Arab Office — the Arab League's information body — the young Albert Hourani (later a leading British scholar of the Middle East) explained that 'the basic objection... is one of principle... to further immigration' and added[53] that a bi-national state would

> only work if a certain spirit of co-operation and trust exists... and if there is an underlying sense of unity to neutralise communal differences... but that spirit does not exist... as such Magnes' solution... [is] impossible... and if a bi-national state was created it would lead to either [the] complete

> deadlock of Palestine and the need for foreign intervention... or else domination of the whole life by communal considerations.

In answer to questions from committee members following his statement, Hourani went further and admitted that he believed that 'the parity which Magnes suggests is not as complete as it appears'. Ahmed Shukayri, Hourani's Arab Office colleague (and later the first head of the Palestine Liberation Organisation) also spoke on behalf of the Arab League. He made the same argument as Hourani, but in a far less diplomatic manner, when he claimed that 'bi-national government [was] void of justice, security, expediency'.[54]

After these hearings, the Arab League published a critique of the bi-national proposals which was circulated in London and Washington, arguing that the Magnes proposals were unacceptable and had no more legitimacy than did the orthodox Zionist call for a Jewish State in all, or part, of Palestine.[55] The following year it reiterated this view claiming that Magnes 'presented an apparent departure from the official Zionist line but in fact demanded the same thing. For in spite of its outward cloak of moderation his bi-national state is only a preliminary step to a Jewish state'. It added that the 'apparent moderation of Magnes' was a Zionist plot and that 'this distribution of rôles or functions is a tactical trick highly characteristic of Zionist propaganda [whereby the] extremist attitude of Ben-Gurion is intended to make the Magnes proposals appear as a kind of compromise which might deceive... and camouflage the real intention behind the bi-national state scheme'.[56] Later in the same year the Arab League's newspaper in London[57] summed up

> the fundamental Arab objection to the idea [of parity/bi-nationalism] is one of principle... proposals of Magnes and his group are nothing but another way of reaching the objective of Zionism, the creation of a Jewish state. For this reason the Arabs regard the views of Magnes no less extreme, and perhaps, more dangerous than those of the official Zionists because they are cloaked in an aspect of moderation and reasonableness.

The Gentile Anti-Zionist Response After 1945

By the end of the war Magnes found himself isolated among the Gentile anti-Zionist community in England — but there had been some exceptions. Colonel Stewart Newcombe continued to champion him and in September 1940 he wrote a memorandum to the Colonial Office arguing (somewhat misleadingly) that although Magnes was 'not an accepted Zionist leader... he is greatly respected by Arabs who agree that they can co-operate with him';[58] and in 1942 he told an audience at the prestigious Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) that Magnes's support of bi-nationalism

was the 'best news for a long time'.[59] However, all other leading Gentile opponents of Zionism in England at that time (such as Sir John Hope Simpson, the land and refugee expert whose report on Palestine in 1930 opposed further Jewish immigration or land settlement, and Major General Sir Edward Spears, a veteran MP, whom Churchill had appointed Minister Plenipotentiary in Lebanon and Syria during the war) opposed Magnes's proposals. Likewise, Sir Ronald Storrs, the former Governor of Jerusalem and a harsh critic of Zionism, also had little respect for what he called the 'pathetic reasonable Magnes school'.[60]

Although such men opposed partition, they rejected Magnes's view that there was an 'indissoluble historical association of the Jewish people and of Judaism' with Palestine.[61] They agreed with the Arab position that a bi-national state, rather than being a compromise, would be prejudicial to the Arabs.[62] At the heart of this Gentile anti-Zionist distaste for Magnes's proposals was a belief that his demand for 'parity' and 'equality' was unfair to the Arabs because the Palestine issue was not a matter of 'right and right', as Chaim Weizmann had told the Royal Commission on Palestine in 1937. Rather, it was a matter of right and wrong; Dr. Maude Royden-Shaw, a leading British missionary and a vocal anti-Zionist, stated during a November 1945 BBC radio discussion on Palestine, 'I cannot see that there are two rights'.[63]

Thus, in the crucial period between the end of the war in 1945 and the end of the British Mandate in 1948, bi-nationalism found little support among the Arabs, their defenders in England, or within the British government. Magnes's most committed supporter in England in these years was the Jewish-born Rita Hinden, secretary of the Fabian Colonial Bureau (FCB). That Bureau was a clearing house for information on colonial affairs and became a pressure group acting for colonial peoples. Although it was an independent body, it was closely linked to the Fabian Society — the oldest socialist organization in Britain (founded in 1881) whose early members included George Bernard Shaw, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and H. G. Wells. The Fabian Society supported the FCB by way of an annual grant, which was later augmented by the Trade Unions Congress and the Labour Party. Some members of the FCB were committed Zionists (such as Labour MP Lyall Wilkes, who was on the group's advisory committee[64]). But Rita Hinden explained to a correspondent in 1945 that the Bureau's position had 'never been to favour the complete Jewish state idea'.[65] In 1943 Magnes had approached Hinden about the possibility of forming a high-powered committee in London to support his bi-national proposals, but after consultation with other interested parties, she told Magnes that while she sympathized with his position, and believed his proposals deserved serious consideration

in Britain, it was impossible (at least through the FCB) to organize an influential body to 'enter into the whirlpool of this immense political problem'.[66]

Nevertheless, between 1943 and 1948, Magnes corresponded regularly with Rita Hinden and also sent her articles he had published or which referred to his bi-national proposals in the world press. As their personal relationship and friendship blossomed, he increasingly confided in her about his growing frustration and pessimism over the relentless hostility against him from both Jews and Arabs.[67] In turn, as she herself became increasingly disillusioned with what she considered to be the 'extreme and, what seems to most people, the unreasonable attitude being taken today [by the Zionist movement]',[68] she promised to use her position at the FCB to give Magnes whatever help she could. She also promised him that if he ever visited Britain to fight for his proposals she would put the FCB's resources at his disposal.[69]

In 1945 Rita Hinden included an essay by Magnes on bi-nationalism in the FCB's high-profile Symposium on Palestine.[70] Moreover, she made extra provisions for his contribution to the symposium to be sent as an individual pamphlet to (as she put it) 'a few key people'.[71] And although she thought it unwise for the FCB to be directly associated with the publication of his, and Ihud's, English-language publications, she did offer to help him distribute such material 'to the right people in England'.[72] She also agreed to arrange for the FCB's circulation manager to assist in the distribution of Ihud's pamphlets to a wider audience.[73] More importantly, following the Labour general election victory in 1945, Magnes consulted her on the best way to approach the new Labour government, with which the Fabians had very close ties. He asked her, for example, whether he and other Ihud leaders (most notably, Martin Buber) should write directly to Prime Minister Atlee to put forward the bi-national case.[74] He also appealed to her to use her connections with the government to get him an invitation to the 1947 London Conference on Palestine.[75] She attempted, but failed, to get Magnes invited to the talks, but told him that she could easily arrange unofficial meetings between him and members of the Labour government, although the appearance that this might give of him being forced to go by the back door was 'unsatisfactory'.[76]

Magnes and Anglo-Jewry

British Zionists were very aware of Magnes's attempts to lobby for support in Britain and they exerted much effort in countering his bi-national proposals — which they termed a 'national calamity'.[77] The Zionist press, most notably *The Zionist Review* (the organ of the

British Zionist Federation) and *New Judea* (the organ of the World Zionist Organisation in England) criticized the work of the League of Jewish Arab Co-operation, the English branch of Ihud, which was founded in 1942. In particular, Zionists argued that the League was dangerous because it highlighted a division in Jewish opinion at a time when unity was vital for the Zionist cause.[78] Moreover, they argued that the existence of such a body implied that the mainstream Zionist movement was opposed to co-operating with Arabs, which was totally untrue.[79] In 1943, British Zionists stepped up their attacks on Magnes after the publication, by the Independent Jewish Press Service, of a leaked letter purportedly written by Magnes to the leading American Jewish anti-Zionist leader Rabbi Morris Lazaron. In that letter Magnes explained that the Zionist programme was 'likely to provoke civil war in Palestine and confusion abroad' and, most controversially, he referred to Jewish nationalism as both 'chauvinistic' and 'terroristic'.[80]

British Zionists, like their counterparts in the Yishuv, were also very concerned by the fact that Magnes's position as president of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem damaged the Zionist cause in England, where that University was held in high regard. For example, following his testimony before the Anglo-American Committee, *The Times* reported that Magnes spoke in his capacity as both the 'Rector of the Hebrew University' and as the founder of Ihud.[81] Indeed, until his death in October 1948, the Zionist press in Britain continued to condemn Magnes for using his position at the Hebrew University to 'attack bitterly and [do] his best to destroy the state of Israel'.[82] Despite the Zionist dominance of Anglo-Jewry, by this time there was some support for Magnes among the influential non-Zionist organization, the Anglo-Jewish Association (AJA). The AJA was founded in 1871 as a charitable and cultural body. On the issue of Palestine, it supported Jewish settlement and was prepared to work with Zionists for the practical benefits of the Yishuv, but refused to endorse the objective of a Jewish State. AJA members believed that the bi-national proposals advocated by Magnes would promise Jews equal rights in Palestine and constitute a fair compromise to the conflict; it therefore gave much encouragement and publicity to Magnes. In 1943, for example, a number of leading members of the AJA, including the distinguished Norman Bentwich, arranged for the publication and distribution in England of a pamphlet by Magnes on bi-nationalism which had previously appeared as an article in *Foreign Affairs*.[83] The AJA's own journal, *The Jewish Monthly*, published Magnes's statements on Palestine claiming that it was both 'privileged' and 'performing a public service' in being able to present the views of Magnes which had 'received scant attention in the Anglo-Jewish press'.[84] The response of the magazine's readership to the 'prophetic message' of Magnes was so positive that

the AJA decided to publish his articles as individual pamphlets which were then distributed to members.[85]

In 1946, R. N. Carvalho, a leading member of the AJA, argued that in Magnes's proposals 'alone lies hope' and he appealed to both British Zionists and the extreme anti-Zionists of the Jewish Fellowship (who opposed the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine in principle under any circumstances) to co-operate with Magnes.[86] The Fellowship never officially endorsed a bi-national solution, and its sister organization in the United States, the American Council for Judaism, rejected the bi-national plan as undemocratic,[87] but the Fellowship's leaders lamented the fact that bi-nationalists were being 'ignored by the Zionist machine in Britain'.[88] The editors of *The Jewish Outlook*, the Jewish Fellowship's monthly magazine, also gave strong editorial support to Magnes and publicized the efforts of the League for Jewish Arab Co-operation to promote bi-nationalism in Britain.[89] Like their peers in the AJA, leading members of the Fellowship worked to promote Magnes's proposals. Most notably, Fellowship member Albert Hyamson, whose co-operation with Newcombe in the 1930s had won Magnes's endorsement, promoted bi-nationalism wherever possible. In 1943, he had co-operated with Bentwich and others in distributing in England a pamphlet by Magnes, and in 1945 he set out in *The Contemporary Review* the reasons for his support of bi-nationalism, which he viewed as a compromise between the extreme solutions of either Zionist or Arab dominance of Palestine.[90] He reiterated this view in a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1946, in which he rejected partition, and argued that 'a bi-national state in an undivided Palestine with as wide an autonomy as possible... preserves [the] unity of Palestine... [and] safeguards members of both principal communities from domination by each other'.[91] Hyamson also wrote several articles in support of Magnes in *The Jewish Outlook*.[92]

Conclusion

Magnes never abandoned his belief in the key rôle which Britain could play in promoting a bi-national solution to the Palestine problem and both he, and his small band of British supporters, regularly wrote to the British press to draw attention to the British rôle.[93] In 1947, he even proposed that potential Jewish immigrants to Palestine could instead be diverted to Great Britain as part of a bi-national solution.[94] But with the exception of some members of the non-Zionist AJA and the anti-Zionist Jewish Fellowship, Magnes could find as little support in Anglo-Jewry as among the British Arabist elite or policy makers in Whitehall. Indeed, in April 1948 he made the final trip of his life to the United States, not Britain, to lend his voice to those opposing the imminent establishment of Israel.[95]

Magnes died on 27 October 1948, five months after the establishment of the Jewish State which he had relentlessly opposed for more than two decades. In an emotional tribute, *The Spectator* weekly praised the 'humanity, good sense and humility' of his bi-national vision.[96] Even *The Zionist Review* paid him a generous tribute in an obituary entitled 'Rebel and Saint'.[97] But it was Magnes himself, in a moving letter to Rita Hinden just months before he died, who provided the most honest assessment of his struggle to promote bi-nationalism and the disillusion which he felt about championing that cause: 'I am very gloomy over it all... I hope I am wrong in this, and I am almost tempted to say that I am sure I am wrong, and this is because I seem to have been wrong in all of the things I have worked and written, and pleaded for, for more than a generation'.[98]

NOTES

[1] Ahmad Samih Khalidi, 'After Oslo', *Prospect*, October 1998, pp. 32–35, p. 35. See also his article, 'A One-State Solution', *The Guardian*, 29 September 2003.

[2] See Tony Judt, 'Israel: The Alternative', *The New York Review of Books*, vol. 50, no. 16, 23 October 2003. See also interview with Edward Said, *Reuters News Agency*, 29 June 2001 and his article 'Truth and reconciliation', *Al-Ahram Weekly*, 14–20 January 1999, no. 412.

[3] Evyatar Friesel, 'Criteria and Conception in the Historiography of German and American Zionists', *Essential Papers on Zionism*, Jehuda Reinharz and Anita Shapira eds., New York, 1996 (pp. 298–317), pp. 309, 310–311.

[4] Judah Magnes, *Palestine — Divided or United? The Case for a Bi-National Palestine before the United Nations*, Jerusalem, 1947, pp. 32, 46.

[5] Martin Buber and Judah Magnes, *Arab-Jewish Unity: Testimony before the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission for the Ihud (Union) Association*, London, 1947, p. 14.

[6] Sir John Chancellor to Lord Passfield, 2 November 1929, Chancellor Papers, Rhode House, Oxford, Box 20, File 17, cited in Judah Magnes, *The Magnes-Philby Negotiations, 1929: The Historical Record*, Jerusalem, with Introduction by Menachem Kaufman, p. 169.

[7] Judah Magnes, 'Statement on Palestine', *New York Times*, 18 July 1937.

[8] Judah Magnes, *Light Unto All the Nations*, Jerusalem, 1930.

[9] See Israel Kolatt, 'The Zionist Movement and the Arabs', in *Essential Papers on Zionism*, op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 617–647, p. 636.

[10] See, for example, Martin Buber, 'The Bi-National Approach to Zionism', in *Towards Union in Palestine: Essays on Zionism and Jewish-Arab Cooperation*, Martin Buber and Judah Magnes (eds), Jerusalem, 1947, pp. 7–13.

[11] Raphael Patai, *Journeyman in Jerusalem, Memories and Letters, 1933–1947*, Salt Lake City, 1992, p. 410.

[12] Shabtai Teveth, *Ben-Gurion, The Burning Ground 1886–1948*, Boston, 1987, p. 411.

[13] Sir Alan Cunningham to Colonial Secretary George Hall, 5 April 1946, Cunningham Papers, Box 5/2, Middle East Centre, St Antony's College, Oxford.

[14] Chancery, British Embassy, Washington to Eastern Department, Foreign Office, 19 December 1942, Public Record Office, F[oreign] O[ffice] 371/35031.

[15] Judah Magnes, *The Magnes-Philby Negotiations*, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 52.

[16] Cited in Teveth, op. cit. in Note 12 above, p. 539.

[17] Ben-Gurion to Magnes, 24 February 1938, cited in David Ben-Gurion, *My Talks with Arab Leaders*, New York, 1973, p. 186.

[18] The Balfour Declaration (named after Lord Balfour, Britain's foreign minister) was issued in the form of a letter to Lord Rothschild, the leading figure in Anglo-Jewry. The Declaration called for the 'establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people' and pledged that Great Britain would 'use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine'. Another proviso, which was responsible for much of the opposition to the Declaration within Anglo-Jewry, stated that 'nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Jews in any other country'.

[19] Harry Defries, *Conservative Party Attitudes to the Jews, 1900–1950*, London and Portland OR., 2001, p. 115.

[20] Philby to Magnes, 20 February 1930, Philby Papers, Box 10/2, Middle East Centre, St Antony's College, Oxford.

[21] See telegram from Magnes to Arthur Sulzberger, 28 October 1929, Joseph Levy papers, Box 28, Israel State Archives, cited in Judah Magnes, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 17.

[22] See Magnes, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 100.

[23] Ibid., pp. 108–109.

[24] See Hyamson and Newcombe, *Suggested Basis for Discussion on Reaching an Agreement on Palestine*, London, 1937. See also Neil Caplan, *Futile Diplomacy: Arab-Zionist Negotiations and the End of the Mandate*, vol. II, London, 1986, pp. 78–84. For the contemporary correspondence on the Hyamson-Newcombe proposals, see Jerusalem and East Mission Papers, Box LXV/2, Middle East Centre, St. Antony's College, Oxford.

[25] Ben-Gurion to Magnes, 24 February 1938, cited in Ben-Gurion, op. cit. in Note 17 above, pp. 147–167.

[26] Kolatt, op. cit. in Note 9 above, p. 638.

[27] See Report of the Palestine Royal Commission, Cmd. 5479, London, July 1937.

[28] See memorandum by Judah Magnes to the chairman and members of the Palestine Partition Commission, 27 July 1938, PRO C[olonial] O[ffice] 733/371/14.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Sir Harold MacMichael, High Commissioner, Palestine, to Sir John Shuckburgh, Colonial Office, 5 September 1938, PRO CO 733/371/14.

[31] Judah Magnes to Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, 22 September 1938, PRO CO 733/371/14.

[32] Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald to Judah Magnes, 4 October 1938, PRO CO 733/371/14.

[33] MacMichael to Shuckburgh, 5 September 1938, PRO CO 733/371/14.

[34] See comments by Bennet in minutes on 'Dr. Magnes', 14 September 1938, PRO CO 733/371/14.

[35] See comments by Shuckburgh in minutes on 'Dr. Magnes', 21 September 1938, PRO CO 733/371/14.

[36] See letter from Sir John Chancellor to Lord Passfield, 2 November 1929, Chancellor Papers, Rhode House, Oxford, Box 20, File 17, cited in *The Magnes-Philby Negotiations*, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 169.

[37] See comments by Shuckburgh in minutes on 'Dr. Magnes', 21 September 1938, PRO CO 733/371/14.

[38] See memorandum by the Committee for the Defence of the Rights of Jews in Central and Eastern Europe submitted to the Rt. Hon. Viscount Halifax, 23 February 1938, PRO FO 371/23245.

[39] J. E. Mackenzie, minutes on 'Memorandum on a Solution of Palestine Problem', 25 February 1938, PRO FO 371/23245.

[40] *Palestine, A Statement of Policy*, Cmd. 6019, London 1939. The immigration clauses of the document restricted Jewish immigration to 75,000 over the subsequent five years, after which the Arabs of Palestine would have the final say on future Jewish immigration levels.

[41] Kolatt, op. cit. in Note 9 above, p. 640.

[42] See, for example, Lascelles, British Legation, Beirut, to C. W. Baxter, Foreign Office, 29 April 1943, PRO FO 371/34958.

[43] Chancery, British Embassy, Washington to Eastern Department, Foreign Office, 19 December 1942, PRO FO 371/35031.

[44] W. G. Hayter, British Embassy, Washington to C. W. Baxter, Foreign Office, 9 March 1943, PRO FO 371/35032.

[45] 'Notes on Conference held in Commander in Chief's War Room', 6 April 1944, PRO FO 371/40135.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Philip Collier, 'A Pacific Policy', *Journal of Palestine Studies*, vol. XI–XII, no. 4–5, Summer–Fall, 1982, pp. 116–118.

[48] Raphael Patai, op. cit. in Note 11 above, p. 410.

[49] Magnes to MacDonald, 22 September 1938, CO 733/371/14.

[50] Magnes to Rita Hinden, 24 October 1945, Fabian Bureau Archives, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6, Rhodes House Library, Oxford (hereafter, FBA, followed by Box and file number).

[51] There are two main academic studies on the Anglo-American Committee. Amikam Nachmani, *Great Power Discord in Palestine: The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry into the Problems of European Jewry and Palestine*, London, 1986 and Alan H. Podet, *The Success and Failure of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, 1945–46: The Last Chance in Palestine*, Lewiston and Queenston, 1986. See also Michael J. Cohen, 'The Genesis of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine, November 1945: A Case Study on the Assertion of American Hegemony', *Historical Journal*, vol. 22, no. 1, January 1979, pp. 186–207.

[52] See Buber and Magnes, op. cit in Note 5 above.

[53] Evidence of Albert Hourani and Ahmed Shukayri on behalf of the Arab Office, before the Anglo-American Committee, Jerusalem Hearings, 25 March 1946, pp. 96–134, p. 104.

[54] Ibid, p. 100.

[55] See *The Problem of Palestine: Summary of the Arab Point of View*, London, 1946, p. 3.

[56] 'A Review of Zionist Evidence before the UN Fact Finding Committee in Palestine', *Arab News Bulletin*, Supplement to no. 43, 8 August 1947, p. 5.

[57] 'Solution Unacceptable to the Arabs', *Arab News Bulletin*, no. 52, October 1947, p. 1.

[58] Newcombe, 'Memorandum on the Palestine White Paper', 12 September 1940, PRO CO 732/86/28.

[59] Newcombe, 'Arab Countries', Chatham House speech, 17 September 1942, Archives of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, no. 8/860.

[60] See Manuscript Diary of Sir Ronald Storrs, 1 February 1945, Storrs Papers, Box 6/6, Pembroke College, Cambridge.

[61] Buber and Magnes, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 14.

[62] Sir John Hope Simpson to Sir Edward Spears, 31 August 1945; Sir Edward Spears to Sir John Hope Simpson, 12 September 1945, Spears Papers, Box 6/2, Middle East Centre, St. Antony's College, Oxford. See also Sir John Hope Simpson, 'The Jewish World Since 1939: Comment on Dr. James Parkes' Paper', *International Affairs*, vol. 21, 1945, pp. 100–105, p. 101.

[63] Royden Shaw, 'The Future of Palestine', BBC Home Service, 26 October 1945, reprinted in *The Listener*, vol. 34, no. 877, November 1945, pp. 479–495, p. 480.

[64] For evidence of Wilkes's pro-Zionism see his pamphlet, *Palestine: The Stark Facts and the Way Out: A Tract For Labour MP's and Others*, London 1948.

[65] Hinden to B. Boroker, 12 December 1945, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[66] Hinden to Magnes, 13 August 1943, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[67] Magnes to Hinden, 24 October 1945 and 27 December 1945, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[68] Hinden to Magnes, 10 January 1946, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[69] Hinden to Magnes, 30 November 1945, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[70] See Judah Magnes, 'The Case for Jewish-Arab Co-operation', *The Palestine Controversy, A Symposium*, London, 1945.

[71] Hinden to Magnes, 27 September 1945, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[72] Hinden to Magnes, 1 November 1946, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[73] Hinden to I. Kopiowitz, 25 February 1946, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[74] Magnes to Hinden, 21 November 1946, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[75] Magnes to Hinden, 22 January 1947, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[76] Hinden to Magnes, 28 January 1947, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[77] *The Zionist Review*, 5 October 1945, p. 8.

[78] See, for example, B. Rabinowitz's *Zionism and the Arabs*, London, 1946, p. 34.

[79] 'A New Group', *The Zionist Review*, 28 June 1946, p. 2.

[80] 'Magnes Encourages American Anti-Zionist Rabbis', *Independent Jewish Press Service*, 4 December 1942.

[81] *The Times*, 15 March 1946.

[82] 'On Jewish Humanists', *The Zionist Review*, 10 September 1948, p. 8.

[83] See Magnes to Hinden, 15 June 1943, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

[84] 'Commentary', *The Jewish Monthly*, vol. 1, no. 10, January 1948, p. 2. Also see the article on Magnes's proposals in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 'Dr. Magnes Again Suggests a Bi-National State', 5 January 1945, p. 8. At the end of 1946 Magnes contributed an article to the *Jewish Chronicle* entitled 'The Bi-National State Proposal: Ihud's Plan for Palestine', 27 December 1946, p. 14.

[85] For the positive response to Magnes among AJA members, see Walter J. Wolfgang's letter to the editor of *The Jewish Monthly*, vol. 1, no. 11, February 1948, p. 7.

[86] See R. N. Carvalho, 'Arab Jewish Unity: Testimony of Magnes and Buber before the Anglo-American Committee', *The Jewish Monthly*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1946, p. 4.

[87] Thomas A. Kolsky, *Jews Against Zionism*, Philadelphia, 1990, p. 114.

[88] See *The Jewish Outlook*, vol. 2, no. 3, August 1947, p. 10.

[89] See, for example, *The Jewish Outlook*, vol. 2, no. 1, June 1947, p. 6.

[90] Albert Hyamson, 'The Problem of Palestine', *The Contemporary Review*, April 1945, pp. 221–226, p. 221.

[91] The *Jewish Chronicle*, 20 September 1946, p. 16.

[92] See Albert Hyamson, 'The Problem of Palestine', *The Jewish Outlook*, vol. 1, no. 7, November 1946, p. 10 and 'Hope for Palestine', *The Jewish Outlook*, vol. 2, no. 5, November–December 1947, p. 3.

[93] See, for example, letter from Magnes to the editor of *The Times*, 26 September 1945, and letter from Evelyn Wrench in support of Magnes's efforts to find a peaceful solution to the Palestine problem, *The Times*, 25 August 1945.

[94] See Magnes's letter to the editor of *The New York Times*, 18 February 1947.

[95] Kolsky, op. cit. in Note 87 above, p. 186.

[96] 'A Spectator's Notebook', *The Spectator*, 5 November 1948, p. 581.

[97] 'Rebel and Saint', *The Zionist Review*, 5 November 1948, p. 8.

[98] Magnes to Hinden, 15 January 1948, FBA, Mss.Brit.s.365, Box 176/6.

THE RENAISSANCE OF HASSIDISM

William Shaffir

(Review Article)

JACQUES GUTWIRTH, *The Rebirth of Hasidism: 1945 to the Present Day* (translated from the French by Sophie Leighton), vii + 198 pp., Free Association Books, London, 2005, £19.95 or $35.00, paperback.

JACQUES Gutwirth is a veteran ethnographer whose anthropological research on hassidic Jewry is extensive. We first met in the early 1970s when he came to Montreal to study the city's hassidim. I was then in the midst of my Master's research on some of the sects in that city and was still comparatively naïve about collecting data which would help to generate what C. Geertz identified as 'thick description'.[1] Gutwirth understood that approach only too well: it was hard not to be impressed by his ability to produce detailed observations after a visit to a hassidic establishment or neighbourhood.

The Rebirth of Hasidism documents what is indubitably an unexpected and remarkable success: the regeneration of Hassidism after the Second World War. Hassidic communities had been very nearly destroyed by the Nazi genocide in Europe: only some 20,000 of their members had survived by 1945. Today, there are between 350,000 and 400,000, with about half that total living in Israel. Gutwirth gives a vivid portrait of their major centres — in Antwerp, New York, and Paris as well as in Jerusalem and Bene Beraq(*sic*). He stresses that while apparently uniform to the untrained eye, hassidim are divided into distinct sects of dynasties, each owing allegiance to a charismatic leader, a *rebbe*. He focuses on such matters as the social and political contexts of the various communities, the range of institutional supports available to the followers, the activities of the *rebbe*, gender relations, and various social control measures to limit contact with the secular world. The result is a rich overview of hassidic life today. Perhaps paradoxically, the hassidic success has strained the economic and

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 48, nos. 1 and 2, 2006

social resources which are necessary to sustain their growth. The long-term consequences flowing from this development will impact negatively on their social cohesion: they will be increasingly required to move beyond their own institutions for support — thereby weakening the boundaries which insulate their enclaves.

After an outline of the history and development of Hassidism, the author proceeds to examine the various centres of the movement. He starts with Antwerp, the Belgian city where he conducted his doctoral research, which resulted in his outstanding *Vie juive traditionelle: ethnologie d'une communauté hassidique.*[2] During the years immediately following the end of the Second World War, Jewish survivors of the death camps and other displaced Jews from Poland, Hungary, and Romania found temporary refuge in Belgium. Gutwirth estimates that there are now no less than 950 hassidic households in Antwerp, with a total of between 4,750 and 5,700 individual members. They account for at least one quarter of Antwerp's Jewry. The chapter on that city serves as a blueprint for the others: a complete understanding of the hassidic lifestyle must necessarily examine interactions with Jewish and Gentile neighbours as well as involvement in the local (and even sometimes in the national) political life.

In the following chapters, Gutwirth concentrates on three Brooklyn areas in New York state which are home to hassidic dynasties: Williamsburg, Boro Park, and Crown Heights. Williamsburg is the bastion of the Satmar sect: some 40,000 hassidim live there (p. 28) including half of all American Satmar hassidim. That Satmar total has been estimated to number 5,000 to 6,000 households in the United States and Gutwirth notes that there is an average of six persons per household — two adults and four children. The three regions of New York state where they reside are home to some 30,000 to 36,000 individual followers of Satmar — who have experienced a dramatic expansion since the end of the Second World War. He draws particular attention to their anti-Zionist ideology. They are active in the kasher industry and the provision of religious equipment — working as ritual slaughterers, supervisors to oversee the preparation and production of food, and scribes for the Hebrew inscription on parchments for Torah scrolls and phylaceteries — but they are also employed in secular occupations: photographic equipment, bookbinding and printing, photography, electronic sales and computer programming. An increasing number of men and women work outside the boundaries of their enclaves and are therefore not subject to all the social-control measures which regulate the Satmar who remain within.

In the early 1970s, the Satmar established the Kiryas Yoel community in a rural area some 80 kilometres from New York city. The expansion of the sect in Williamsburg necessitated the provision of another settlement to house the overflow and it was decided to found

a satellite settlement in an environment removed from the distractions of urban life. The first name of the recently-deceased *rebbe* at the time was Yoel and the new enclave was called KiryasYoel in his honour. In recent years it numbered 1,322 households totalling about 7,500 residents. The leaders of this autonomous township have had to engage in political negotiations in order to ensure that the Satmar residents remain tightly insulated from secular influences but might also secure various advantages.

A significant number of hassidim settled in Boro Park in the 1960s: by the twenty-first century, there were about 60,000 of them, with the Bobover sect constituting some 10,000 to 12,000 or 15 to 20 per cent. While Williamsburg is dominated by one sect, that of the Satmar, Boro Park is home to about 20 hassidic dynasties who are mainly of Polish origin. Financial difficulties in housing and in catering for a rapidly-expanding population have obliged the leaders of these various communities in Boro Park to establish jointly the Council of Jewish Organizations in Boro Park (COJO) to promote economic development. That has resulted in the emergence of a number of local entrepreneurs to whom local and state politicians increasingly turn for electoral support.

Crown Heights in Brooklyn is inhabited mainly by one sect: the Lubavitcher hassidim, who number 12,000 to 16,000 residents. It is the headquarters of the Lubavitch movement which is also known by the acronym of Habad — *hokhma* (wisdom), *bina* (understanding) and *da'at* (knowledge). Its famous *rebbe* (who died in 1994 and has not been replaced by an acknowledged new *rebbe*) for several decades was Menachem Mendel Schneerson. He had acquired (in addition to his yeshiva studies) secular knowledge: he had been a student at the University of Berlin (where he studied philosophy, mathematics, and physics) and in Paris he was enrolled at the higher institute of civil engineering (p. 65). This highly unusual accomplishment for a leader of a powerful hassidic movement had led to his influence on unobservant Jews who were persuaded to sponsor the Lubavitcher. Hassidim generally refrain from close contact with secular Jews but the Lubavitch seek them out and proselytize; Gutwirth documents their innovative measures — such as radio and television programmes, video cassettes, billboard advertising, and the development of sophisticated websites. He comments that while 'the other Hasidic leaders have misgivings about radio and are opposed to the use of television and the internet because of all the "obscenities" that these media transmit, the rebbe, probably influenced by his technical knowledge and his interest in technology, did not hesitate to use it for "positive" ends' (p. 69). The chapter also describes the active rôle of the Lubavitch in local and in Israeli politics — as well as their dramatic (but controversial) media blitz in the late 1980s asserting that their charismatic leader, Rabbi

Schneerson, was the Moshiach (the Messiah). In the event, the *rebbe* had a stroke which left him speechless for more than a year and he died in 1994 in a New York hospital.

There are two chapters on hassidim in Israel; the majority live in Jerusalem and in Bene Beraq. In Jerusalem, they are concentrated in Mea Shearim, an area packed with synagogues and *shteebleh* (plural of *shteebl*, typically a one-room prayer hall), as well as ritual baths, religious schools and yeshivot interspersed with numerous shops for food, religious articles, clothing, and religious literature. Mea Shearim is home to the 'trendy' Bratzlaver hassidim and has pockets of Belzer, Gerer, and Satmarer; it is also the seat of Toldot Aron, a group commonly labelled as the most extremist hassidic element owing to its strident opposition to the Jewish State in Israel. Finally, in that chapter, the author examines the institutional expansion of the Belz and Ger communities and their involvement in Israeli politics.

The next chapter deals with Bene Beraq, which has 145,000 inhabitants; some 85 per cent of the residents are ultra-Orthodox — unlike the case in Jerusalem, where the ultra-Orthodox constitute only a minority of the Jewish population. Not all the Bene Beraq ultra-Orthodox are members of hassidic sects, but the multitude of synagogues and yeshivot there are a magnet for both hassidim and *mitnagdim* ('the orthodox opponents of Hasidism', p. 189); the latter are mainly of Lithuanian and Russian origin. A main focus of this chapter is on the Vishnitz hassidim, whose enclave houses some 6,000 followers. Both in Jerusalem and in Bene Beraq, a large proportion of the households live below the poverty line. The chapter also describes several other hassidic pockets: in Tel Aviv, the Lubavitch settlements in Kfar Habad and Nachlat Har Habad; a hassidic centre near Natanya, Kiryat Sanz, established by the Klausenburger *rebbe*; and a few settlements on the West Bank.

A chapter on the hassidim in France follows. Readers of this Journal will have seen the article by the author in the 2005 volume, describing the rebirth of Hassidism in France. The Lubavitch in that country now number between 10,000 and 15,000 followers. In the early 1960s, Jews from North Africa left Algeria and Morocco as well as Tunisia when these countries achieved independence; a large proportion settled in France and the Lubavitch were quick to help with their vast institutional structure, including an array of educational facilities. The large majority of the present-day Lubavitcher in France nowadays are the children and grandchildren of the immigrants of the 1960s.

The last chapter gives an overall assessment of hassidic life today. Gutwirth speculates about the hassidic organization as a source of psychological support for its members, the movement's projected demographic forecasts, the interplay between traditionalism and the tentative courtship with aspects of modernity; the status of women; and whether the movement is experiencing a spiritual or intellectual

revival. Although he identifies several hassidic features which he finds unattractive (negative attitudes toward women, the rejection of secular knowledge for anything other than immediate practical purposes, and the parochial nature of its culture) he remains optimistic about the movement's prospects. He sees Hassidism as a movement offering not only spiritual nourishment, but also as a successful organization with an effective system of social assistance to provide support for the Orthodox way of life of its adherents.

However, Gutwirth's guarded optimism is perhaps not fully justified. Hassidic communities are facing major social changes whose impact may not be easily cushioned by the measures of control which were successful in the past. That is especially evident in the case of households living below the poverty line. The demographic explosion is so large that it may not be possible to raise sufficient charitable funds to meet the essential needs of the hassidim. Furthermore, it may be that the next generation of charismatic leaders will not emerge in sufficient numbers or in sufficient spirituality to attract the unqualified devotion of followers or the appeal of their predecessors to non-hassidic benefactors who seek merit in financing the ultra-Orthodox. In the absence of such support, will the hassidim be in a position to sustain their institutions and to provide for their followers' sustenance in the manner to which they have become accustomed?

The author has certainly captured the vibrancy of the present hassidic movement, as seen from the outside. But a somewhat less rosy picture is beginning to emerge from a closer viewpoint: high-speed internet is now being used for purposes other than those specifically sanctioned — thus providing the means to engage from the comfort of one's home with elements of secular culture which hassidic authorities condemn. Moreover, such forbidden contacts may be pursued in the privacy of one's room, even without the knowledge of other members of the household. Of course, that may not as yet be the case for a large proportion of hassidim — not as yet. My own recent observations have persuaded me that the gap between the idyllic representation of the hassidic lifestyle and the practices of an increasing number of hassidim is widening. The short (and long-term) consequences of this development will emerge sooner or later.

Gutwirth does acknowledge that his choice of hassidic centres is selective: he does not deal in any detail with the situation in Montreal or in London — two cities with sizable hassidic populations. But that does not invalidate the contours of his analysis. The success of hassidic Jewry in regenerating and safeguarding a way of life which had almost disappeared is quite remarkable. In spite of the reservations about the future, there is room nevertheless for some optimism. When the first young Lubavitcher came to Montreal in 1941, local non-hassidic

Jews lay bets as to whether the beards and the distinctive garb would continue to exist in the next generation. They have done so for more than two generations, as has the lifestyle.

The Rebirth of Hasidism is superbly documented, enabling the reader to consult the original sources upon which the author has drawn. However, the translation from his French text uses some awkward English phrases. There is a glossary of Hebrew and Yiddish terms, but the appendix (pp. 153–54) of little more than one page — dealing with the various methods used by the author to gather his data — would have benefited from a fuller discussion by an ethnographer of Gutwirth's skill and experience. Nevertheless, students of Hassidism will consider this volume to be an indispensable addition to their library.

NOTES

[1] Clifford Geertz, 'Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture', in R. M. Emerson, ed., *Contemporary Field Research*, Boston, 1983.

[2] Jacques Gutwirth, *Vie juive traditionelle: ethnologie d'une communauté hassidique*, Paris, 1970.

THE BAAL SHEM TOV

Norman Solomon

(Review Article)

IMMANUEL ETKES, *The Besht: Magician, Mystic, and Leader*, translated from the Hebrew by Saadya Sternberg, Brandeis University Press, Waltham, Ma., 2005, $39.95.

THREE eighteenth-century Jewish leaders epitomize the trends which dominated most Jewish religious thought in the West until very recently. The lives of these three remarkable men overlapped by just over 30 years, from 1729 to 1760; but they never met. They were so different in both temperament and intellectual outlook that it is challenging to imagine how they might have conversed — had such a meeting ever taken place. The three were Moses Mendelssohn (1729–1786), the pioneer of Enlightenment Judaism; Elijah, the Vilna Gaon (1720–1799), the archetypal rabbinic scholar, mistrustful of religious enthusiasm but utterly devoted to Torah learning and piety; and Israel ben Eliezer (1700–1760), more commonly known as the *Baal Shem Tov*, abbreviated to *Besht*.

Immanuel Etkes published his influential Hebrew biography of the Vilna Gaon in 1998; an English translation by Jeffrey M. Green, *The Gaon of Vilna: The Man and his Image*, appeared in 2002 (Berkeley, University of California Press). The present work, of which the Hebrew original was published in 2000, seeks the reality behind the legendary images of the *Baal Shem Tov*. The work is not quite a biography of the *Besht*: anyone who picks it up, expecting an ordered and carefully-documented life-story of Israel ben Eliezer, will be disappointed. On the other hand, it is more than a mere biography: its chapters explore in depth the principal issues surrounding the man and his life's work, and offer a critical examination of the meagre available sources.

In the first chapter — 'Magic and Miracle Workers in the Days of the Baal Shem Tov' — Etkes takes issue with 'Hasidic historiography' (accounts of Hassidism by earlier historians such as Graetz and Dubnow) for the way its practitioners have denigrated magic and the

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 48, nos. 1 and 2, 2006

arts of the *baalei shem* (*baalei* is the Hebrew plural of *baal*) as exploitation of the crass superstition of the ignorant masses. He adduces a great deal of evidence to demonstrate that it was not only the ignorant masses who held such beliefs in the eighteenth century and earlier, but leading rabbis and scholars: the *Baal Shem Tov*, purveying cures through miracles, potions, spells, and the like was in harmony with the outlook of his time and place, distinguished only by the reputation that his cures had greater efficacy than those of his rival *baalei shem*. His historical description is broadly correct, although he does not explain how it was shown that the *Besht*'s cures were more efficacious than anyone else's. However, the *maskilim* Etkes has in his sights were surely aware of the widespread belief in superstition, and if they castigated the *Baal Shem Tov* and hassidic leaders for preying on the ignorance and superstition of the masses, this was a veiled way of attacking what they believed to be the benighted ethos of Eastern European Jewry in general — both the leaders and the led.

In the second chapter, the author seeks to demonstrate the distinctive character of the *Besht*'s practice as a *baal shem*. A group of stories has been preserved narrating how the *Besht* acquired his great knowledge through secret writings he had received from a certain 'Rabbi Adam'. Previous scholars have identified the mysterious 'Rabbi Adam' as a follower of the false messiah Shabbetai Zevi, or even as a Christian: in either case, his true identity would be concealed. Almost half a century ago, Khone Shmeruk undermined these theories by his discovery of a seventeenth-century Yiddish text containing fabulous tales of Rabbi Adam, though Ze'ev Gries could still maintain that the stories linking the *Besht* with Rabbi Adam were a cover for the connection he claimed with Isaac Luria, whose incarnation he believed himself to be. Etkes rejects the attempts at historical reconstruction and interprets the Rabbi Adam stories as an attempt to establish the *Besht*'s credentials — since the *Besht* had neither a distinguished ancestry nor any known teacher. Tales of the secret writings enhanced his reputation and bolstered his self-confidence as one who practised with authority, and enabled him to disparage the activities of rival *baalei shem* and so exercise the leadership rôle which forms the topic of the next chapter.

The *Besht* was obviously deeply concerned with the well-being of the Jewish people; when they were threatened with apostasy and persecution he was quite ready to intercede on their behalf with God, the Messiah, and the chief demon Samael, on his periodic excursions to the 'Upper Worlds'. Two of these 'excursions' are graphically narrated by the *Besht* himself in letters to his brother-in-law Gershon of Kotov. His earthly interventions appear to have been confined within the Jewish community, and concern the lease-holding business and the supervision of *sheḥita*. Whether such interventions qualify

him as a 'leader' in a conventional political sense, or how effective they were, seems open to debate; however, the image they convey contributed to the model of later hassidic leadership.

The chapter on the *Besht* 'as Mystic and Pioneer in Divine Worship' forms the kernel of the work. Etkes poses the question: in what way did the *Besht*'s mysticism differ from that of other Jewish mystics — for instance, from the path of *devequt* ('cleaving' to God) practised by the Safed mystics? He identifies four distinctive aspects of the *Besht*'s path: *devequt* is an ecstatic episode, brief and intense, not a continual focus of thought on God; unlike the Safed mystics, he talks of a direct *devequt* with God, not with some kabbalistic emanation; the *Besht* implies that God's immanence in the world is absolute, without gradations; finally, the *Besht* did not seek an elevated state through ascetic practices, but adopted gratification of the body as a means of elevating the soul (p. 123).

Etkes cites (on p. 125) a seminal passage in the *Shivhei Habesht* which describes, though not at first-hand, the way the *Besht* entered a mystical state through intense prayer:

> The Besht was seized with a violent shaking and trembled and went on trembling as he always did during his prayer... [when] the Besht remained in his place and did not move onward toward the Ark, R. Wolf Kotses the Hasid came and looked at his face and saw that it was burning like a torch and that his eyes were bulging out and were open and motionless as if he was dying heaven forbid... they had to put off reading from the Torah until he calmed down from his trembling.

After such states the *Besht* would often report a journey to the 'Upper World', where he would converse with figures such as the Messiah, interceding where he could on behalf of threatened and persecuted Jews. Now of course the *Besht*'s contemporaries, at least those who had confidence in his powers, would accept such reports and marvel at them; the reports accorded well with their world-view, and it is for the historian to note this. But surely the modern historian needs to offer some comment on the psychological state of a man who behaved in this strange way. There is of course insufficient evidence for a proper diagnosis, though one suspects catatonia, or a hysterical conversion syndrome; the latter would account for the bulging eyes and 'shining' face, especially if he held his breath. Etkes, however, does not consider the psychological aspects, but takes the reports at their face value as accounts of journeys of the soul to God, conceding only that since the experience cannot be properly described in words, the *Besht* would simply have done the best he could with the language available to him.

Other than his own letters, the main source for a life of the *Besht* is the hagiography known as *Shivhei Habesht*; this is an anthology of about 250

stories, many of them fanciful in the extreme, first printed close to half a century after the *Besht*'s death — having been edited both by the compiler of the stories, Dov Ber of Lince, and by the printer, Israel Jaffe. It tells us more about the editors and their intended audiences than it does about the subject. In Chapter Six, Etkes takes issue with Moshe Rosman on the value of this work as a historical source. Rosman considers it of little worth, but Etkes has little difficulty in demonstrating that the number of stories apposite to the agendas of either the compiler or the printer is quite small and he adds (p. 241) that 'the origins of the majority of the tales are well-known figures who were members of the rabbinical elite or who held religious offices. Moreover, a few of the storytellers knew the Besht and his associates in person'. Etkes concludes that the stories of healing the sick, of exorcising dybbuks and demons, and of ecstatic prayers and 'performances in the Upper Worlds' are to be acknowledged by the historian if he is not to fail 'in his obligations to understand and describe the figure of the Besht as the Besht himself and those surrounding him perceived it' (p. 243). We can, in addition, learn from them the geographic range of the *Besht*'s circuit as a *baal shem* (itinerant healer), the nature of the circle with which he was most involved, and a good deal about the society in which he lived and his relations with it.

The *Besht* himself, writing to his brother-in-law, refers to *havura sheli* ('my group'). Was this a circle like the other known pietistic ('hassidic', though not in the later sense) fraternities which are known from that period and earlier? Etkes argues that the *havura* was the innermost ring within such a circle, formed of the *Besht*'s constant companions with whom he prayed regularly in Medžibož (Volhynia, Ukraine); yet the circle differed in significant ways both from the earlier fraternities and from the later hassidic 'court'. Hassidism as a movement did not crystallize until a decade or two after the Besht's death, but it was the members of his circle who carried his reputation as a mystic of the highest rank, and his new style of ecstatic worship, into the new movement; it was to this circle, rather than to the broader public, that the *Besht* entrusted his 'message'.

Etkes's work is an important addition to the literature, well-documented and soundly argued; it both complements and challenges Moshe Rosman's biography, *Founder of Hasidism: A Quest for the Historical Ba'al Shem Tov*, published by University of California Press in 1996. If any criticism is to be made, it is of a type of tunnel vision which characterizes much Jewish scholarship, and tends to see Judaism as evolving in isolation from religious developments elsewhere. It would be interesting to have the author's thoughts, for instance, on the relationship of the *Besht*'s attitudes to prayer, mysticism, and leadership with those of local Christian charismatics such as the Philopowcy

and the Doukhobors, sects deriving from the Old Believers, a matter to which attention was drawn by Yaffa Eliach already in 1968. Indeed, eighteenth-century Europe was plagued or blessed, depending on your point of view, by a wide range of mystical and charismatic sects. Hassidism did not evolve in a vacuum.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOHN COOPER, *Pride Versus Prejudice. Jewish Doctors and Lawyers in England, 1890–1990*, x + 451 pp., The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, Oxford and Portland, OR, 2003, £37.50.

This belated review has been greatly delayed because a medical consultant married to a lawyer — who seemed to be an ideal person to approach — did not in the end produce a typescript. Perhaps the waiting list of books accepted for review was even longer than the list of patients waiting for an appointment.

John Cooper's volume is a remarkable work of scholarship. It has been researched since at least the 1990s, for several references give dates of interviews which he carried out in those years and well into the present century. There are abundant footnotes at the bottom of practically every single one of the 400 pages which constitute the main text. His Introduction is succinct and the book is written in clear grammatical prose while the proofreading has been admirable — a very rare achievement nowadays. He tells us that he is a solicitor and that his decision to focus on medicine as well as the law was in part owing to the fact it is 'the profession which Jews entered in the greatest numbers; moreover, it is well researched and the Wellcome Institute offers magnificent facilities...' (p. 1). The list of lawyers and doctors (whose careers he describes briefly or at some length) is most extensive. I was acquainted since my student days at the London School of Economics with several of the lawyers whom he mentions; and with a few of the doctors and surgeons either as a patient or as a friend or relative of a patient whom I accompanied (sometimes because their knowledge of English was very limited). In every case with which I was personally acquainted, I found his description of the professional individual's background, career, and personal characteristics to be fair and perceptive.

John Cooper explains why until the 1940s it was far more expensive to train as a solicitor than as a physician. A solicitor had to be articled and the fees were often unaffordable for parents with modest means: they had 'to pay a premium of between 300 and 500 guineas in the 1930s and 1940s,... a stamp fee of £80' and a trainee was given a salary only in exceptional circumstances. Articles were usually for five years. In the late 1920s, a medical student's fees were £35 to £40 per annum for the same period of five years, while scholarships

were available for some of the brighter students. Lucien Isaacs in the 1920s 'was fortunate' as an articled clerk to be given a wage of ten shillings a week (pp. 184–85).

In the Victorian era, several lawyers were members of wealthy Sephardi families who had settled and prospered in England in the eighteenth century and whose sons were sent to public school. But Oxford and Cambridge colleges were affiliated to the established church and they could not grant a degree to Jewish students until the 1850s while the University Tests Act of 1871 'threw open fellowships and professorships to all suitable candidates irrespective of religious belief' (p. 12). The University of London, which was incorporated in 1837, was not affiliated to the established church and its Jewish students could receive degrees. However, lower middle-class parents — such as small shopkeepers — discouraged their sons from following their ambition to enter the professions since, as a correspondent writing to the *Jewish Chronicle* as late as 1904 noted, a lawyer or a doctor could not be expected to make a living before the age of thirty (p. 12).

Moreover, there was a great deal of undisguised prejudice in obtaining promotion in these professions: John Cooper provides ample evidence throughout the volume of lawyers and medical men failing to rise in their chosen career because they were Jews and the governing bodies of these professions preferred to appoint Christians whom they found more congenial. There is also written evidence of eminent Jewish lawyers or doctors advising their Jewish protégés to adopt a respectful stance at interviews in order to create a better impression of deference. That was the position until the 1970s. It is therefore not surprising that a number of aspiring Jewish lawyers or medical men distanced themselves from the Jewish community; some anglicized their names, took a non-Jewish spouse and their children were raised as Christians, while a few others went further and converted to Christianity. Indeed, it was the very fear of such a denial of Jewishness which caused Jewish parents to object to a professional choice of career; John Cooper tells us in the first page of his Introduction that this was the attitude of one of his grandfathers: he was adamant in opposing one of his sons who wished to qualify for a profession, 'seeing such a career as a well-trodden path to assimilation — a view that deterred many Jews from joining a profession'. That did not surprise me: much later than the epoch of that grandfather, I was working in a Sephardi London office to help resettle middle-class Sephardi refugees from Egypt and was offered a full scholarship for a teenage boy suitably qualified to profit from an education at the boarding school in Scotland which had been attended by Prince Charles. There was such a boy in one of the refugee families and I was well acquainted with his mother. The founder of that school had gone so far as to offer to lodge the boy during the school holidays

with a local family, since his parents might not be able to pay the railway fares to London for the Christmas and Easter vacations. To my amazement, the parents politely refused the offer and sent their son to a local comprehensive school in London where he did not show any interest in his studies and failed to pass even the French examination — although French was his mother tongue. Years later, the parents told me that they now regretted the decision to refuse the Scottish scholarship, but the local family who had offered to welcome the boy during the Christmas and Easter vacations was that of the local clergyman and, although the founder and headmaster was a German Jew who had fled Nazi Germany, they had feared that the boy who was only 14 years old might be tempted to distance himself from Judaism. (*Kashrut* was not a serious consideration, since they were not strictly observant and ate non-kasher food outside their home.) A cousin had been sent to study in England some years earlier and married a Christian woman, and was now estranged from his Sephardi roots.

On the other hand, John Cooper relates instances of Jewish professionals taking pride in their Judaism. Many of the older generation of consultants in Britain were the sons of rabbis (p. 284) and, although several tended to distance themselves from strictly Orthodox practice, they took an active part in Reform synagogues. Professor Joseph Yoffey (1902–1994) was the son of a Manchester rabbi and professor of anatomy at Bristol University from 1940 to 1976. He was well versed in the Talmud and 'helped Israel's new medical schools and the rabbinical authorities to formulate policies on post-mortems and dissections' (p. 284). The famous anaesthetist Professor William Mushin (1910–1993) was the son of a headmaster of a Talmud Torah and after he was invited to open a new department in Cardiff in 1947, he became a founder member of the Cardiff Reform Synagogue. Jack (Jacob) Pepys (1914–1996) was a professor of clinical immunology and a member of the Upper Berkeley Street Reform Synagogue but his son, Professor Mark Pepys FRS, born in 1944, is said by John Cooper to belong to an Orthodox congregation. Cooper adds that by the 1970s Jewish doctors could express their Jewishness openly: 'In multiracial and multicultural British society, the espousal of Judaism and the retention of Jewish values was no longer a burden' (p. 285).

As for lawyers, they also suffered from open prejudice when applying for promotion until well into the twentieth century — although there were exceptions: Rufus Isaacs (1860–1935) was appointed Solicitor-General and knighted in 1910; three years later he was sworn in as Lord Chief Justice; he became the first Marquess of Reading and 'in turn was ... British ambassador to the United States, Viceroy of India, and Foreign Secretary — positions most of which had never

before been filled by a Jew' (p. 104). He was not an observant Jew and his son later noted (pp. 109–10):

> . . he never severed connection with Judaism and left in his will instructions that at his funeral there was to be 'a simple Jewish service' . . .

JUDITH FREEDMAN

LADISLAU GYÉMÁNT, *Evreii din Transilvania. Destin istoric*, 147 pp. in Romanian; followed by English translation, *The Jews of Transylvania* by Simona Farcasan, pp. 152–313, Romanian Cultural Institute, Cluj-Napoca, 2004, n.p.

This book by the distinguished scholar Professor Ladislau Gyémánt of the University of Cluj-Napoca in Romania, aptly memorializes a formerly vibrant part of Eastern European Jewry which is currently fading away. Jews lived in Transylvania (the region to the west of the Carpathian mountains) for many centuries, but the small settlements suffered persecution and destruction, especially during the sixteenth century. It was only in 1623 that the first organized Jewish community in Alba-Iulia was legally established and was granted civil and religious rights. It was founded by Sephardi Jews who came from Turkey and the Balkans. Thereafter, Transylvanian Jewry developed fairly rapidly, with Jews migrating into the region from Poland, Turkey, Moldavia, Wallachia, Hungary, Moravia, and other parts of central Europe. The population reached its peak in 1910 when it numbered 230,000, with hundreds of organized communities in towns and villages.

The Jews of Transylvania lived in a multicultural environment, in an area with a most diversified ethnic composition, primarily Romanians and Hungarians, but also Saxons, the Schwaben, Gipsies, and Serbs, as well as sub-ethnic groups such as the Hungarian-speaking Szeklers (Szekely) in the south-eastern part of the region and the Romanian Motii of the Western mountains. The Jews, despite their diverse origins, amalgamated fairly quickly and became wedded to the larger Hungarian Jewry, on the whole adopting the Hungarian language and identifying with the particular culture developed by Hungarian Jewry. Transylvania was a Principality with some independence, but was mostly ruled by the Hungarians and then in recent centuries by the Austrian and Austro Hungarian Empires. The development of Transylvanian Jewry was greatly influenced by the Habsburg Emperors, especially by Maria Theresa during the eighteenth century who — although known as 'the enlightened monarch' — maintained a discriminatory policy towards the Jews; and by Francis Joseph who, unlike Maria Theresa, gave a tremendous impetus to the emanci-

pation of the Jews in Transylvania during the second half of the nineteenth century, and right up to the First World War.

Gyémánt's book charts the developments in the life of Transylvanian Jewry, providing us with very rich historical, demographic, and socio-economic data, which some readers may find difficult to wade through. His meticulous and detailed account, especially of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and his clear analysis of the trends and outcomes, give his work a definitive nature. He deals with all aspects of Jewish life throughout the modem period, right up to the Holocaust and the post-war era: demographic changes; the changing socio-economic structure; communal organization; religious life, and cultural activities; political involvement particularly after the First World War when Transylvania was unified with Romania as a result of the Treaty of Trianon in 1920; and the increasing Zionist activity, especially in the inter-war period. The overall picture is impressive. To give just one example from Jewish cultural life: in the town of Cluj alone twenty Jewish periodicals were published.

Two specific occurrences which Gyémánt mentions are, to my mind, particularly worth noting. The first was during the Second World War, when Transylvania was divided in 1940 by the Vienna Diktat: Northern Transylvania was returned to Hungarian administration — as a result of which some 150,000 Jews were deported to Auschwitz with dire consequences; whilst Southern Transylvania remained part of Romania and thus some 40,000 Jews who, although they suffered gravely at the hands of the violently antisemitic Iron Guard, were ultimately saved. The second occurrence concerns the interesting and unusual story of the village of Bezidul Nou (Bozod Ujfalu), where 39 Szekler Sabbatarian families converted to Judaism in 1868. They adopted Jewish names, the men were circumcised, they built a synagogue and conducted an observant Jewish religious life. They clung to their faith and to the Jewish people, and were eventually deported to Auschwitz during the tragic years of the Holocaust (p. 183).

Professor Gyémánt's book provides us with an accurate and scholarly account of Transylvanian Jewry, another great community which was practically annihilated during the Second World War.

ERNEST KRAUSZ

YAKOV M. RABKIN, *Au nom de la Torah. Une histoire de l'opposition juive au sionisme*, 15 + 274 pp., Les Presses de l'Université Laval, Quebec, 2004, n.p.

Professor Yakov Rabkin teaches history at the University of Montreal, Canada. He is probably best known for his researches into the rôle of

the scientific intelligentsia in the demise of the Soviet Union. But in recent years he has become a spokesperson for a Jewish lobby which calls for the destruction of the State of Israel and the incorporation of the Jews living there into a bi-national Judeo-Arab state to be called (in his own phrase, in an article he penned in 2002) 'Abrahamia'. For reasons that I can only surmise are connected with this curious campaign, he has now decided to offer his reading public a survey of the history of the opposition of religious Jews to the concept of Zionism, which is as everyone should know the movement for the self-determination of the Jewish people.

Au nom de la Torah is in large measure a narration of the story of *Orthodox* religious opposition to Herzlian Zionism. In so doing the author nods (as well he might) at the fascinating tale of the de-territorialization of Judaism following the destruction of the Second Temple and the creation of an apparently permanent Jewish Diaspora. Following these events the hope of a return to Zion became a dream, and as such was elevated from this world to the next, and from the physical to the metaphysical. Worship at the synagogue replaced sacrifice at the Temple. The restoration of Zion would come — but only with the coming of the Messiah.

Professor Rabkin is quite right to remind us that Herzl's call for a *Judenstaat* is best understood within the context of the hoped-for evolution of the Habsburg Empire into a series of internally self-governing ethnic polities, all basking in the protection which (it was supposed) only the Habsburgs could give. Zionism was, in this sense, Europe's last great nationalist movement. And it was a movement in a hurry. At the end of the nineteenth century it was difficult to see how a *Judenstaat* might be constructed in Ottoman-controlled Palestine. Herzl himself, a totally assimilated and irreligious Jew, did not mind very much whether his *Judenstaat* was established in Europe, Palestine, Egypt, East Africa, or the U.S.A. It was only with his death (in 1904) that the World Zionist Organisation set its sights firmly and exclusively on the Palestinian option.

Zionism attracted Jewish opposition on a number of different levels. Jewish socialists in Russia saw it as a distraction from the sacred task of overthrowing the Tsarist regime. The ruling Jewish elites in Germany, France, and Great Britain feared that a successful Zionist movement would play into the hands of antisemites, who would use its success as proof that, deep-down, Jews were rootless and cosmopolitan; though it is interesting to note that some British Jews of this persuasion nonetheless saw in the Zionist enterprise a useful way of 'solving' the problems posed by the presence in Britain of thousands of poor, Yiddish-speaking Jews, whose emigration — to Palestine or anywhere else — became a communal obsession.

Yet other Jews opposed Zionism on religious grounds. The *Protestrabbiner* to whom Professor Rabkin refers — the orthodox rabbis (they

included Dr. Hermann Adler, the be-gaitered Chief Rabbi of the British Empire) who formally protested at the birth of the World Zionist Organisation and who contributed to the anti-Zionist volume of essays published in Warsaw in 1900 under the title *Or Layesharim* ('Light unto the Righteous') — affected to condemn Zionism because of its presumption that it was going to do that which the rabbis had supposed and taught for generations only the Almighty could (and would) do at a time of His choosing, rather than according to the time-table of Theodor Herzl and his friends.

How widespread was Jewish religious opposition to Zionism at that time? Professor Rabkin sidesteps this question. The preoccupation of the *Protestrabbiner* was inextricably linked to their fear that Zionism would replace Orthodoxy as the common denominator of the Jewish people. In the communities of the Diaspora the rabbis ruled. But what would happen in a recreated Jewish State? The Jews had not had a state of their own for two millennia. Rabbinical thinking had not had to confront this issue, and most rabbis did not possess the intellectual wherewithal to do so now. But there were exceptions: the saintly Avraham Aba Werner, whom the orthodox Jews of London's East End brought from Helsinki to be their rabbi in 1891, became a fervent supporter of the Zionist movement, and attended in person the second Zionist Congress.

Werner stressed to his congregants the fact that belief in a return to Zion was rooted in the Hebrew Bible — the *Torah*. Avraham Yitzhok Kook — who in the years 1916–1919 ministered to the congregation over which Werner had presided a generation earlier, and who subsequently became Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of Mandate Palestine — took a similar view: even irreligious Jews, who were then engaged in rebuilding the Jewish presence in that land, were (he taught) performing a *mitzvah*.

Orthodox opponents of Zionism shared a common platform with non-orthodox opponents, pre-eminently the proponents of Reform and Liberal Judaism, about which Professor Rabkin has very little to say beyond a passing reference here and there. This is a pity not least because (had they had the courage to acknowledge it) there were important, but paradoxical, reasons why Jews at the very opposite ends of the spectrum of religiosity had reached more or less identical conclusions about the Zionist enterprise. Those who espoused non-orthodoxy saw the Jew as having a distinct rôle in the world that was entirely hermeneutical; many of them blamed Zionism for the rise of Nazism. Those who espoused ultra-orthodoxy saw the Jew as having a rôle in this world that was exclusively moral and subservient. A number of anti-Zionist rabbis (pre-eminently Yechiel Weinberg of Berlin and Eli Munk of Anspach) gave a qualified but cautious welcome to Nazism. The Jew, they argued, could dwell amongst 'the

nations' but could not join them. If the Nuremberg laws forbade marriage between Jews and Aryans, so much the better; and if Nazism relegated the rôle of the woman to the home, better still.

Weinberg and Munk were prominent Agudists. Inevitably, much of Professor Rabkin's book is concerned with *Agudas Yisroel*, the movement established in Poland in 1912 in response to the alarming growth of the religious-Zionist *Mizrachi* movement founded in Lithuania a decade earlier, and of which Joseph Hertz (elected Chief Rabbi of the British Empire in 1913) was a prominent member. Professor Rabkin naturally tells us about contacts between Zionists and Nazis in the 1930s, but is — dare I say? — economical with the truth in detailing the tragic consequences of the misplaced German nationalism of the Berlin Agudists at that time.

In the late 1930s *Agudas Yisroel* split. A minority of die-hards founded *Neturei Karta*, whose present leadership has no qualms about sharing platforms with the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) and burning the Israeli flag. But the majority made and continue to make a peace of sorts with the re-established Jewish State. In a celebrated incident in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1954 the prominent *Agudist* Rabbi E. M. Bloch agreed to take part in the *Yom Ha'atzmaut* celebrations and even shared the platform with a *Mizrachi* representative. In Israel *Agudas Yisroel* elects Members of the Knesset, and makes sure that its voice is heard when grants are being allocated. It is indeed a pity that Professor Rabkin has not deemed it necessary to chart the fascinating odyssey of *Agudas Yisroel* back to an admittedly awkward and more-often-than-not unspoken *rapprochement* with post-Holocaust Zionism. But he naturally has a great deal to say about *Neturei Karta*, from whose leading lights he quotes liberally.

Unfortunately, Professor Rabkin fails to make the connection between the theological ramblings of *Neturei Karta* and the theological canon of Reform and Liberal Judaism. For instance, he offers us quotations from the *dicta* of 'Rabbi' Yisroel Dovid Weiss, one of the leading twenty-first century exponents of the *Neturei Karta* movement. In August 2002, Mr. Weiss demanded acceptance of his view that 'the Jewish people was created to serve as a moral example. The desire to possess a country at any cost contradicts our collective moral mission'. I could offer similar quotations from a host of non-orthodox Jewish theologians — for instance C. G. Montefiore — who have spoken and written in almost identical terms. But, as I say, these theologians are simply not addressed in Professor Rabkin's volume.

There is a serious study to be undertaken about Jewish religious opposition to Zionism. The work Professor Rabkin offers us is an inadequate substitute.

GEOFFREY ALDERMAN

RABBI CHAIM RAPOPORT, *Judaism and Homosexuality: An Authentic Orthodox View*, xxiv + 231 pp., Vallentine Mitchell, London and Portland, OR, 2004, £30.00 or $49.50 (paperback, £17.50 or $24.50).

The title of the first chapter of this book, 'The Prohibition of Homosexual Practices', tells us all. The Orthodox view is definitely that (male) homosexual practices are an abomination and are forbidden by biblical precept. Rabbi Rapoport states that 'theoretically' they are punishable by death. There is no such direct prohibition of lesbianism in the Bible but it is so by inference and through rabbinical interpretations; it is regarded as an obscenity but not liable to incur the severe punishment which male homosexuality would (theoretically) attract. One might wonder what else there is to say — what can the ensuing eight chapters occupy themselves with?

There is a Foreword by Jonathan Sacks (Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the Commonwealth) and a Preface by Dayan Berkovits (then of the Beth Din of the Federation of Synagogues). They are both Orthodox organizations and both men praise the book — which includes the published encomium of senior, international Orthodox authorities. What makes it so special? The book's origin was the author's article, 'Homosexuality and Judaism', published in the *Jewish Chronicle* in February 2000. That article is reprinted in Chapter Eight, together with a number of questions which were subsequently put to him, along with his answers.

This is certainly a work of supreme erudition. There are 20 pages of bibliography, mostly consisting of rabbinical and other religious texts relating directly or indirectly to the subject but also including other publications on homosexuality. The research which has gone into it is shown by the fact that the very detailed endnotes are as long as the text — while some of the individual notes are essays in their own right. Erudition in this context means a great deal of rabbinical ratiocination and, characteristically, augmentation. The author takes issue with the views of a number of rabbis, Orthodox and (as might be expected) Reform. A long note on pp. 176–78 attacks the Reform position and briefly also that of Conservative Judaism. On the back cover, the book claims to be 'in effect the first comprehensive work on Jewish attitudes to homosexuality', although other writers, to whom the author refers, have at least touched on it. His message is quite simple, is repeated several times, and can be summarized as follows.

In the first place, he distinguishes between homosexual orientation and homosexual activities, the former providing no great problem if unaccompanied by the latter. He accepts that a person may be of exclusive homosexual disposition and, moreover, considers it to be

wrong to condemn people for it. He states on p. 47 (with italics in the original text):

> Gay men and women *cannot be blamed or censored for having the feelings and desires that they naturally have*. To do so would be a violation of basic morality and would be antithetical to Jewish values.

This is a fairly liberal approach, along with his view that heterosexuals should understand the difficulties faced by homosexuals who all should not, as he puts it, 'be disenfranchised by co-religionists' (p. 135). Thus they are no different from other Jews and should be encouraged to participate in Jewish life. One of the questions put to him after his article was published in the *Jewish Chronicle* was (p. 121):

> I am... concerned about the invitation you have extended for Jewish homosexuals 'to participate in every aspect of Jewish life that they feel able to'. How can we possibly allow such deviants to infiltrate the Jewish community?

Rabbi Rapoport replied (p. 125):

> Communities that only welcome Jews that are completely observant would invariably shut their doors on such homosexuals, as they would indeed on those who violate any aspect of the sexual code in Leviticus, the laws of *Shabbat*, *kashrus*, and the like.... The notion that such homosexuals should be treated like lepers, just because of their religious failing in this area, goes against the grain of my religious conscience.

Moreover, he strongly argues against homosexuals either attempting 'cures' or, in extremis, getting married to a woman. This last applies to those who are exclusively homosexual: 'Someone with even a small degree of heterosexual interest may have more reason to be optimistic about the possibility of marriage than the confirmed homosexual would' (p. 94). However, in a note on the next page he states that the 'ability to go through the mechanics of heterosexual intercourse does not necessarily make such relationships available, achievable, or even permissible'. But in connection with homosexuals engaging in heterosexual relations, he does make some broad generalizations, this time without reference to sources. He notes that a 'person with an exclusive gay disposition could experience much trauma and emotional agony, if not depression, when living with a lifelong heterosexual partner'. However, he adds that with compassion in relation to the commandment to procreate, the *halakhah* 'would not ordinarily demand of him that he should embark upon a relationship that is likely to be fraught with suffering' (p. 95).

Rabbi Rapoport recognized at the outset that the confirmed homosexual, like most people, 'seeks companionship, love and intimacy', but notes that the observant homosexual would argue (p. 17):

> My Creator has instilled in me (or has allowed me to develop) a homosexual disposition. I have an intense desire to develop a meaningful and mutually beneficial loving relationship with another person. As a homosexual, I feel unable to accomplish this with a woman. I desire the warmth, security, and intimacy that most human beings long for. My Creator has effectively deprived me of these blessings. I do not understand why He has presented me with this predicament. The rational and emotional objections expressed by our sages make little sense to me, at least as far as I personally am concerned. However, I accept that God has forbidden homosexual practices and — without seeking to second guess His wisdom — I accept that I have to subordinate myself to the Will of my Creator and do my best to overcome the temptations I confront.

What then is left for homosexuals who must not engage in sexual activity? This may be the weakest part of the argument. Rabbi Rapoport states that they should be encouraged to use their abilities in all sorts of other positive activities. This sublimation may be a helpful and useful answer for some, but it does not necessarily fulfil the homosexual desire for love and companionship. Nevertheless, there will surely be a general welcome for the liberal, inclusive attitudes displayed by the author of this book.

HAROLD POLLINS

MARGALIT SHILO, *Princess or Prisoner? Jewish Women in Jerusalem, 1840–1914*, translated from the Hebrew by David Louvish, 38 + 330 pp., Brandeis University Press, published by University Press of New England in the Brandeis Series on Jewish Women, 2005, $29.95 paperback (hardback, $65.00).

The title of this book is puzzling. Nowhere is any of the Jewish women the author describes even remotely treated as a princess or as a prisoner. In page after page and chapter after chapter the Jewish women of Jerusalem in the nineteenth century are said to live in abject poverty, to be the victims of male chauvinism and of severe rabbis who threaten them with *herem* (excommunication) and deportation from the Holy City of Jerusalem if they fail to observe their duties. Girls were not to be taught to read, not even religious texts. She quotes from the Mishnah Tractate Sotah (3:4) that Ben Azai declared that a man is under the obligation to teach his daughter Torah but 'R. Eliezer says: Whoever teaches his daughter Torah, it is as though he teaches her obscenity'. Professor Shilo (who is in the Land of Israel Studies Department of the University of Bar-Ilan) adds: 'The Halakha as practiced over the centuries was based on Rabbi Eliezer's approach' (p.149).

We are told of one case of a protective Sephardi father who agreed to the marriage of his daughter to an Asbkenazi but only on the condition

that she was not to have her head shaved after the wedding (the usual custom in Ashkenazi wedding ceremonies) and that the young couple make their home in the bride's household (p.48). That is the nearest instance of a Jerusalem woman being treated as a princess in this book. As for being a prisoner, a Jerusalem wife had the duty to be the provider in the household: her husband, like all Jewish men in Jerusalem in the nineteenth century, was to spend all his days in prayer and in Torah study in order to hasten the advent of the Messiah and Redemption in the Holy City. Jerusalem Jews were heavily dependent on the '*halukah* — the monetary contributions sent by Jews from all over the world to be distributed among their brethren in the Holy Land'.

However, the sums received were very modest and some wives had to earn money by becoming small shopkeepers (working in a store, to use the American expression). Margalit Shilo tells us (p.85):

> The Ashkenazic woman's responsibility for the family's daily bread was taken for granted by all concerned. Rabbi... Lifschitz had no idea of the location of his wife's store; he was so engrossed in his studies that he paid no attention whatever to her worries.

On the other hand, we are told on the same page that a husband was under strict obligation to ensure that his wife had a shaven head: '... a man whose wife did not shave her head would not be allowed to rent a place in the study house'.

Some women went out to work as maid servants while others took in washing or did housework for women who had just given birth. These were menial occupations and Jewish women in Jerusalem did not like to provide such services. This was especially so in the case of Ashkenazi women — to such an extent that the leaders of the community who could not find help for the frail and the invalid are quoted as making the following statement: 'This is a matter of life and death....' (p.117). To remedy the situation, the officials cut by half the *halukah* allotted to some women in order to compel them to seek employment (p.118).

Christian missionaries were very active in Jerusalem and established hospitals and schools. The hospitals gave medical treatment and medications free of charge, while the doors of the English Hospital had mezuzot, 'the food was kosher and prepared by Jews, the staff included Jewish nurses; there was even a small synagogue on the premises' (p.204). Caroline Cooper, who had converted to Christianity, opened a workshop to teach Jewish women sewing and embroidery and to acquire a new profession. The products were sold and the women earned money in this fashion while the enterprising Miss Cooper decided to open a school for the daughters of these women who also received 'kosher food and clothing'. The mothers, busy with their needles, would be entertained by Miss Cooper's assistants who

'would read them chapters from the New Testament in Hebrew, Ladino, and Arabic' (p.205).

The success of the missionaries alarmed the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem and Jewish organizations and charitable institutions in the Diaspora. Both English and French Jews took energetic steps. Sir Moses Montefiore founded a school for girls in 1855 and the Anglo-Jewish Association took an active part in the promotion of education, as did the British Rothschilds. The French Rothschilds and the admirable Alliance israélite universelle established schools which eventually became accepted by Jerusalem's Jews as respectable institutions of great benefit to their daughters. The Sephardim led the way, since their rabbis were more tolerant than the Ashkenazi rabbinate. The Evelina de Rothschild school, founded in 1868 with 50 pupils, saw the number quadrupled to more than 200 by 1872. The Sephardi Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem publicly examined the educational standards of the girls and declared his great pleasure in finding that the pupils were successful 'both in the study of our holy tongue and in their knowledge of its sacred commandments'. He also praised their progress in the study of French and of handicrafts (p.158).

Chapter 2 is concerned with 'Marriage as a Female Experience'. There was a stark contrast between Ashkenazi and Sephardi wedding ceremonies. The former were joyless, with the bride soberly dressed and a 'rather gloomy atmosphere' (p.62). Sephardi brides 'wore elaborate finery' (p.60) and there was instrumental music and dancing and celebrations for seven days with banquets served to guests every day of that week. The author comments: 'Sephardic society was more open and life-loving than Ashkenazic society' (p.67).

In Chapter 6 there is a brief section on prostitution; there are records of at least two brothels. In one case, a rabbinical court was convened and the two guilty women who had opened the establishment were found guilty and 'their heads were shaved as a sign of disgrace' (p.200). Surprisingly, Professor Shilo does not comment on the fact that totally innocent Ashkenazi brides also had their heads shaved — but clearly not as a sign of disgrace.

The paperback edition of this volume is so tightly bound that it requires a great deal of effort to keep the book open in order to read its many pages; some repetitive sections caused at least one reader to reflect occasionally that the effort was not always rewarding. Nevertheless, present-day Jerusalem women who read the book will be immensely relieved that their Jewishness does not condemn them to the life of misery which their predecessors endured in the years 1840–1914.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

CHRONICLE

At the end of September 2005, the Central Bureau of Statistics of the State of Israel is reported to have stated that at the start of the Jewish New Year, Israel's population had grown to 6.87 million. Jews account for 5.24 million and represent 76.2 per cent of the total population — down from 77.8 per cent in 2000.

There were 1.12 million Muslims (16.1 per cent); 144,000 Christians (2.1 per cent); 113,000 Druze (1.6 per cent); and about 265,000 people with no religious classification (3.2 per cent). Most of those in that last category are non-Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union.

*

In the last week of December 2005, the Jewish Agency reported that 23,000 Jews had made aliyah in 2005 — an increase of about 1,000 over the previous year. A record 5,700 Israeli expatriates returned to Israel in 2005.

In 1999, the last year of large-scale immigration from the former Soviet Union, 76,700 newcomers had settled in Israel. But after 2000, the year when the intifada broke out, the influx dropped. A spokesman of the Jewish Agency is reported to have commented that it is unlikely to see many more immigrants from the former Soviet Union since most of those who wanted to leave had now left. The emphasis is shifting to 'aliyah by choice' from western countries. Immigration from France had risen in 2005 to 2,980 — an increase of 23 per cent over the previous year; resurgent antisemitism in the country is said to have been a contributory factor. Jewish immigrants from South America showed the highest percentage increase (37.2), with 1,850 new arrivals. Aliyah from North America in 2005 also rose (by 15 per cent) with 3,052 immigrants — the highest number since 1983.

*

The Community Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews published in the summer of 2005 a *Report on Community Vital Statistics 2004*.

Births. The number of births is given only up to 2003 because no data were then available for 2004. The data on births 'are based on totals of *milah* and circumcision which are extrapolated by a biologically determined male: female birth ratio'. The total given for 2003 was 2665 Jewish births in Great Britain. The Report points out that the Community Unit's researchers have been aware for many years that their birth data are the least firmly-founded because, for several reasons, some halakhic male births are not followed by *brit milah*.

Marriages. The total number of synagogue marriages recorded in 2004 was 952, an increase of 23 (2.5 per cent) over the previous year.

Gittin: Religious Divorces. There were 272 completed *gittin* in 2004, 12 fewer than in 2003. 'Annual numbers simply relate to the year in which the *get* was granted and so annual variations are misleading'.

Burials and Cremations. There were 3257 burials and cremations under Jewish religious auspices in 2004. These include some 70 burials which took place in Israel because the Research Unit's data 'relate to permanent residence immediately before death and not to place of burial'. The mean age at death was 80.09 for men and 84.35 years for women.

More than two-thirds of synagogue marriages (73 per cent) and of burials and cremations (70 per cent) took place in London and the remainder in the provinces.

*

The May 2006 issue of *Middle Eastern Studies* includes an article by Sule Toktas on 'Turkey's Jews and their immigration to Israel' (pp.505–519). The author notes that most of the data concerning that migration are available from Israeli sources since in Turkey 'there is a scarcity of official documentation of Jewish emigration'. During the British Mandate of Palestine, immigrant visas were severely restricted; but after the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, there were no obstacles to entry. By 1951, a total of 34,547 Turkish Jews had settled in Israel; they accounted for nearly 40 per cent of the Jewish community of Turkey. 'The Turkish state neither promoted nor obstructed emigration to Israel' (p.508). Most of those early immigrants came from the lower socio-economic strata of Turkish Jewry. In later decades, middle-class and professional members of the community came to Israel and by 2001, there were some 82,000 Jews of Turkish origin (first and second generation migrants).

They have their own cultural associations in Israel as well as two Masonic lodges.

*

It was announced in June 2005 that the Portuguese village of Belmonte now has a Jewish museum. The 150 Jewish inhabitants claim to be the descendants of Jews who officially converted to Catholicism ('conversos') after the 1496 Edict of Expulsion but who continued until the 1980s observing Jewish rituals in the secrecy of their own houses. A rich businessman from Morocco had a white-painted synagogue built in Belmonte some years ago. Jews from Belmonte are now helping with the production of modern Portugal's first *kasher* wine, under the supervision of two rabbis, one of whom had served in the Belmonte synagogue.

*

The Sociological Institute for Community Studies of Bar-Ilan University published in July 2005 (in its *Sociological Papers* series) *Jewish Identity: Opinions of Secular Jews in Israel* by Edith Elchanani. A Note by the editors of the Series on the first page of that publication states that it is

> part of a larger project on Jewish identity in Israel which is being carried out at the Sociological Institute... It reports on research concerning a

particular group of outstanding Israeli writers, media personalities and other professionals, who declare themselves as having a secular Jewish identity. Elchanani highlights their definitions of their own identity and the way they perceive their place in the Israeli national culture and society. ... Further analysis will integrate this facet into the overall framework of the research project on Jewish identity in Israel.

*

In July 2005 *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* received a copy of *Getting your Get* by Sharon Faith and Deanna Levine, from Cissanell publications, P.O. Box 12811, London N20 8WB. The publishers stated in a letter enclosed with the paperback that it is a 'brand new paperback edition of the hugely successful e-book' and 'is a limited edition and is not yet for sale to members of the public' and 'suggest that the book is made available only for reference'.

The first page of *Getting your Get* gives a reference to the website at www.gettingyourget.co.uk and includes a description of the contents:

> Information for Jewish men and women in England, Wales and Scotland about divorce according to Jewish law with articles, forms and explanations for lawyers.

The website is sponsored by a firm of London solicitors. The second page of the publication makes a Disclaimer: 'The information contained in this publication is of a general nature and should not be relied upon in any particular case, for which advice should be sought'.

The back cover of the publication prints the favourable comments of eminent personalities as well as of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Jewish Marriage Council.

*

The September–December 2004 issue of *La Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, a publication of the Jewish community of Italy, includes an article on antisemitism in Germany, by Susanna Bobme-Kuby and an article by Maurice Roumani on Jewish Refugees from Arab countries in Israel today.

An English summary of that latter article states:

> The article outlines the suffering of the Jews in each Arab country, who is responsible for their status and how, contrary to the Palestinian refugees, Israel accepted and integrated them into the new state with the aid of world Jewish philanthropy.

It also adds that when the issue of Palestinian refugees is discussed, one must ensure that the position of Jewish refugees from Arab countries be considered and the fact that their 'communal and private properties were confiscated or nationalized by the host Arab states'.

*

The January–March 2005 issue of the *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions* contains articles concerned with the separation of church and state. It was in 1905, a century earlier, that the *Séparation* was established by law. The issue's

heading states: 'La République ne reconnait aucun culte'. One of the articles, by Régine Azria, is about the effect of that separation on French Jewry (pp.135–148). Napoleon had established the Consistoire but after 1905 the French republic legally ceased to consider that institution as the representative body of the Jews of France. In practice, however, the Consistoire continues to be generally considered as such. It is a case of 'implicit recognition', according to the author.

Other articles deal with Catholics, with evangelical protestants, and with Muslims from the standpoint of the *Séparation*.

The July–December 2005 issue of the *Archives* includes an article, 'La conversion prohibée: mariages mixtes et politiques de conversion dans le champ religieux juif argentin' by Sébastien Tank-Storper (pp.123–142). In 1927, the Argentinian rabbi, Shaul David Setton (of Syrian Jewish origin) issued a decree prohibiting 'for ever' any conversion to Judaism taking place in the Republic of Argentina. His decision was based on the fact that at the time, some 40 to 50 per cent of Argentinian Jews had taken non-Jewish spouses, who had obtained a quick conversion in order to enable them to go through a Jewish ceremony of marriage. Rabbi Setton's decision was approved by an Ashkenazi rabbi in Argentina and by both the Sephardi and Ashkenazi Chief Rabbis of Palestine.

Nowadays, when Argentinian rabbis are satisfied that an Orthodox Jewish conversion has occurred according to the principles of halakhah, they can submit the case to the Israeli rabbinical authorities who may formally validate the conversion. However, the 1927 decree has apparently not had the effect of restricting the incidence of intermarriage in Argentina: nowadays, about 40 per cent of couples in the Jewish community have spouses who are not Jewish (p.139).

*

On editing The Jewish Journal of Sociology (continued)

There seems to be a notable increase in a strategy employed by authors who submit articles. If we tell them that we would be willing to publish an article if more data are available substantiating the author's assertions, we get a reply thanking us for our 'acute' suggestions but explaining that it would take some months for the extra research to be carried out and a revised version submitted. Could we wait? We reply that we would reserve space in the next issue. Increasingly, the author does not resubmit — but finds another outlet for the original typescript and does not have the courtesy of withdrawing the article. In one case, the author submitted another article two years later adding that the previous paper had now been published elsewhere, in a note at the end of the letter. We later received another letter asking for news of the 'status' of the new article.

There are unrealistic expectations about the financial resources of academic journals: some seem to think that publishers of such journals have funds at their disposal similar to those of powerful press barons. One dean of graduate students at a famous London University college asked me at the launch of a new publication whether my 'Journal's driver' was waiting to drive me home. University teachers generally believe themselves to be underpaid; but

I expected the head of a department in an English provincial university, who held a chair, to be able to afford a telephone call. I was mistaken. He had to correct proofs and was at home. He telephoned his university's secretary to ask her to telephone me to request that I telephone him to note his proof corrections. I was puzzled, but did as I was asked. He gave no explanation for his request. I was still puzzled and later when I met the professor who had suggested to me that his colleague in the North of England would be a suitable reviewer, I asked him to enlighten me; he replied that the salary of the economising reviewer was at the lowest end of the professorial scale!

We regularly get requests for free subscriptions. For some years, we received a circular with the name of the article to be inserted in a space left blank; it was from a 'reverend' in Malta and he persevered for a decade until he must have realised that he would not be receiving free copies from us.

Some librarians do not seem to hesitate about falsely claiming non-receipt of an issue. On one occasion, one of our subscribers had told me that he had seen the Journal in a Continental university where he was a visiting professor; a few months later, the librarian of that university claimed not to have received the issue. This happens usually when there is an article about, for example, Canadian Jews: presumably, some reader cuts out the article and the Canadian librarian wishes to obtain another copy of the Journal. The cheapest way out is to claim non-receipt.

We used to include the invoice for the next number when we sent the present year's issue. On one occasion the librarian, in due course, returned the invoice with a cheque for the renewal. But a year later, he claimed not to have received the issue and asked for an urgent replacement. When we wrote back to him, with a photocopy of the invoice which had been included in that issue, he replied indignantly: 'Well, perhaps we did receive it. But usually publishers send us replacement copies without any difficulty'.

On the other hand, there are thankfully some librarians who do not resort to such stratagems. Many years ago, we published an article about the Jews of Leeds; some months later, a Leeds librarian wrote to ask us to send them another copy and to enclose our invoice: we were so impressed that we seriously considered sending a free replacement — but in the end did not do so in case it might set a precedent.

On one occasion, the librarian of a famous university wrote to state that one of our issues had been damaged and could we please send a free replacement because the library had no funds for replacements. We replied that we would not charge the rate for back numbers as a concession and when we received their cheque it had the printed words 'Replacement Fund'.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN retired as a Professor in the Department of Sociology of Brown University. He is now Emeritus Professor.

RORY MILLER is Senior Lecturer, Mediterranean Studies, in the School of Humanities of King's College London.

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

UZI REBHUN is Senior Lecturer in the Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics of the A. Harman Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

WLLIAM SHAFFIR is a Professor in the Department of Sociology of McMaster University, Canada.

NORMAN SOLOMON is a Member of the Oxford University Teaching and Research Unit in Hebrew and Jewish Studies.

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR: Judith Freedman

VOLUME FORTY-EIGHT, 2006

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

CONTENTS

The Baal Shem Tov *by N. Solomon* 75
Book Reviews 80
Changes in the Geographic Dispersion and Mobility of American Jews *by U. Rebhun and S. Goldstein* 5
Chronicle 93
Herbert Martin James Loewe in Oxford *by H. Pollins* 34
J. L. Magnes and the Promotion of Bi-nationalism in Palestine *by Rory Miller* 50
Notes on Contributors 98
The Renaissance of Hassidism *by W. Shaffir* 69

BOOKS REVIEWED

J. Cooper, *Pride Versus Prejudice. Jewish Doctors and Lawyers in England* 80
L. Gyémánt, *The Jews of Transylvania* 83
Y. M. Rabkin, *Au nom de la Torah. Une histoire de l'opposition juive au sionisme* 84
C. Rapoport, *Judaism and Homosexuality: An Authentic Orthodox View* 88
M. Shilo, *Princess or Prisoner? Jewish Women in Jerusalem, 1840–1914* 90

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

S. Goldstein 5
R. Miller 50
H. Pollins 34
U. Rebhun 5
W. Shaffir 69
N. Solomon 75

AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS

G. Alderman 84
J. Freedman 80, 90
E. Krausz 83
H. Pollins 88