

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR

Morris Ginsberg

MANAGING EDITOR

Maurice Freedman

SECRETARY, EDITORIAL OFFICE

Paul Glikson

VOLUME FIVE 1963

Published on behalf of the World Jewish Congress
by William Heinemann Ltd, 15-16 Queen Street, London W1

CONTENTS

| | | | |
|--|----------|---|----------|
| Adult Programme of the Jewish Centre in the United States, The by <i>Samuel D. Freeman</i> | 187 | Historical School of Zacharia Frankel, The by <i>David Rudavsky</i> | 224 |
| Ambivalence and Self-Image among Oriental Jews in Israel by <i>Walter P. Zenner</i> | 214 | Jewish Figures in Post-war Dutch Literature by <i>Henriette Boas</i> | 55 |
| Belleville, France, and Beyond by <i>Herbert Tint</i> | 255 | Jewish Immigration in England by <i>J. Maitlis</i> | 138 |
| Books Received | 149, 265 | Jews under Italian Fascism by <i>Daniel Carpi</i> | 143 |
| Centres of Jewry in the Western Hemisphere: A Comparative Approach by <i>Moshe Davis</i> | 4 | Notes on Contributors | 153, 266 |
| Chronicle by <i>Paul Glikson</i> | 150, 198 | Organization of South African Jewry and its Problems, The by <i>Gustav Saron</i> | 35 |
| Development and Utilization of Sociological Research: The Case of the American Jewish Community, The by <i>Marshall Sklare</i> | 167 | Sickness and Death in the Hebrew Novel of the Haskalah by <i>David Patterson</i> | 84 |
| Do Jews Learn from History? by <i>Jacob Lestschinsky</i> | 245 | Statistics of North African Jewry, The by <i>Robert Attal</i> | 27 |
| Economic Interpretation of Anti-semitism in Eastern Europe, An by <i>Stanislav Andreski</i> | 201 | Study of Jewish Communities in a Comparative Context, The by <i>Seymour Martin Lipset</i> | 157 |
| Editorial | 3 | Youth and Youth Movements in Israel by <i>Jochanan Peres</i> | 94 |
| Emerging Patterns and Attitudes in American Jewish Life by <i>C. Bezael Sherman</i> | 47 | Zionism and <i>Aliyah</i> on the American Jewish Scene by <i>Edward Neufeld</i> | 111 |

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

| | | | |
|------------------|----------|----------------|-----|
| Andreski, S. | 201 | Neufeld, E. | 111 |
| Attal, R. | 27 | Patterson, D. | 84 |
| Boas, H. | 55 | Peres, J. | 94 |
| Carpi, D. | 143 | Rudavsky, D. | 224 |
| Davis, M. | 4 | Saron, G. | 35 |
| Freeman, S. D. | 187 | Sherman, C. B. | 47 |
| Glikson, P. | 150, 198 | Sklare, M. | 167 |
| Lestschinsky, J. | 245 | Tint, H. | 255 |
| Lipset, S. M. | 157 | Zenner, W. P. | 214 |
| Maitlis, J. | 138 | | |

AUTHORS OF SHORTER NOTICES

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---------------|---------------|
| Cannon, I. C. | 149 | Maybaum, I. | 260 |
| Cohen, P. S. | 260 | Roback, A. A. | 259 |
| Levenberg, S. | 261 | Strizower, S. | 148, 263, 264 |
| Marmorstein, E. | 263 | | |

BOOKS REVIEWED

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----|
| Carlebach, J. <i>The Jews of Nairobi 1903-1962</i> | 148 | Mantel, H. <i>Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin</i> | 263 |
| De Felice, R., <i>Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo</i> | 143 | Maus, H. <i>A Short History of Sociology</i> | 149 |
| Gartner, L. P. <i>The Jewish Immigrant in England (1870-1914)</i> | 138 | Rabi, <i>Anatomie du Judaisme Français</i> | 255 |
| Herberg, W. <i>Judaism and Modern Man</i> | 260 | Roland, C. <i>Du Ghetto à l'Occident: Deux générations de Yiddiches en France</i> | 255 |
| Infeld, H. F., ed., <i>Essays . . . in Memory Dr. Noah Barou</i> | 261 | Strizower, S. <i>Exotic Jewish Communities</i> | 263 |
| Israel, B. J. <i>Religious Evolution among the Bene Israel of India since 1750</i> | 263 | Werblowsky, R. J. Z. <i>Joseph Karo —Lawyer and Mystic</i> | 264 |
| Landmann, S. <i>Jidisch: Abenteuer einer Sprache</i> | 259 | | |

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME V NO. 1

JUNE 1963

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----|
| Editorial | | 3 |
| Centres of Jewry in the Western Hemisphere: | | |
| A Comparative Approach | <i>Moshe Davis</i> | 4 |
| The Statistics of North African Jewry | <i>Robert Attal</i> | 27 |
| The Organization of South African Jewry and its Problems | <i>Gustav Saron</i> | 35 |
| Emerging Patterns and Attitudes in American Jewish Life | <i>C. Bezalel Sherman</i> | 47 |
| Jewish Figures in Post-war Dutch Literature | <i>Henriette Boas</i> | 55 |
| Sickness and Death in the Hebrew Novel of the Haskalah | <i>David Patterson</i> | 84 |
| Youth and Youth Movements in Israel | <i>Jochanan Peres</i> | 94 |
| Zionism and <i>Aliyah</i> on the American Jewish Scene | <i>Edward Neufeld</i> | 111 |
| Book Reviews | | |
| Jewish Immigration in England | <i>J. Maitlis</i> | 138 |
| Jews under Italian Fascism | <i>Daniel Carpi</i> | 143 |
| Shorter Notices | | 148 |
| Books Received | | 149 |
| Chronicle | <i>Paul Glikson</i> | 150 |
| Notes on Contributors | | 153 |

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY

on behalf of the World Jewish Congress
by William Heinemann Ltd, 15-16 Queen Street, London W1

Annual Subscription £1.1.0 (post free)—Single Copies 12s 6d net

*Applications for subscription should be addressed to the Managing Editor,
The Jewish Journal of Sociology, 55 New Cavendish Street, London W1*

EDITOR Morris Ginsberg
MANAGING EDITOR Maurice Freedman
SECRETARY, EDITORIAL OFFICE Paul Glikson

ADVISORY BOARD

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| R. Bachi (<i>Israel</i>) | Jacob Lestschinsky (<i>Israel</i>) |
| André Chouraqui (<i>France & Israel</i>) | Eugène Minkowski (<i>France</i>) |
| S. N. Eisenstadt (<i>Israel</i>) | Louis Rosenberg (<i>Canada</i>) |
| Nathan Glazer (<i>USA</i>) | H. L. Shapiro (<i>USA</i>) |
| J. Katz (<i>Israel</i>) | A. Steinberg (<i>Britain</i>) |
| O. Klineberg (<i>USA</i>) | A. Tartakower (<i>Israel</i>) |

© THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS 1963

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BUTLER AND TANNER LTD
FROME AND LONDON

EDITORIAL

THE first four papers in this issue of the *Journal* (by Moshe Davis, Robert Attal, Gustav Saron, and C. Bezalel Sherman) were read in their original form at the Third World Congress of Jewish Studies held in Jerusalem, 25 July to 1 August 1961, in the section 'Contemporary Jewry'. This section was under the joint chairmanship of Professor Moshe Davis and Dr Shaul Esh of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. We are grateful to them for making these papers available to us. We expect to be able to publish further papers read at the Congress in later issues of the *Journal*.

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH*

Moshe Davis

THE comparative approach applied to the study of Contemporary Jewry adds an important dimension to the research and interpretation of individual Jewish communities. Most present research analyses the local community in the context of its native environment and its adjustment to that environment. With the comparative method, one can explore the common relationship of Jewish communities throughout the world while taking into full account the problems of locus and specific historical configuration. Thus a particular Jewish community can be studied not only in its relation to the enviroing culture, but also in the total context of the Jewish People, of which it is an integral part. Moreover, by establishing new perspectives, the comparative method may reveal lacunae in the available research material, even as it clarifies existing interpretations. The dynamic, variegated, and global character of Jewry offers an excellent opportunity to study one entity in different settings. What we may learn from applying this method to the study of the Jewish People may contribute to social studies generally.¹

The object of this paper is to delineate, by way of comparison, some of the disparate and common elements in the three major Jewish centres of the western hemisphere—Canada, the United States, and Argentina; and to suggest, by these examples, other elements which require investigation. The selected disparate element relates to the varying forms of representative organization of the Jewish communities as they are influenced by their respective majority, or host cultures. The common element refers to the nature of individual identification with Jews and Judaism, a problem which is similar in the three communities. In this case the 'indifferent' are discussed with special reference to the manifestations of intermarriage and gradual separation from Jewish life.

* This paper, prepared for the Section of Contemporary Jewry at the Third World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem, is intended to open a discussion on a methodology for the research of contemporary Jewish life.

I

Without ignoring internal Jewish needs and conditions, the definitions of the nature of the three principal Jewish communities in the western hemisphere emanate to a very large extent from the socio-political organization of the respective societies in which they live. The quality of the difference in these communities lies in the way the society at large understands the Jewish group, and in the response of the Jewish community to this conception. Recognizing the limitations of a specific definition in a relationship which is subject to development and change, nevertheless broad categorization of the respective images of the Jewish group can be essayed. In Canada the Jewish community is regarded and regards itself as a *cultural* minority within the Canadian nationality, like the Anglo-Saxon, the French, the Scots, etc. The Jews of the United States, while proportionately a decreasing minority, are viewed and function as one of the major *religious* groups. There the common comparison of Jews is with Protestants and Catholics. In Argentina, the Jewish community is distinguished from the majority by its *ethnic* pattern, although there is a religious underpinning to this relationship in a monolithic Catholic ambience. It is enlightening to note that these very formulations have entered the vocabulary of the Jewish communities when they describe themselves, finding expression in official documents, in the public forum, in the press, and in ordinary conversation.

Canada, it has been said, is still in search of a nationality. It is both dependent upon and related to the United States and Great Britain. However, while the influence of the United States in Canadian history and culture is apparent and increasing, community forms and political institutions in Canada are deeply rooted in the traditions of Great Britain. In this sense, the institutional structure in Canada is more British than North American. Thus, the British conception vis-à-vis the Jews, of host country and minority culture, was more likely to develop in Canada. Maurice Freedman called the volume of social studies of the Anglo-Jewish community which he edited *A Minority in Britain*, a title or frame of reference which is rarely, if ever, now used in the United States, but one which could easily be used as a general appellation of the Jewish community in Canada. Moreover, Canada internally is being formed by two civilizations, the English and the French, living side by side, separate but commingling, both motivated by ancient and contemporary European influences. In what is essentially a bi-cultural country, the Jewish entity is encouraged to flourish and to develop its group life and institutions—a further example of Canadian cultural latitudinarianism.

The conceptual framework for Jewish group existence in the United States has tried to avoid minority-majority stratification or self-

perpetuating ethnic grouping, preferring to be cast among the religious communities of America.² The earlier self-defined image of America was that of 'a nation of immigrants'. Even from the very outset the use of the idea of 'minority-majority' was not deemed particularly applicable in the United States although in fact it was true. Immigrant groups, large or small, preferred to identify themselves with a religious, cultural, or ethnic majority. Several decades ago, it was thought that the areas of diversity in American life would be drawn along ethnic lines.³ Out of such views came the cultural pluralism theory and the implications derived therefrom for Jewish group life. But in recent years, as the native population became preponderant and as the nation cohered, religious association became a more acceptable legitimate difference among citizens and among groups. Jefferson's prescient observation on the American spiritual structure, that 'the maxim of civil government is reversed in that of religion, where its true form is "divided we stand, united we fall"' accurately describes the current American trend.

In this climate of religious pluralism, the Jewish group, generally speaking, is most comfortable. The most prevalent form of individual Jewish identification in America is through the synagogue. And in the process, the Jewish religious group has earned a status of 'full partnership in the American enterprise' together with the Catholic and Protestant traditions.⁴

The contrast between the social systems of Argentina, Canada, and the United States is marked in every major area: economic, political, cultural, religious, linguistic. Yet in Argentina too, the Jews have been free to develop their ethnic individuality within the national milieu. In this regard, the Jews are not unique; other ethnic communities in Argentina are the English, the French, and the German.

A concept which illuminates, even if it does not fully explain, the attitude of the majority culture in Argentina towards its sub-communities, and its readiness to foster them ethnically, is that of *Madre Patria*. The idea of a 'mother-fatherland' does not refer to the native land but to the 'old home' in Europe. This concept is not peculiar to the Spanish people; it appears in French and Italian forms as well. Created for the people living in the colonies, in order to link the *colonia residente* to the *metrópoli*, the main strength of *Madre Patria* is to intensify the feeling of love and attachment for the manners and ways of the land of origin. In a country like Argentina whose language and folkways are of Spanish background, the majority appreciates the desire of the various ethnic groups within it to nurture the 'old home' cultures. As for the Jews, society at large accepts the strong ties to the Jewish traditions and way of life which they brought with them from Europe. Nor does it see any conflict between the cultural and linguistic expression in Argentina of the Jewish *Madre Patria* and the national culture. One of the remark-

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

able developments in modern Jewish history seems to be the conceptual association in South America generally of the State of Israel as the *Madre Patria* of the Jewish people.⁵

As we move from general analysis to the examination of the selected disparate element—the forms of Jewish representative institutions in Canada, the United States, and Argentina—we emphasize the evolving nature of these institutions, even as the socio-political systems which have shaped them are themselves undergoing continuing change. Furthermore, the historical situations, general and Jewish, in which these communities have grown, must be kept in the foreground of our consideration, although it is not within the scope of this paper to deal with them in detail. It is the result of these historical and sociological factors which concern us. The three major Jewish communities in the western hemisphere, in their attempt to attain practically the same purposes of Jewish existence, have created representative institutions which are dissimilar. By representative institutions, we mean country-wide organizations accepted by Jewish groups to direct internal Jewish life or to act on their behalf with governmental and non-governmental authorities, domestic and overseas.

In Canada a communal 'establishment' is developing. Founded in 1919, and re-organized fundamentally in 1933, the Canadian Jewish Congress has become increasingly recognized as the national representative and co-ordinating Jewish organization. Although synagogue affiliations are rising steadily, no characteristic Canadian Jewish religious trend has emerged. The major religious institutions are motivated by or directly affiliated with United States Jewish religious movements; most of the leading congregations are staffed by spiritual leaders who were trained in the rabbinical seminaries in the United States. Other national agencies in the spheres of culture, Zionism, mutual aid, and defence have concentrated on their immediate tasks and constituencies without attempting seriously to assume an all-inclusive Jewish communal role.

Moreover, influenced by the general Canadian ambience and by their own direct experience in European Jewish communities—the Canadian Jewish settlement includes a large post-First World War immigration—the Jews in Canada are community-oriented rather than synagogue-centred. Consequently any national representative organization was bound to be built beyond the religious interests of the Jews, and to concentrate primarily on their status, welfare, and socio-cultural concerns. This the leadership of the Congress well understood, and directed its programme to the all-embracing interests of Canadian Jewry within the contours of the larger society.⁶ Through a combination of factors the Congress has become within several decades the central representative body for internal and external Jewish affairs in Canada. Among these factors we note a comparatively small community com-

pactly located in a few major cities; slow and controlled immigration; the negation of the American Jewish system of decentralization, and an aware volunteer and professional leadership.

A decisive demonstration of the Congress' publicly accepted position as the spokesman of Canadian Jewry was the manner in which it motivated and conducted the observance of the National Bicentenary of Canadian Jewry in 1959. When the Governor-General of Canada, George P. Vanier, accepted the *Proclamation of Faith and Thanksgiving*, 'the document in which the *Canadian Jewish Congress* [italics added] proclaims the year 1959 one of thanksgiving and prayer . . .,' he endorsed the authority of the Congress to speak on behalf of Canadian Jewry.⁷

The scope of the Canadian Jewish Congress activities, unlike that of most affiliates of the World Jewish Congress in other parts of the hemisphere, is not limited to the struggle for status and rights; and indeed there are very few organizational vacuums in Canadian Jewish life which are not quickly pre-empted by the Congress, separately or conjointly with other associations. As may be seen from the fortnightly reports published by its Executive Vice-President, the Congress is involved in all spheres of Jewish life, such as education and culture, social welfare, overseas aid, and Israel, in addition to its main responsibility in the areas of representation and defence of Jewish rights.⁸ Despite this initiative, the Congress has managed not to overshadow other national organizations, such as the religious movements and various campaigns for Israel (although tensions can and do exist).

While the sole representative character of the Congress has been established, its controlling authority in Canadian Jewish life should not be exaggerated. In crucial matters liaison with other national bodies was created. In matters affecting Israel the Congress acts through a Joint Community Relations Committee in conjunction with the Canadian Zionist Council; in issues of antisemitism and discrimination it functions through a Public Relations Committee with the Canadian lodges of B'nai B'rith; and in representation to the government in matters concerning Jewish immigration it acts with representatives of the Jewish Immigrant Aid Services. A striking example of such liaison to achieve community discipline is the internal advice of restraint which was jointly issued (with the United Zionist Council and the B'nai B'rith Public Relations Committee) during the Eichmann trial. Sent to all national and local organizations, it urged the Jewish community to impose closure on any public discussion or programme on the Eichmann trial for the sake of 'a much higher duty in the interests of the community and the people of Israel'.⁹ The document is rare for any voluntaristic community. Its very issuance indicates a mood of discipline and self-control which the Congress in consonance with other national

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

agencies has introduced into Canadian Jewish life. The Canadian Jewish Congress achieved its position of *primus inter pares* in the constellation of Jewish organizations in Canada both by its overarching programme which it carries out with great efficiency (including research in Canadian Jewish life and institutions), and by its carefully designed policy to aim at unity while preserving the autonomy of other specialized organizations.

As Canadian Jewry is achieving a unified representation, American Jewry apparently chooses to speak with 'a hundred voices'. It does not have a representative body or a central co-ordinating agency; and it seems to aspire to neither. Despite the hazards of overlapping and waste, American Jewry prefers organizational pluralism to singularism, even in specialized areas of Jewish communal life. In 1951, Robert M. MacIver, analysing but one sector of American Jewish organization, the 'defence agencies', found that these had reached an appalling 'state of uncoordinated complexity'.¹⁰ A decade later, the Rabbinical Assembly of America, 'in convention assembled', was less circumspect. It adopted a resolution on 'unity in American Jewish life', in which it upbraided the community for its 'confusion of counsels, unseemly competition among Jewish organizations for public attention, a confused image of Jewish policy in the mind of the American community and a weakening of the effectiveness of Jewish representations before governmental forums here and abroad'.¹¹

Such criticisms, heard in many places, while they may be descriptively accurate, disregard the etiological factors, and often lead to decisions which confuse more than they correct.¹² An examination of the causes and background of the duplication, competition and confusion, reveals that they are in keeping with 'the American way' of growth and achievement in a land of bigness, expanse and emphasis on quantitative accomplishment. American Jewry has grown up in a society whose religious, civic, and mutual aid institutions are self-propelled rather than initiated by State or Church, and where association with these institutions is the free choice of the individual, subject only to social pressures within and without his group.¹³ Other qualities of American society have also impressed themselves on the Jewish group, influencing its method of collective action, such as the impulse to individual initiative in public as in economic affairs, and the voluntary associative spirit which is on the one hand a declaration of independence of the individual from governmental restraint, and on the other means a greater dependence on individuals in their group association. Among the many factors which must be considered are specifically Jewish aspects: the spread of Jewish communities over the land in its main cities and towns; the diversity of Jewish religious-cultural expression and institutions in the modern world; the

transplantation of European Jewish communities and institutional traditions, and the imperative to weave them into a new pattern of experience.

Nor can the long record of attempts and failures to create representative organizations be overlooked. From the earliest proposal of Isaac Leeser and Louis Salomon in 1841, the efforts to create a representative body of American Jewry were many and varied. Even in the middle of the nineteenth century, for example, it followed almost naturally from the prevalent congregationalism in American life that the European system of a centralized *Gemeinde* would not be appropriate for American Jewry. Yet the possibility was not excluded that some representative body of American Jewry could be developed to eliminate the negative results of decentralization. Social anarchy, Leeser declared even then, was not a condition of synagogue autonomy. From this very first proposal on, whether action was initiated from the religious, defence or philanthropic sectors of American Jewish life, the respective 'calls to assembly' seem to have been written by one hand saying that more effective organization would measurably improve the *quality* of Jewish life. It is equally striking to note that the collective will of American Jewry, as manifest in its decisions, consistently denied this argument. From time to time, 'ceiling' organizations did come into existence, but they were most often of an *ad hoc* nature, generally for emergency or overseas needs.

The observance of the American Jewish Tercentenary in 1954 reflected the basic organizational character of the collectivity of Jews in America. It was not a celebration arranged by an American Jewish community as such, but by a more or less 'balanced' committee of representative personalities and institutions. These men and organizations, despite their divergencies, co-operated to formulate a national programme to celebrate the anniversary year. This was stated unequivocally in the first report on 'Scope and Theme'.

We do not believe that the Tercentenary should be made a vehicle for propagation of any particular ideology in American Jewish life. Some among us may feel strongly that the identification of a Jew is solely in terms of his religion; others may lean towards a different interpretation. The celebration should not be committed to either philosophy. It should be neither Zionist, non-Zionist, nor anti-Zionist. It should not try to formulate or advance any particular definition of Jewishness. The Tercentenary belongs primarily to five million people who regard themselves as patriotic, loyal American Jews, whatever their definition or their philosophy; it should be broad enough to appeal to 160,000,000 Americans, who have shared in the building of America, and who, we would hope, would be willing to join in commemorating with us this happy anniversary.¹⁴

The existence of this pattern of Jewish communal functioning in

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

America does not denote its acceptance on the part of many thinkers, leaders, and organizations as either inevitable or permanent. Serious thought continues to be advanced as to ways of changing the existing situation: Mordecai M. Kaplan's concept of 'the organic community'; Israel Goldstein's propulsion of the idea of a democratically constituted representative body; and the Rabbinical Assembly's decision to bring about an American Jewish Assembly through the initiative of the Synagogue Council of America. Nahum Goldmann's continuing critique of the disorder in American Jewish communal affairs found its most recent expression in his proposal that American Jewry should 'democratize its life and organize itself'. As in the European past and in South American Jewish communities today, Dr Goldmann argues that the Kehillah form can serve as an ideal unifying framework—a proposal which was endorsed by the *Reconstructionist*. There are others who feel the need for representative organization, but seriously contend against an imposition of any *national* collective body for different reasons. Philip Klutznick maintains that national 'voluntary cooperation' is feasible but 'organic unity' will always be a controversial issue. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds maintain that, in time, the local communities shall constitute the basis of the organized American Jewish community. To all such suggestions, the American Jewish Committee answers that the present arrangement is the most democratic, warning against separate enclaves in the American social structure.¹⁵

Since the past decade, two antithetical trends are progressing simultaneously: higher walls of separation between institutions geared to campaign methods and demands, and the formation and strengthening of associations of related interest groups for specific purposes (e.g. the National Community Relations Council, the Synagogue Council of America, the American Zionist Council). The result is clusters of autonomous groups operating in free competition, without an authoritative, directing body. Whether it be 'organized chaos' or not, even the most carping critics of the organizational patterns of the American Jewish community stand in awe at the measure of its accomplishment on its own behalf and for the welfare of Jews throughout the world.

Of Jewish communal life in Argentina, as Jacob Shatzky has pointed out, it is possible to say that the first group of East-European settlers at the end of the past century already constituted 'a community' on the boat that brought them to the shores of their new country.¹⁶ The beginnings of the present Jewish community in Argentina, the Kehillah, was developed in Europe by the emigrants who took with them from their towns—to the extent they could anticipate—spiritual and educational leadership and personnel, including rabbis, *shochetim*, and

mohalim. In this *guided communal migration* a whole culture was transplanted from one part of the world to another, from one social climate and regime to another. Despite the metamorphosis of the Jewish community in Argentina from rural to urban, and its removal from the interior to Buenos Aires and a number of other cities, we can trace a continuity in its communal life. Community organization served as the spine of Jewish association, resisting the kind of breakup of Jewish group life which took place in other communities in the western world. However, in describing Argentinian Jewry in our own times, a qualification must be introduced. The rapid, and sometimes convulsive nature of the social process in Argentina generally, can conceivably affect not only the Jewish community outwardly, but also be reflected within. Such signs of deep inner change in Jewish life are all too apparent.

The uniqueness of the Jewish community in Argentina is its Kehillah, a central body based on popular democratic foundations. In a study of 'The Jewish Community of Buenos Aires', Irving Louis Horowitz describes how ethnic allegiances rather than religious beliefs have come to define the modern social types in Argentinian city life, and relates the Kehillah, 'the little society', to the Jewish 'community of fate'.¹⁷ Conceived and conducted as a quasi-parliament of the Jews of Argentina—its revised constitution, statutes, and by-laws were formally accredited by the Argentine Government in 1956—the Kehillah is organized on party lines, virtually counterpart to the factions on the Israeli scene. Its representatives are not elected at conventions, but directly by the members of the Kehillah, which numbers some fifty thousand family units.¹⁸ Because of its party composition, ideological factors play an important role in the Kehillah programme and deliberations. It also explains the Kehillah's concern for the educational and cultural direction of the community. Another example of the representative structure in Argentina, is the DAIA (Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas.) The DAIA is a co-ordinate body of Jewish organizations and institutions, including the Sephardi community, charged with the responsibility to represent Argentinian Jewry in political and defence activities. It is housed in the building of the Kehillah. The respective responsibilities of the two bodies are clearly defined and co-operation is manifest.

Called 'the mother of Jewish communities in Argentina', the Buenos Aires Kehillah was founded in 1894 as the 'Hevra Kaddisha Ashkenazi'. In 1949 it became the 'Ashkenazi Community of Buenos Aires'. The Kehillah is also known as AMIA (Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina). The Sephardi community of Argentina is not affiliated with the Ashkenazi community, and it too maintains cultural and social institutions and projects. While the complex of problems which flow from this communal duality influences the texture of Argentinian Jewish life, the separate existence of the Sephardi community does not detract in any

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

real way from the central communal character of the Kehillah. Significantly, the Kehillah is slowly dropping the name 'Ashkenazi' from its legend, preferring to become 'the central Jewish organization of Jewish life in South America'. The Kehillah's organizational character is indeed the model for communities throughout Latin America; and in Argentina it is the leading force in the *Va'ad ha-Kehillot*, the council of the Jewish communities of Argentina, which embraces about 110 communities.¹⁹

Again a national Jewish event serves to illustrate the community structure. In August 1960 the Jewish community of Argentina celebrated its first centenary. Unlike the celebrations in the United States and Canada, it was almost exclusively an internal Jewish event, recognized and briefly commented upon by the public, but not endorsed, sponsored, or seriously participated in by governmental authorities. An extraordinary congress was convened under the auspices of the single authoritative council of communities, *Va'ad ha-Kehillot*, and led by the Kehillah of Buenos Aires. Some 240 delegates, the official representatives of the local communities, attended, quite literally, a congress of Argentinian communities ('Cien años de vida Judía en la Argentina—Congreso Extraordinario de Comunidades'). The agenda was devoted to the direct and immediate needs of these communities as a whole: the problems of the younger generation, the lack of spiritual leadership, education, communal organization, and the more effective co-ordination between the Ashkenazi and Sephardi communities.²⁰

The 'inner directedness' of the Buenos Aires Kehillah is its most distinctive quality. The Kehillah is, in effect, education-centred, although it derives most of its income from burial fees—a monopoly which goes back to its origin as a *Hevra Kaddisha*. It subsidizes more than half of the affiliated schools' budgets and 50 per cent of the cost of school buildings.²¹ The fact that the Kehillah expends more than half of its income on education (including youth activities, seminars, and a *haluziut* programme) reflects not only its 'inner directedness' but also its popular democratic basis, which compels it to meet the family needs of its constituency. In the Argentinian Jewish community, unlike the United States and Canada, the very existence of the Kehillah as its democratically constituted body virtually has created an organic community reflecting an unusual degree of communal order and discipline.

We indicated how all three communities, similarly committed to the Jewish Tradition and the Jewish People, experiencing on the whole analogous internal Jewish needs and problems, are building indigenous institutions in their respective localities to ensure their future as Jewish communities. However, the representative forms which they have created for these purposes are dissimilar, primarily because of the direction given by the prevalent majority cultures. The hypothesis of this paper, namely, that the study of the Jewish People in its separate

locales as related parts of an organic whole will lead to new dimensions of comprehension about both the parts and the whole, is, as indicated, subject to basic investigation and analysis. Some of the possibilities which derive from this hypothesis can suggest themselves from the survey of the representative forms in their cultural, religious, and ethnic contexts. One possibility relates to the different kinds of Jewish affiliation. Another lesson is to be derived for world Jewish organization.

The present world Jewish community is organized not territorially but on the basis of ideology, practical purpose, or emergency. Further study and analysis may possibly lead to another conclusion, out of which the idea for a new structure of world Jewish organization may emerge. If indeed the various Jewish communities have developed unique representational forms as a result of the general forces in the societies which shape them, a new system of world Jewish union might be based on these very dissimilar territorial community units. However, before any definitive conclusions may be reached, more areas of study need to be probed. In respect to the majority such variables include the existence of an immigrant population, the component strands of the general population, their relative cultural status, their relation to one another and to the Jews. As regards the elements distinguishing between the Jewish communities, some of the variables are the bases of Jewish affiliation and the attitude and loyalties to outside Jewish communities including Israel.

II

Through the comparative analysis not only are the systems of organized Jewish life cast in a new light, but their role in Jewish survival also compels reappraisal. What Horowitz says about the situation in Buenos Aires—that there is a ‘disequilibrium between organization and ideology’—is equally true for the somewhat less centralized community of Canada and the pluralistic community of the United States. ‘The main issue has become the nature and value of Judaism rather than the organizational forms required to secure the continued survival of the Jewish community.’²² An aspect of Jewish life which is common to Canadian, United States, and Argentinian Jewry is the crisis of Jewish identity which is affecting large segments of Jews. This problem of finding ties with one’s Jewish past and with one’s present may be essentially individual, but its impact is felt by the entire Jewish collectivity.

There are two contiguous trends emanating from this problem—return and withdrawal. While ‘the return’ is also a result of the contemporary crisis of identity, it is the withdrawal category which is most affected, and concerns us directly. Regrettably, for lack of adequate basic studies on the withdrawal group, it is impossible to write in any

conclusive way about what is probably the largest numerical sector of Jews in all three countries. We know little about the nature of their crisis as Jews, the basis of their neutralism, passivity, and non-identification. Before any significant evaluation can be made we need definitive answers to such questions as what 'being Jewish' means to them; how they see the relation between the Jewish and non-Jewish group and their own part in these groups; what their attitude is to the historical past, the religious tradition and cultural content of Jewish life and to Israel; what differences exist in these areas between themselves and their parents; and, in general, what are the forces that will draw them to and repel them from Jewish life.²³ We need further to know whether the answers to these questions will or will not vary in countries of different cultural influences. Although it seems that the crisis of Jewish identity is universal and constitutes today a common element of concern, it is important to discover through comparison the subtle differences in attitude and reaction among and within the respective communities. Thus a clearer picture of the image of the individual Jew will emerge with possible indications of the specific nature of the crisis, which do not appear from the study of the group.

The manner of withdrawal is easier in the comparatively free society of our times than it was in the past. It can be a departure in several forms: mixed marriages and the relegation of the decision of conversion until it comes of its own accord, or prompted by one's children, or by family crises; gradual separation from the Jewish community and the Jewish milieu which need not be a dramatic or forced exit or one engendered by an ideology of assimilation. Both aspects of this withdrawal function as part of a single process, complementing and strengthening each other. On the individual plane, the result is assimilation—the loss of group identity. For the Jewish community, the consequence is a weakening of its entire structure.

The statistics of intermarriage cited here for Canada are derived from governmental sources; for the United States, a unique governmental source is available, the civilian population report of 1957 which includes information on religion; for Argentina, we have but Jewish communal compilations, and they are, in fact, only rough estimates. In Canada, where official government figures on intermarriage are available since 1921, the rate of mixed marriages has increased from 6.2 per cent in the period 1936-40, to 9.6 per cent during the Second World War, then to about 16 per cent in 1960.²⁴ According to the United States report, the intermarriage rate there is 7.2 per cent.²⁵ Estimates for Argentina vary from 15-20 per cent.²⁶

Unfortunately, the studied analyses of these figures are still tentative and oft-times contradictory. Yet, despite the numerical variations, the available statistical data reveal many significant facts which obtain in all three communities. In the first place, intermarriage is much higher

in the smaller localities than in the larger cities where Jewish communal life is more developed because of the opportunities afforded by spatial consolidation.²⁷ However, the increasing rate of intermarriage, combined with a lower than average fertility rate, indicates a serious attrition of the biological existence of the Jewish communities.²⁸ Second, the falling away from the Jewish community is not always determined by the quality or character of Jewish education in the home. The decision to marry is made at an age when young people are not under the direct influence of their parents or of the Jewish environment. Thus it is the young persons' own feelings about Jews and Judaism which determine, at a crucial moment in their lives and when so many conflicting factors are operative, their indifference to, acceptance or rejection of Jewish communality and values.²⁹ Third, the more open the society, the more possible and even more likely the dissocation. When there is a condition of social and intellectual fluidity between the various religious, racial, and ethnic strands, the Jews quite naturally become part of that interchange, and the centripetal forces in Jewish life lose strength. Therefore, despite Erich Rosenthal's thesis, based on his significant Chicago case study, that large-scale assimilation can be offset by 'voluntary segregation in a high-status area combined with a modicum of Jewish education', he finds it necessary to qualify his conclusion by emphasizing that 'there can however be no doubt that the likelihood of intermarriage increases with increased acculturation.' And he cites as evidence the Bigman study on Greater Washington which shows in detail that persons with an educational achievement beyond high school and with high professional status are most likely to enter into intermarriage.³⁰ Fourth, a new type of family is being introduced into the larger Jewish family circle. Whether the intermarried household is divided or united in a religious sense, serious problems are presented to the Jewish community as a whole by those who wish to identify with the Jewish group without formal conversion. New situations created by intermarriage and the pursuant patterns of intermarried families are mounting. However, the acceptance of these families in the synagogues and other institutions of the Jewish community is becoming the practice, *halachic* dictates notwithstanding.³¹

Intermarriage, whatever its motivation and intent, is a decisive act in which generally the individual reckons with the possibility or desirability of disaffiliation from his community. Gradual separation requires no such act of negation. It is, in effect, indifference, passive acceptance or absentee membership in the Jewish community.³² Precisely because such separation can be realized in free societies without an overt act of conversion or repudiation, the 'indifferent' (those who refrain from identification with Jews and Judaism, while not disavowing them) represent a foremost challenge to the future of Jewish life in all three communities. For they live as citizens of their respective countries,

involved in the economic and cultural life about them, entirely or largely apart from the Jewish community and apparently without need for religio-cultural identity.³³ Classified as the unaffiliated, their number is legion; and they come from all sectors of the Jewish population. Their most eloquent spokesmen are to be found among the intellectuals, on the university campuses and in the wider literary and artistic circles. Tangential information on this element can be gleaned from other more inclusive attitude studies, community and institutional histories, and contemporary literary sources.³⁴

In Canada, the literary documentation is perhaps the most revealing. In poetry and prose, young gifted Jewish writers are in the front rank of Canadian letters, being called by some critics the only representative group of Canadian writers. The poems and novels of such writers as Henry Kreisel, Irving Layton, Lionel Shapiro, Adele Wiseman—A. M. Klein is in a class by himself—reflect not only the acute nature of the generational conflict, but also the clash of cultures, the dilemmas of family and religious loyalties, the sharp critique of Jewish group life, the cry for a Tradition which could have been theirs, but is not.³⁵

A straightforward memoir by Mordecai Richler, 'We Jews are almost as bad as the Gentiles', was featured across Canada in *Maclean's Magazine*, and shocked the public-conscious members of the Jewish community. Yet he wrote what is preached in the pulpits and what researchers reported in *Crestwood Heights*, a suburb of Toronto, in more restrained scholarly fashion. This is Richler's complaint:

When I was a boy I was told that we had to live in a ghetto because that was the only way we had survived thousands of years of oppression. Assimilation and intermarriage, I was told, meant extinction. And so returning to Canada it is ironic to see this same community, *as insular as ever*, [italics added] doing unto themselves what they say the Gentiles have been trying to do since the beginning of our history, namely, to destroy those traditions that make us appear different.³⁶

Thus in the new ghettos of suburbia, the physical togetherness of Jews has not resolved the dilemma of the indifferent.³⁷ It is a great paradox: Jews living within the circle of Jews continue to live on the perimeter of Judaism. And the Canadian account repeats itself in the United States and in Argentina. One of the most eloquent testimonies in the entire genre of self-evaluating literary fragments which regularly appear in the journals in the United States, is Daniel Bell's 'Reflections on Jewish Identity'.³⁸ Writing as one for whom the Jewish 'past is still present', Bell nevertheless leaves the reader with a vexing question: Is he making the 'still present' his dynamic future? Again, most of the studies indicate a troubling negative.³⁹

While knowledge of the situation in Argentina is more a matter of common observation than of systematic study, the evidence of the continuing crisis of Jewish self-identification is produced at conferences

of Jewish groups on all levels in many sectors of the community.⁴⁰ 'Convivencia' or 'living together', is a pervading concept in Argentina. For large sections of Jews, this concept aptly describes their aspiration for social interaction with the general community without necessarily being involved in the Jewish group. In these circles, the tug towards Jewish 'convivencia' is not generally felt, although they are mindful of the many opportunities for Zionist, Yiddishist, cultural, and religious association. Alienation and assimilation are the terms most often applied to the greater number of Jews by the intensivists in the Jewish community, whose children, like the children of the Yiddishists and culturalist immigrant parents in the United States and Canada, have removed themselves from the world of their parents without creating a Jewish world of their own. The religious groups have been unable thus far to capture the imagination or interest of significant numbers of the disaffiliated, though several brave attempts are being made. The result is that most of the intelligentsia are estranged from the collectivity of Jews and Judaism.⁴¹

A recent statement by León S. Pérez, a participant-observer in student and university life, underlines some of the characteristics of the Jewish university situation in Argentina.⁴² Dr. Pérez explains that the Jewish university students on the whole are not concerned with the survival of the Jewish group, having lost their 'auto-identity' as Jews. The problem of antisemitism has been divested of its specific character as a threat to Jews and is translated by them in terms of a general threat to democracy. Many reasons are advanced: the highly politicized university environment; the poor level of local Jewish culture in comparison with the general culture; the opportunities available to the university-trained student outside the Jewish community. In sum, the ties with Jews and Judaism are gradually weakened:

He [the student] tends gradually to blot out his own limits within larger non-Jewish groups and to remain within the confines of the Jewish family without deepening his roots in it. The dangerous transition period is crossed without conceptual safeguards and without a secure frame of reference. He reacts with fear and incertitude towards the Jewishness within him, which for the most part becomes subordinate, inert or passive, and for that reason unimportant in the totality of his existence.

Antisemitism becomes, automatically, the mirror of his Judaism. And that which effaces or is capable of effacing antisemitism is capable of effacing his Judaism.⁴³

The crisis of Jewish identity assumes a variety of forms. It has been described as the escape from tradition, the conflict of ideology, and even *Selbsthass*. But it seems that the negative implication of such critique is misleading. The indifferent in the communities under discussion are not engaged in a battle against Jews and Judaism. Their indifference is a counterpart of their involvement in their milieu in which they find

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

or purport to find what they describe as rootedness, 'at homeness', 'convivencia', identification with their native environment, the love of their land, and the joy and freedom to struggle for its goals.⁴⁴

To define the sources of Jewish self-effacement inherent in this common element of withdrawal is also to explain, in part, the reasons for 'the return'. Many who seek to resolve the dilemma of identity by choosing Jewish identification, may on deeper analysis be found to do so because their very rootedness and involvement in their native societies urge them to bring forward their individual and group difference.⁴⁵ Statements in the counter-symposia to *Commentary's* symposium ('Jewishness and the Younger Intellectuals') in *Judaism* and the *Reconstructionist* reflect this possibility.⁴⁶

The growing literature on the crisis of Jewish identity reveals more fundamental questions relating to the creative survival of Jewry in contemporary western civilization. In a society where the Jews are integrated in the social and economic spheres, can there be religio-cultural distinctiveness? Is there a Jewish distinctiveness? Can it evolve and create in a situation where the Jewish pattern is secondary to almost all other aspects of the life style of the country? Recent social thinking has changed its former stance and now tends to the view that acculturation need not lead to complete assimilation.⁴⁷ But there is no conclusive evidence to this view. And there are those who contend that inevitably the pervasiveness of the majority culture leads to a diluted Jewish culture. Whatever the position be, the impact of the acculturation process on Judaism needs to be studied. Acculturation includes both the positive processes of challenge, adaptation, and accretion, and the negative manifestations of spiritual and cultural assimilation.⁴⁸ There has been on the whole an understanding of the positive aspects of the accommodation of Judaism to the modern world. However, on the negative side, there has not been proper understanding of the cultural and religious syncretism resulting from the fusion of Jewish ideas and values with alien concepts and forms.

These are some of the problems which arise from a study of the category of withdrawal. Other fruitful areas in the investigation of common elements can be the impact of middle-class stratification, urbanization, and suburban culture on Jewish life and institutions; the problems of marginality and alienation; and the position of the third generation within the pattern of return and withdrawal. As these aspects are uncovered and analysed, it will be possible to explain more fully the factors which might account for the resemblances and the differences between the three communities.

* * *

The purpose of this paper was to describe, by comparison, two aspects of Jewish life in the three most important communities in the western

hemisphere, where an estimated six and a half million Jews—about one half of the Jewish world population—live. In the course of the presentation several methodological problems were touched upon which require solution, if the comparative approach can be utilized effectively, not only for an understanding of the processes of Jewish life in these three communities but in all the contemporary Jewish world. A major problem is posed by the absence of studies in the principal fields of Jewish concern and the unevenness of the material which does exist. The demographic data are so inadequate that we do not know the answer to the elementary questions of whether the Jewish population in the United States is increasing or decreasing; or whether the population figure for Argentinian Jewry is closer to 350,000 or the accepted 450,000. Canada is the only country in the western hemisphere where statistics on the Jews are incorporated in the Government censuses. Our knowledge about the rate of intermarriage is not better. Marshall Sklare properly raises the issue of the analysts who are 'soft' on the intermarriage problem, asking whether the lack of good qualitative studies is an accident or due to the fact that we would rather not know the full story.⁴⁹

Another serious problem straddles the methodological and the substantive qualities of the existing studies. Obviously, it has not been suggested here that there is no place for local Jewish studies written from the vantage of their immediate context. It is emphasized, however, that particularly in our times, for a Jewish community anywhere, the measure is the totality of Judaism and the Jews. Seen in the additional comparative light, the interpretation of the local community may change. Primary and secondary forces, the vital and the less important, the temporary and the permanent, may be seen differently when they are evaluated as part of the existence of the whole Jewish People and not only in terms of the striving of the Jewish group to adapt itself and survive in its land of residence.

In sum, it is our contention that if more comparative studies will be undertaken on a regional and global basis, many of these deficiencies will be discovered and, it is hoped, met. In time, a scholarly consensus will grow on the vital areas of investigation to be undertaken, and priorities will fall into their proper place. No organization or school is adequate itself—although the Institute of Contemporary Jewry wishes to do its share—to assume this task, but a world community of scholars concerned with these problems, working independently and in concert, can fulfil the need. From both the substantive and practical scholarly vantage points, the comparative method can make a qualitative difference in the study and interpretation of contemporary Jewish life.

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

NOTES

¹ For an interpretative statement of the comparative method, see Morris Ginsberg, 'The Comparative Method', in *Essays in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, Vol. III: *Evolution and Progress* (London, 1961), pp. 194-207.

² Bezalel Sherman, in *The Jew Within American Society* (Detroit, 1961) questions whether the Jews are 'a religious fellowship, an historical continuum, a cultural group with peculiar racial traits, or a people'. He determines that 'the Jews defy categorization as an entity' but nevertheless suggests that the term 'sub-community' most accurately describes their status. About the Jews in Canada, Louis Rosenberg writes in a private memorandum: 'While the greater percentage of Jews in Canada reported themselves in the Canadian censuses of 1951 and 1961 as Jewish by religion than Jewish by ethnic origin, nevertheless the ethnic and cultural bonds between Jews in Canada is still greater and stronger than that involved in belonging to a religious congregation.'

³ Compare Oscar Handlin, 'Historical Perspectives on the American Ethnic Group', *Daedalus* (Spring, 1961), pp. 220-32.

⁴ See James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison, editors, *The Shaping of American Religion*, Vol. 1 of *Religion in American Life* (Princeton, 1961), pp. 4-5.

⁵ The problem of dual loyalty does not seem to disturb the public conscience of Argentinian Jewry. On Columbus Day, a national holiday, a Jewish institution like the Sociedad Hebraica Argentina flies both the Argentinian flag and the flag of the State of Israel as the flags of the Jewish community. Similarly in Santiago de Chile, where the fire stations are contributed by the ethnic communities, the Jewish 'colonia residente' contributed the funds for the Israel fire station ('Bomba Israel'). Consecrated by the Israel Ambassador, the event was announced with full aplomb. The seal on the fire station is the Star of David; and it also appears on the regular headgear. On national festivals and on Israel Independence Day, the Israeli flag is flown (*El Mercurio* [Nov. 27, 1960], p. 51).

⁶ See Louis Rosenberg's article 'Two

Centuries of Jewish Life in Canada, 1760-1960' in *American Jewish Year Book*, 62 (1961), pp. 36-8. The objects of the Congress, as outlined in the charter of incorporation (1952), are:

(a) to encourage, carry on, and participate in activities of a national, patriotic, cultural, and humanitarian nature, in furtherance of the best interests of the country, and the Jewish people;

(b) to act in matters affecting the status, rights, and welfare of Canadian Jewry;

(c) to investigate the causes of anti-semitism and to advise means of abating its influence throughout the world generally and in Canada in particular; and to promote the growth of a spirit of tolerance, mutual understanding, and goodwill between all ethnic elements in Canada;

(d) to direct investigations, studies, and research on economic and social problems confronting Jewry generally, and Canadian Jewry in particular; to prepare and publish its findings; and to accumulate and preserve records, written material, and data concerning Jewish life in Canada to serve as a repository and documentary source of its activities and historical development;

(e) to carry on and assist in efforts for the improvement of the social, economic, and cultural level of Jewry, and the mitigation of their suffering throughout the world, and to cooperate with other agencies in rendering assistance and helping to rehabilitate Jewish immigrants and refugees.

⁷ The 'proclamation' was published in four languages: English, French, Yiddish, and Hebrew in the *Commemorative Report on the National Bicentenary of Canadian Jewry (1759-1959)*. The authority of the Congress was also approved by the Prime Minister of Canada, John G. Diefenbaker, and the Premiers of the ten provinces when they agreed to sponsor the National Bicentenary under its banner.

⁸ I.O.I. (Fortnightly Summary of Inter-Office Information) from Saul Hayes, compiled by Samuel Lewin to members of Dominion Council and Community Leaders. First published in 1946 and issued five days a week, over 2,700 such summaries have been issued.

The fortnightly summary edition began publication in 1958. Also a fortnightly summary edition dealing with community relations affairs has appeared alternately since 1946; and a monthly edition in Yiddish is also published.

⁹ *The Eichmann Trial*, Statement for the Guidance of Jewish Community Leaders in Canada. Statement authorized by the United Zionist Council and the Canadian Jewish Congress—B'nai B'rith Public Relations Committees, 15 March 1961.

¹⁰ R. M. MacIver, *Report on the Jewish Community Agencies* (New York, National Community Relations Council, May 1951). See also the statements of the respective national agencies on the report (also 1951): American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Jewish Labor Committee, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, United Synagogue of America. See also Abraham G. Duker, *Jewish Community Relations* [An Analysis of the MacIver Report] (New York, Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 1962).

¹¹ *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America*, XXIV, (New York, 1960), pp. 303-4.

¹² Compare Rabbi Abraham J. Karp's individual conclusion based on historical analysis, 'The American Jewish Community—Union Now or Ever' in *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America*, XXV (New York, 1961), pp. 45-67.

¹³ Report of *The Princeton Conference on The History of Philanthropy* (New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1956), pp. 9 and ff.

¹⁴ David Bernstein, 'The American Jewish Tercentenary', reprinted from *The American Jewish Year Book* (1956), p. 103. The extent to which the official Tercentenary celebration deemed the Jewish group to be a conglomerate of individual American Jews rather than an ordered community is demonstrated in the statement prepared for the occasion and incorporated in the programme of the Tercentenary Dinner (Wednesday, 20 October 1954, New York City) addressed by the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower. 'The theme is universal: Man's opportunities and responsibilities under Freedom. The

meaning is personal: the devotion and dedication of the individual American Jew to the country of which he is a citizen and to the faith to which he adheres.'

¹⁵ See Mordecai M. Kaplan's basic statement on the 'organic community' in 'Toward the Formulation of Guiding Principles for the Conservative Movement', published as a supplement to *Conservative Judaism*, VI (May 1950), and the discussion which ensued on the theme of 'The Unity of the Jewish People Throughout the World', in *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly*, XVI (1952), pp. 119-86. Compare the widely divergent views of Ira Eisenstein, Philip Bernstein, Barnett R. Brickner, Samuel D. Gershowitz, Milton Himmelfarb, Simon Kramer, David Petegorsky; most of them, in fact, represented organizational positions. See also Israel Goldstein, *The American Jewish Community: Trends, Potentials, Leadership, and Organization* (New York, 1960). (Reprinted in *Transition Years* [Jerusalem, 1962], pp. 23-48.) Dr. Goldmann's view is summarized in the *Reconstructionist* (Jan. 25, 1963), pp. 3-4. For Philip Klutznick's analysis and particularly the background of the creation of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, see his *No Easy Answers* (New York, 1961), pp. 27-50. For a viewpoint of the role of Federations and Welfare Funds in the development of Jewish communal organization, see Harry L. Lurie's *A Heritage Affirmed* (Philadelphia, 1961), especially Part Two, 'The Federation and Jewish Community Organization', pp. 163-258. An example of the emergent 'grassroots' structure of the Community Council Movement are the by-laws adopted by the Jewish Community Council of Rochester in 1961. The re-organized Rochester Community Council is based on a membership composed of individuals and of organizations. For the American Jewish Committee position, see John Slawson and Manheim S. Shapiro, *Trends in the American Jewish Community* (Revised edition, November 1962).

¹⁶ *Comunidades Judías en Latinoamérica* (Buenos Aires, 1952), p. 19.

¹⁷ In *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* (December 1962), pp. 147-71. See especially the section on 'Voluntary Organization: from Survival to Identity', and p. 154.

¹⁸ The voting turnout is not very high. Thus the 'democratic' reality falls short

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

of the conception. See the Kehillah report of the May 1957 elections:

| List | Name | Number of votes | Number of delegates |
|------|--|-----------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Poalei Zion-Hitachdut | 6004 | 30 |
| 2 | Hashomer Hatzair | 764 | 4 |
| 3 | Zionists-Revisionists | 604 | 3 |
| 4 | Central European (Farband) (German Jews) | 926 | 5 |
| 5 | Progressives (Communists) | 2318 | 12 |
| 6 | Zionist Liberal Party | 863 | 4 |
| 7 | Bund | 555 | 3 |
| 8 | Ahdut Avoda—Poalei Zion | 2490 | 13 |
| 9 | Zionist Federation | 2180 | 11 |
| 10 | Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi | 1080 | 5 |

¹⁰ *Kehillah Un Folk-Comunidad y Pueblo*—Boletín de la Fed. de Comun. Isr. Argén. (Nissan-Iyar 5721—April 1961).

²⁰ *Di Idishe Zeitung* (Buenos Aires, 24 Aug. 1960).

²¹ *Comunidad Israelita de Buenos Aires* (1960?), section entitled 'Subvención Escolar'.

²² See *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. XXIV (Oct., 1962), p. 221.

²³ These questions are from the study memorandum of Simon Herman of the Hebrew University, submitted to the Institute of Contemporary Jewry. Dr. Herman is engaged in socio-psychological research in the Kurt Lewin tradition on the problems of Jewish identity. See his paper, 'American Jewish Students in Israel: A Social-Psychological Study in Cross-Cultural Education', in *Jewish Social Studies*, XXIV (Jan. 1962), pp. 3-29.

²⁴ Louis Rosenberg, 'The Demography of the Jewish Community in Canada', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, I (Dec. 1959), p. 226.

²⁵ Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, no. 79 (Washington, D.C., 2 Feb. 1958), table 6, p. 8. See also the section 'Patterns of Inter-marriage', in Bezael Sherman, op. cit., pp. 183-9, where recent local studies are summarized.

²⁶ These figures are based on the internal report of the Kehillah, 'Cifras Estadísticas de Algunas de Nuestras Comunidades' (Buenos Aires, 1959), where the data on mixed marriages ('casamientos mixtos') in each community are listed separately.

²⁷ For an analysis of the intermarriage data on Canada, see Rosenberg's article in the *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, cited above, p. 226, in which he states, in part: 'The trend to intermarriage among Jews is by no means uniform throughout

Canada. It is lowest in the city of Montreal, with the largest Jewish population in Canada, where it is slightly more than half the intermarriage rate for Canada as a whole; and it is highest in the smaller Jewish communities in the Prairie Provinces, British Columbia, and the Maritime provinces on the Atlantic coast.'

For the United States, see Erich Rosenthal, 'Acculturation Without Assimilation? The Jewish Community of Chicago, Illinois', *The American Journal of Sociology*, LXVI (Nov. 1960), particularly p. 288, where he cites the exceedingly higher than national average intermarriage figures from the 1953 State of Iowa study, and the 1959 San Francisco, Marin County, and the Peninsula survey. See also the *Third Annual Report on the Jewish Population of Charleston, W.Va.*, A Demographic Study (1 March 1961). See especially pp. 5-6, where comparisons are made with the two earlier studies. All three studies of the Charleston community were undertaken by a local committee headed by Rabbi Samuel Cooper. See also Bernard Kligfeld, 'Inter-marriage and Mixed Marriage: A Review of the Literature on the Subject', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book*, LXX (1960), pp. 135-6. The original article appeared in stencil form and contains selected bibliography on the subject. For Argentina, see the internal report of the Kehillah, cited above. 63 communities are listed, with figures on mixed marriages for 33.

²⁸ See Erich Rosenthal, 'Jewish Fertility in the United States', *American Jewish Year Book*, 62 (1961), p. 25.

²⁹ See Kligfeld, op. cit. (stencil), p. 6.

³⁰ Rosenthal, op. cit., *American Journal of Sociology*, p. 288.

³¹ Albert Gordon, *Jews in Transition* (Minneapolis, 1949), pp. 206 ff. Compare also the observation of J. Milton Yinger, 'Group Identification or Withdrawal', *Daedalus*, Ethnic Groups in American Life Issue (Spring, 1961), p. 253, to the effect that 'intermarriage is probably cumulative: children of mixed marriages are more likely to marry outside the group than are children of endogamous unions'. Yinger's statement, although it requires further analysis, is another example of the new kind of dilemmas which face the Jewish community. In Argentina there are differences of opinion between the

rabbinate and the Kehillah over the acceptance of the mixed families into the community. For reference to the tensions which exist on this issue, see *Informe del 6º Congreso de las Comunidades* (Buenos Aires, 1962), p. 36.

³² Compare 'La Communauté et les Indifférents', *Communauté*, 13 (April-May, 1961).

³³ In the economic sphere, the measure of integration achieved by the Jews in the United States and Canada is yet to be realized in Argentina. The very existence of exclusive Jewish banks, credit unions, and business unions reveals the limitations placed upon Jews in the general economy, even as it strengthens the Jewish community. In this regard, Bezalel Sherman emphasizes that the resemblance of the Argentinian Jewish community is greater to the old Jewish settlements of Eastern Europe than to the acculturated Jewish communities in the New World. See Sherman, 'Yidish Leben in Argentina', *Yidisher Kempfer* (Passover, 1962), p. 32.

The attempt to become fully integrated by denying or ignoring minority group belongingness, it has been pointed out, has adverse socio-psychological implications. The dilemma of the 'marginal man' has been discussed by Kurt Lewin in his essay 'Bringing Up the Jewish Child' (1940), in *Resolving Social Conflicts* (New York, 1948). Furthermore, the ego-identity, as E. H. Erikson observed, develops out of 'a gradual integration of all identifications'. See *Childhood and Society* (London, 1951). For the Jew his Jewish group identification is an important constituent of his ego-identity. See Simon Herman, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

³⁴ See, for example, for the United States, the extensive work of Marshall Sklare and his associates at the Division of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee, as developed in their attitude inquiries of 'Bayville', 'River-ton', 'Southville' and other ongoing studies. See also the study 'Jewish Belongingness of Jewish Youth' by Leibush Lehrer published in *YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science*, XI (1954), pp. 137-65, and his questionnaire on the Jewish attitudes and interests of the second and succeeding generations of native American Jews (YIVO Institute for Jewish Research). Also the attitude surveys conducted by the Council of

Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc. (1947, 1952, 1959, 1961, 1962 and undated), The Union of American Hebrew Congregations (1953), the United Synagogue of America (1953). In this regard, a good example of a community history is *From Ararat to Suburbia* by Selig Adler and Thomas E. Connolly (Philadelphia, 1960).

³⁵ Compare Adele Wiseman's *The Sacrifice* (New York, 1956), Henry Kreisel's *The Rich Man* (Canada, 1948), Mordecai Richler's *The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz* (Ontario, 1959) for examples of novels written out of the authors' experiences in the cities of Winnipeg, Toronto, and Montreal respectively. Of Irving Layton's poems which present a negative picture of Jewish life ('And the truth about ourselves is very uncomplimentary, very unpleasant'), see in particular 'Today I am a Man' and 'Stocktaking on the Day of Atonement' in *The Swinging Flesh* (Canada, 1961). See also the article 'Letters in Canada: 1956', edited by Douglas Grant in the *Toronto Quarterly* (University of Toronto, April, 1957), pp. 296-413.

I am beholden to Mrs. Pauline Goldhar, who helped me to assemble Canadian literary documentation.

³⁶ (22 Oct. 1960), pp. 10, 78-82. Compare *Crestwood Heights: A Study of the Culture of Suburban Life*, by John R. Secley, R. Alexander Sim, E. W. Loosley (New York, 1956), especially pp. 212-16. Maurice Freedman sees 'Crestwood Heights' as a common type of the 'open community' in western Jewish life in *The Structure of Jewish Minorities* (London, 1957).

³⁷ See Jacob Neusner's observation on the development of the contemporary Jewish neighbourhood in 'Fellowship and the Crisis of Community', in *The Reconstructionist* (27 Jan. 1961), pp. 8-15. He writes: 'For the most part, however, Jewish neighborhoods develop not around synagogues, but vice versa. People who prefer to live "with their own kind" are not motivated, for the most part, by a desire to maintain a common school and place of worship within an easy walk from home, or to have a common *sukkah* at Sukkot and a common *mikveh* and a common *minyan*. I am not sure what they seek among their own kind, but I suspect that it is a social benefit denied them elsewhere: the right

CENTRES OF JEWRY IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

to be received not as a type ("the Jew") but as an individual. Among one's own kind, the Jew is not, in fact, a member of a minority any longer, or possibly of any socially differentiable group, but he achieves the radical individuation denied him by extenuating circumstances elsewhere. The neighborhood ghetto would seem to have become, therefore, the instrument of achieving its very opposite: a place in the undifferentiated mass.'

³⁸ *Commentary* (June 1961), pp. 471-8.

³⁹ *Supra*, footnote 34. See also Albert Gordon, 'The Problems and Promises of Suburban Life' in *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America*, XXIV (1960), pp. 49-55.

⁴⁰ Several demographic and attitude studies are now being undertaken by the recently established Institute of Social Studies of the Kehillah, which resulted from the 'Primera Conferencia de Investigadores y Estudiosos Judeo-Argentinos en el Campo de las Ciencias Sociales y la Historia' held in October 1961 in Buenos Aires under the joint auspices of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University and the Comunidad Israelita de Buenos Aires.

⁴¹ The replies by several prominent Jewish intellectuals to the questionnaire on Jewish identity propounded by the *Nueva Sion* in Buenos Aires (13 Jan. 1962) reflect this separation from the Jewish community and the indifference to Jewish culture.

⁴² 'Situación del Universitario Judío en la Argentina', report published by the 'Primera Conferencia . . .' (Buenos Aires, 1961).

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 6. The extent to which this characterization may be true for Jewish University students and intellectuals in the United States and Canada should also be studied.

In Argentina, where the situation is in continuing flux, particularly since the Eichmann trial, many Jewish educationists and community leaders disagree with Dr. Pérez's analysis and insist that the chief source of withdrawal is ignorance of Jewish life and culture. They point to evidence of 'return' of many young people, especially University students. In a private memorandum, Professor Lazaro Schallman, Director of the Youth Department of AMIA indicates a rising interest of the youth in Jewish life. The Youth Department,

established several years ago, works with the existing youth organizations, 'Hebraica', 'Hacoaj' and Sephardi groups, and set up a federation of Jewish youth organizations.

For University youth, there exists the *Sionista* with branches in every University in the country. Yet Professor Schallman cites the general estimates that out of 11,000 to 12,000 Jewish students at the Universities, the activities of C.U.S. do not embrace more than 20 per cent.

Another institution which has already had a marked impression on Jewish youth in the community is the young people's synagogue Ramah (and the camp) founded by the Congregación Israelita under the spiritual direction of Rabbi Marshall Meyer. As in other countries, sports activities are an instrumentality for Jewish youth cohesiveness, and in Argentina the F.E.D.I.B.A. (Federación de Entidades Deportivas Israelitas Argentina) serves this purpose.

Other Hebraic and traditional educational institutions, such as the 'Majón', the 'Ieshivá', the 'Hejal Hatorá' and in Israel, the 'Majón Gold' are mentioned by Shalom Rosenberg and Daniel B. Rubinstein Novick who feel that the existence of these institutions has wrought positive transformation among the youth who are estranged from Judaism. See 'El Rol de la Tradición Religiosa en la Comunidad Judía en la Argentina,' report of the 'Primera Conferencia . . .', p. 19.

⁴⁴ See in particular the statements of Enoch Gordis, Andrew Hacker, John Hollander, Judith Jarvis, Ned Polsky in 'Jewishness and the Younger Intellectuals: A Symposium', *Commentary* (April 1961), pp. 323, 326-8, 330-2, 332-3, 333-6 and 345-6 respectively.

⁴⁵ See the discussion of Alfred Kazin on 'Biography' in *The Writing of American Jewish History*, edited by Moshe Davis and Isidore S. Meyer (New York, 1957), pp. 440-1.

⁴⁶ See especially the statements of Robert Alter, Arnold M. Rose, Irwin Weil in *Judaism*, Tenth Anniversary Issue, X (1961), pp. 292-4, 338-40, 347-9 respectively. In the *Reconstructionist* see editorial 'The Intellectual Jew' (April 21, 1961), pp. 3-4. The attempts at authentic Jewish creativity in the English language are other manifestations of the 'return' which should be studied. In

Canada, an interesting example of the positive feeling of Jewish identity is the volume of poems by Leonard Cohen, *The Spice-Box of Earth* (Canada, 1961). See especially 'The Genius', pp. 86-7.

⁴⁷ Yinger, op. cit., loc. cit., pp. 247-62.

⁴⁸ Ahad Ha'am's essay 'Imitation and Assimilation' published at the end of the past century (1893) is a classic exposition of the problem from the Jewish group viewpoint. Ahad Ha'am differentiates between 'self-effacing imitation' and 'competitive imitation', as they apply to the Jewish People. *Selected Essays of Ahad*

Ha'am, translated from the Hebrew and edited by Leon Simon (Reprinted in 1962 by Meridian Books and The Jewish Publication Society, 1962), pp. 107-24.

⁴⁹ Marshall Sklare, 'American Jews and American Jewish Life: Observations of a Sociologist', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook*, LXXI [(1961)], p. 243. Compare Gunnar Myrdal's 'optimism—pessimism' scale in his 'Methodological Note on Facts and Valuations in Social Science', *An American Dilemma* (New York and London, 1944), Appendix 2, pp. 1038-9.

THE STATISTICS OF NORTH AFRICAN JEWRY

Robert Attal

WHEN France established its protectorate of Tunisia (in 1881) and in Morocco (in 1912) and organized a network of public services, the Statistical Services set up in these two countries began by enumerating Jews and Muslims separately. This administrative tradition, which has been kept up without any spirit of discrimination, has persisted to the present day, although certainly with some modification. As a result, by having recourse to the publications put out by the Statistical Services, we can without difficulty find a good deal of information on the Jews in Tunisia and Morocco.

The publications to which I have referred are of two kinds: the *Annuaire Statistique*, usually published every year, and the publications which contain the results of the censuses periodically carried out in each of the two countries. Both kinds of publications, however, show some gaps in the subject which concerns us. Only Jews of Tunisian or Moroccan nationality are separately enumerated, French or foreign Jews being included among the Europeans of other faiths. No distinction has been made between Jews and non-Jews in the French and foreign populations. The *Annuaire Statistique* for Tunisia gives for each year the number of applications for French naturalization granted to Tunisian Jews, and we know that since 1921 about 10,000 such applications were granted, but since each naturalization covers the children of a man who is naturalized, it is practically impossible to establish even roughly the number of French Jews living in Tunisia, especially after the recent political changes. On the other hand, while there has been only a negligible number of French naturalizations in Morocco, Jews of Spanish nationality are very numerous there and they, too, have not been separately enumerated. The gap to which we referred earlier on arises principally in the information on the Jews in Algeria, all of whom, as is well-known, acquired French nationality in 1870, and have since then been enumerated along with Frenchmen of other religions. From 1926 for nearly every year the *Annuaire* provide precise data on civil status (births and deaths), on health, and on schooling.

The registration of civil status was optional in Tunisia from 1886 and became obligatory in 1913; while in Morocco it began in 1915 and was made compulsory only in 1950. But in fact the Jews of Morocco had voluntary recourse to civil registration in quite large numbers from 1915. Certain Community Committees, such as that of Fez, for example, set up registers on their own initiative for recording births among their members. These registers were modelled on the official ones and were kept very methodically in French.

Up to the time Tunisia became independent there was no provision for civil marriage for Tunisian Jews, and religious marriage performed before two Jewish notaries had the force of law. All religious marriages performed in Tunisia were systematically entered in the register specially kept by the Rabbinical Tribunal of Tunis. If the bride or bridegroom was of French or foreign nationality, religious marriage by itself was insufficient, and civil marriage at the municipality or in a consulate became necessary. In the *Annuaire*s only the total of civil marriages is given, broken down according to the nationality of the parties. In this way a marriage contracted between a Jewish Tunisian and a Jew of French nationality is counted as 'mixed', while from the point of view of Judaism the marriage is of course quite normal.

Finally, the *Annuaire*s contain no information on the migration of the Tunisian Jewish population, neither on the movement from village to town, nor on movement out of the country.

As we have seen, the *Annuaire*s of Tunisia and Morocco have separately enumerated Jews and Muslims who are of Tunisian or Moroccan nationality. We shall try to examine in some detail what these sources have to tell us on this category of the population.

In the case of Tunisia, we find in every *Annuaire* figures for births and deaths, by sex; figures on schooling (primary, secondary, and higher) in all subjects, by sex and by subject; figures on examination results, by sex and by subject; and finally, figures on periods spent in penal institutions; the division of prisoners by age, sex, penal category (primary or recidivist), and the nature of the crime. For the town of Tunis we find in addition births, infant mortality, stillbirths (per 1,000 births), and deaths by sex and by cause of death (43 causes).

As for Morocco, the *Annuaire*s provide almost the same information on the Jews as in Tunisia, with a few gaps (the data on schooling are less detailed and there is no information on Jews detained in penal institutions). Nevertheless, certain figures concerning the hygiene of schools and the hospitalization of Moroccan Jews, are to be occasionally found.

The data periodically found in the *Annuaire*s can be supplemented by valuable information from the censuses carried out in Tunisia and Morocco. The census data give us exact numbers at a fixed point in time, the geographical distribution of the population (by town, village, and region), age pyramids and occupational structures. The censuses

STATISTICS OF NORTH AFRICAN JEWRY

were first carried out in Tunisia and Morocco in 1921 and were followed in Tunisia by censuses in 1926, 1931, 1936, 1946, and 1956. In Morocco the fifth population census took place in 1947 and was followed by others in 1951, and 1960. We have to note, however, that in Morocco, only the results of 1947 and later years are of use, the data from the censuses of earlier years being incomplete because of the imperfect control exercised over certain regions and because of other technical reasons; the census enumerators could not without risk make individual contact with the population of insubordinate areas, and the administration had to content itself with estimates of Muslim and Jewish populations.

The occupational distribution and age-grouping of Tunisian Jews had been summarily calculated from the censuses of 1921, 1926, 1931, and 1936 and, in greater detail, 1946. In his book *Les Juifs d'Afrique du Nord* (Paris, 1952), A. Chouraqui devotes a whole chapter to the demographic structure of the Jews in Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco, and in an appendix gives a table showing the distribution of the gainfully occupied population of Tunisia in 1946 more detailed than that provided by the *Annuaire*. These data were furnished at his request by the Statistical Services of Tunisia. The occupational distribution of Tunisian Jews in 1956 has not yet been published. As for the age-group distribution, the same census has not yet been completely worked out and the Administration has confined itself to a ten per cent sample. The results of this sampling carried out separately for Tunisian Muslims and Jews are contained in the tenth *Annuaire Statistique* (1957-8).

In the case of Morocco, at the request of the World Jewish Congress the Statistical Service of Rabat made highly systematic use of the 1951 census and provided a volume devoted entirely to the Jewish population of Morocco (excluding former Spanish Morocco) according to the 1951 census. In this volume we find the geographical distribution of Moroccan Jews (by region and town), the age pyramid, occupational structure (by sex and by town), the gainfully occupied population, etc.

Another census of persons and belongings, undertaken this time by order of the Vichy Government and confining itself to the Jewish population, was carried out in Algeria and Tunisia in 1941. The results of this census, long unpublished, were given by M. Ansky in his book *Les Juifs d'Algérie* (Paris, 1950) and very summarily by J. Sabille in his work *Les Juifs de Tunisie sous Vichy et l'occupation* (Paris, 1954). Since Tunisia and Morocco became independent, and in spite of the desire of the authorities not to make any distinction between Tunisian or Moroccan Jews and Muslims, the *Annuaire Statistiques* of these countries have continued to provide us with separate demographic data on the Jews. But we can expect that little by little this distinction will cease to be made. (We can see it already beginning to disappear in the recording of the gainfully occupied population in 1956: Tunisian Jews have been counted with Tunisian Muslims in the recent account of this

census.) In addition, there will be a slowing down in the publication of the *Annuaire*s as a result of the fact that the statistical staff is now composed essentially of local technicians.

In addition to these official sources, certain authors have dealt with demographic problems, and their work in large measure completes our knowledge of the demography of North African Jewry.

Making use of the census carried out in Algeria in 1931, and going through the individual schedules one by one, Rabbi Eisenbeth produced two books: the first of which is called, *Etude démographique sur les Israélites du Département de Constantine* (Paris, 1931), and the second *Les Juifs d'Afrique du Nord* (Algiers, 1936) which contains unusually detailed information on the Jews of Algeria. It gives us not only their geographical distribution, by region and by town, but also their occupational distribution and the distribution of families by numbers of children. An analogous study on the Algerian Jews was carried out by H. Weiler in 1943, probably using the Vichy census of 1941. This study has remained unpublished and is to be found in the archives of the Centre des Hautes Etudes d'Administration Musulmane, Paris.

In his note 'Le Juif à l'intérieur de la Tunisie' (*Revue Indigène*, 1909) E. Vassel has established the number of Jews in each town and village of Tunisia in 1907 only excepting Tunis, the capital. He got his data by means of a questionnaire which he was enterprising enough to send to the Contrôleurs Civils of each region, asking them to be good enough to count the Jews living within their jurisdiction. Vassel adds to the data he collected in this way a few summary bits of information on occupations. In addition to what I have myself done in this field by the publication of several articles,* I have been through the household schedules of the census carried out in Tunisia in 1956 for the zone corresponding to the Tunis Ghetto. In this way I have been able to report together with P. Sebag in *La Hara de Tunis* (Paris, 1959) the exact number of Jews in this district of the capital. In addition, the results were divided up according to nationality (Tunisia, French, and foreign), occupations and household structure.

P. Flamand in his note 'Quelques renseignements statistiques sur la population juive du Sud Marocain' (*Hespéris*, 1950) gives the number of Jews living in 155 *mellah* in South Morocco in 1950; he collected his data by means of a questionnaire and by using people connected with the Alliance Israélite Universelle as interpreters. This author ends his study with some interesting comparisons with the figures known for the years 1920, 1930, 1936, and 1949, and his own inquiry enabled him to study the migratory movement of Jews from these 155 *mellah* in the years from 1940 to 1949. De La Porte des Vaux in his 'Note sur le peuplement Juif du Sous' (*Bulletin Economique du Maroc*, 1952) gives us some interesting

* See O. Schmeltz, *Jewish Demography and Statistics, Bibliography for 1920-1960*, Jerusalem, 1961, pp. 15 A, B.

STATISTICS OF NORTH AFRICAN JEWRY

figures on the Jews in this area. And three medical men, R. Baron, Mathieu, and Lummau, who carried out a study on nutrition and hygiene among the Jews in Rabat have contributed to Jewish statistics by their 'Note démographique de la population juive de Rabat' (*Bulletin Economique du Maroc*, 1938). R. Ricard has studied the migration of Moroccan Jews to Latin America, to which subject he devoted three notes which appeared in 1928 in *Revue de Géographie Marocaine*, in 1932 in the *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, and in 1944 in *Revue Africaine*. Finally, Blandin in his 'Population de Tanger en 1940' (*Revue Africaine*, 1944) gives us some interesting figures on the Jews in this city. Based on the 1960 census, the central statistics service in Rabat published in April 1961 an addendum by P. Dubois, 'La population marocaine Israélite'. As for former Spanish Morocco, data are provided again by the above mentioned second work of Eisenbeth who has some details on the number of Jews in this area by town and by village, but only for the year 1931. However, from the Statistical Yearbook of Spanish Morocco, published by the Spanish government in 1948, it appears that here also both Jews and Muslims are enumerated separately. It seems that the first Yearbook appeared in 1941, and that only one census later took place, in 1951.

From the time it was set up in North Africa, O.S.E. achieved some veritable miracles in the health field among the Jews in the ghettos and *mellah* by dint of a constant and devoted battle against such scourges as tuberculosis, ringworm, and trachoma. This organization received effective collaboration from the local Jewish doctors who published interesting statistical reports on the health of Tunisian and Moroccan ghettos and *mellah*. These reports, usually mimeographed, are kept in the O.S.E. archives, and are used as basic information by the Tunisian and Moroccan branches of the organization for the improvement of the state of health of Jews in ghettos and *mellah*, and to help wipe out the causes of contagious diseases.

The Alliance Israélite Universelle, which has just celebrated its centenary, has a network in North Africa of 83 schools (77 of them in Morocco). It provides us periodically with detailed tables on the registration of young Moroccans and Tunisians in its schools. In the publications put out by this body (*Bulletins annuels et mensuels*, *Paix et Droit*, *Cahiers de l'AIU*) we can easily trace the educational development of a section of young Jewish scholars for whose training and culture the Alliance has made itself responsible.

Today the demographic structure of the Jews of these three North African countries is undergoing a complete revolution. Emigration to Israel and to other countries is absorbing nearly one half of the total Jewish population of these regions. It is the young people above all who emigrate, leaving behind them a growing mass of people over the age of 40. The comparison between the age-groups among Tunisian Jews in

ROBERT ATTAL

1946 with those given for February 1956 on the one hand, and on the other, the gradual decline in births in this element of the population, as well as the declining proportion of the school population made up by Tunisian Jews, appear to substantiate our assertion.

To conclude this survey, we should praise the administrative tradition of the Protectorate government which in its statistical publications separated Jews, Europeans, and Muslims. This 'separation' allows us to study not only the demography of the Jews of Tunisia and Morocco in all its aspects, but enables us to make interesting comparisons with other population elements: the Europeans, by whom the native Jews were conquered, and the Muslims, from whom they sought to detach themselves, but many of whose characteristics they retained.

TABLE I. *Algeria, Census Population, 1921-1941*

| <i>Year</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Jews</i> | <i>Europeans</i> | <i>Muslims</i> |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1921 | 5,804,275 | 73,967(a) | 811,007 | 4,919,301 |
| 1931 | 6,553,451 | 110,127(b) | 850,279 | 5,593,045 |
| 1941(c) | — | 116,800 | — | — |

(a) Incomplete figures.

(b) According to Eisenbeth.

(c) Census of Jews only under the Vichy Government.

TABLE II. *Tunisia, Census Population, 1921-1956*

| <i>Year</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Tunisian Jews</i> | <i>Europeans</i> | <i>Tunisian Muslims</i> | <i>Jews as percentage of</i> | | |
|-------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | <i>Total</i> | <i>Euro- peans</i> | <i>Tunisian Muslims</i> |
| 1921 | 2,093,939 | 47,711 | 156,115 | 1,826,515 | 2.3 | 30.6 | 2.6 |
| 1926 | 2,159,708 | 53,022 | 173,281 | 1,864,908 | 2.5 | 30.6 | 2.8 |
| 1931 | 2,410,692 | 55,340 | 195,293 | 2,086,762 | 2.3 | 28.3 | 2.7 |
| 1936 | 2,608,313 | 59,222 | 213,205 | 2,265,750 | 2.3 | 27.8 | 2.6 |
| 1941 | — | 68,268(a) | — | — | — | — | — |
| 1946 | 3,230,952 | 70,971 | 239,549 | 2,832,978 | 2.2 | 29.6 | 2.5 |
| 1956 | 3,783,169 | 57,792 | 255,324 | 3,383,904 | 1.5 | 22.6 | 1.7 |

(a) See Table I, note (c)

STATISTICS OF NORTH AFRICAN JEWRY

TABLE III. *Births and Deaths among Tunisian Jews, 1914-1959(a)*

| Year | Births | Deaths | Year | Births | Deaths | Year | Births | Deaths |
|------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|
| 1914 | 1724 | 995 | 1929 | 1863 | 1011 | 1944 | 2798 | 1554 |
| 1915 | 1818 | 1011 | 1930 | 1905 | 944 | 1945 | 2795 | 1349 |
| 1916 | 1775 | 1088 | 1931 | 1857 | 1070 | 1946 | 2604 | 1051 |
| 1917 | 1860 | 1206 | 1932 | 1818 | 964 | 1947 | 2809 | 1065 |
| 1918 | 1669 | 1274 | 1933 | 1846 | 1074 | 1948 | 2718 | 858 |
| 1919 | 1664 | 1148 | 1934 | 1862 | 988 | 1949 | 2444 | 807 |
| 1920 | 1855 | 1069 | 1935 | 1712 | 957 | 1950 | 2477 | 765 |
| 1921 | 1939 | 999 | 1936 | 1886 | 1015 | 1951 | 2357 | 713 |
| 1922 | 1851 | 1025 | 1937 | 1848 | 1095 | 1952 | 2332 | 708 |
| 1923 | 1728 | 1059 | 1938 | 1669 | 1022 | 1953 | 2040 | 679 |
| 1924 | 2004 | 1225 | 1939 | 2074 | 1243 | 1954 | 2025 | 640 |
| 1925 | 1764 | 1070 | 1940 | 2047 | 1153 | 1955 | 1807 | 556 |
| 1926 | 1837 | 980 | 1941 | 2079 | 1395 | 1956 | 1516 | 574 |
| 1927 | 1682 | 1104 | 1942 | 2165 | 1333 | 1957 | 1413 | 367 |
| 1928 | 1756 | 994 | 1943 | 1985 | 2575 | 1958 | 1234 | 387 |
| | | | | | | 1959 | 1186 | 340 |

(a) The figures for up to 1921 are incomplete.
Source: *Annuaire Tunisien des Statistiques*.

TABLE IV. *Births and Deaths among Tunisian Jews, Census Years, 1921-1956*

| Census year | Births per thousand | Deaths per thousand |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1921 | 40.6 | 20.9 |
| 1926 | 34.6 | 18.5 |
| 1931 | 33.5 | 19.3 |
| 1936 | 31.8 | 17.1 |
| 1946 | 36.7 | 14.8 |
| 1956 | 26.2 | 9.9 |

TABLE V. *Tunisian Jews according to Age, 1946 and 1956(a)*

| Age | 1946 | | 1956 | |
|-------|---------|----------|---------|----------|
| | Numbers | Per cent | Numbers | Per cent |
| | 70,971 | 100.0 | 57,800 | 100.00 |
| I | 1,942 | 2.7 | { 7,160 | } 12.4 |
| 1-4 | 6,971 | 9.6 | | |
| 5-9 | 7,605 | 10.7 | 6,950 | 12.0 |
| 10-14 | 7,754 | 10.9 | 6,220 | 10.8 |
| 15-19 | 7,300 | 10.3 | 5,510 | 9.5 |
| 20-24 | 6,433 | 9.1 | 3,780 | 6.5 |
| 25-29 | 5,254 | 7.4 | 3,870 | 6.7 |
| 30-34 | 5,238 | 7.4 | 3,750 | 6.5 |
| 35-39 | 4,858 | 6.8 | 3,510 | 6.1 |
| 40-44 | 3,952 | 5.6 | 3,440 | 6.0 |
| 45-49 | 3,163 | 4.5 | 4,080 | 7.0 |
| 50-54 | 3,153 | 4.4 | 2,370 | 4.1 |
| 55-59 | 2,343 | 3.4 | 2,550 | 4.4 |
| 60 | 5,185 | 7.3 | 4,610 | 8.0 |

(a) Ten per cent sample.

ROBERT ATTAL

TABLE VI. *Morocco(a), Jews of Moroccan Nationality, 1921-1960*

| | | |
|------|-------------------|---------|
| 1921 | Total population | 91,315 |
| | Census population | 81,315 |
| 1926 | Total population | 115,552 |
| | Census population | 107,552 |
| 1931 | Total population | 124,585 |
| | Census population | 117,605 |
| 1936 | Total population | 161,942 |
| | Census population | 119,780 |
| 1947 | Census population | 203,839 |
| 1951 | Census population | 199,156 |
| 1960 | Census population | 160,032 |

(a) Until 1951 French Morocco only.

Source: Until 1951, *Recensement de 1951*, Vol. 4, Rabat, 1953.

THE ORGANIZATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY AND ITS PROBLEMS

Gustav Saron

THAT Jewish communities in various countries exhibit significant differences is a truism, and nowhere is this more evident than in Israel, in the Kibbutz Galuyot. I have long been intrigued by the question how and why the differences came about. It is obvious that, as minority sub-cultures, Jewish communities take on many of the social patterns, as well as the values and the mores, of their native countries and that they are also moulded by the specific circumstances of their historic development. This can be readily illustrated by the South African Jewish Community.

FACTORS WHICH MOULDED SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY

Various factors moulded South African Jewry into a distinctive entity. First, there was the general South African environment: the physical and climatic conditions, and especially the confrontation with two white 'European' groups—the one English-speaking, the other Afrikaans-speaking—differing from each other, sometimes considerably, in historical traditions and also in contemporary outlook. Next, was Jewry's confrontation, as an integral part of the white population, with non-white peoples of the sub-continent—a subject which has scarcely been explored, and which deserves much fuller study.

Apart from these environmental factors, there have been distinctive internal ones. South African Jewry has been described as 'a colony of Lithuania' because so many of its members emigrated from that famous centre of Jewish life and learning in Eastern Europe. Prior to the arrival of the Litvaks, there had been immigrants of German and British descent, but many of the German section tended to become assimilated (although some rose to positions of leadership in the community). The British influence in those early days was strong and the religious organization of the community was largely patterned on the British model. In many ways indeed, Jewish life in South Africa is a unique blend resulting from the interaction of Litvak and British elements with the emergent South African way of life. The Litvak legacy

is to be seen, I think, in some of the characteristics of South African Jews, their warm-heartedness, practical-mindedness, sense of Jewish solidarity, devotion to learning (combined with a religious affiliation which is sometimes more of the head than of the heart); and particularly their support of the Zionist movement.

Demographic Aspects

The main immigration movement occurred between 1880 and 1937, during which period I estimate that 70,000 Jewish immigrants arrived, the great majority from Lithuania and other East-European countries (including some five to six thousand from Germany as victims of Nazism). While the immigration of Jews periodically became a matter of political controversy, the first legal restrictions were introduced in 1930 by the 'Quota Act', followed by the Aliens Act of 1937. Although Jews were not expressly mentioned in these Acts, in practice the number of Jewish immigrants dropped very greatly, especially during and after the Second World War. The composition of our community has in consequence undergone a big change. We cannot expect replenishment through immigration. We have become substantially a South African-born community—at any rate as far as those of forty years and under are concerned, and this has many implications for our future communal development.

According to the 1960 census, the population of the country is nearly 16 million; of whom just over 3 million are whites and the remainder non-whites (10,807,000 native Africans, 1,500,000 Coloureds and 477,000 Indians). The Jews now number about 115,000. Their percentage in the white population was at its highest in 1936 when it reached 4.5 per cent: it is now about 4 per cent. This drop seems to reflect long-term demographic trends: (a) the lower birth-rate of Jews in comparison with the general population; (b) the fact that the older age groups are represented in greater numbers; (c) immigration is now a minimal factor. One should perhaps add a fourth factor, a small but perhaps significant trend towards emigrating.

Whereas a generation or more ago there were still fairly large numbers of Jews living in the countryside, away from the large cities, the general trend towards urbanization has been even greater in the case of our own community. Almost half of the total Jewish population—over 50,000—live in Johannesburg and another 20,000 in Cape Town. Most of the remainder are distributed in other urban centres, and relatively few are to be found in the small villages or on farms.

Integration

The conditions in the country have generally favoured the maintenance of Jewish group identity. Inasmuch as the population consists of so many diverse races and cultures, and the white group itself is divided

ORGANIZATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY

into the two distinct sections, the principles of cultural pluralism have usually been put into practice, and the retention of group identity and cultural separateness by the various elements has been fostered (although latterly there are signs of some pressure towards Afrikanerization).

In general, Jews are well integrated into the economic, cultural, and political life, and enjoy full equality. Culturally, however (and also politically), they have tended to identify themselves with the English-speaking section, partly out of preference for the older and richer English language culture, but mainly because of objective sociological conditions: until quite recently, the urban centres, where a majority of Jews live, were predominantly English speaking, influenced by English modes of thought. On the other hand, the official statistics show that the percentage of Jews who are bilingual (i.e. who speak and write both the English and Afrikaans languages) is at least as large as, if not larger than, the proportion among other sections of the population.

For these and other reasons there were periods of estrangement, especially during the period 1933-45, between the Jewish community and the Afrikaner Nationalist Party (which now controls the country politically). However, since the National Party came into power in 1948, the government has honoured its undertaking to remove 'the so-called Jewish question from the life and politics of the country'. It has also displayed a very positive and sympathetic attitude towards the State of Israel.*

The Jewish community has not found it possible or desirable to take up a collective position in regard to the racial policies of the country. It has stressed that individual Jews as citizens have the right and duty to participate in the country's politics (of which the core is the racial issue), in accordance with their personal convictions and beliefs. The most recent congress of the Jewish Board of Deputies, last year, in reaffirming this standpoint 'urged every Jewish citizen to make his individual contribution towards the promotion of understanding, good will and cooperation between all the peoples and races which make up the population of South Africa, and to strive for a peaceful and secure future for all its inhabitants based on the principles of justice and the dignity of the individual, in accordance with the teachings and precepts of Judaism'.

* The official attitude of the South African Government towards the State of Israel has undergone a certain modification and certain privileges previously granted to the Zionist movement for the transfer of funds have been withdrawn. These changes of the Government's policy were the results of the support given by Israel in the U.N. General Assembly to resolutions calling for various forms of sanctions against South Africa, because of this country's racial policies.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

From this inadequate outline of the background factors, I turn to my main theme, the organizational structure of South African Jewry. In general, we followed the pattern of communal development in other countries, with a tendency towards conservatism. The early immigrants established the basic institutions necessary for the maintenance of Jewish group life: Hebrew Congregations, Chedorim, Chevra Kadishas and other welfare organizations, landsmannschaften, and so on. With the passage of time these institutions changed their character, as the outlook and needs of the community changed. The Synagogues, which continue to occupy a central place in the communal structure, are now larger and more imposing and often provide facilities for the education of the young as well as for limited cultural and social activities (it is significant, however, that the American idea of a fully-fledged synagogue centre has not taken root). Most of the Hebrew congregations describe themselves as Orthodox, whatever be the personal religious practice of their members. During the last quarter of a century the Reform Movement has established itself, and claims about 10 per cent adherents in the community. Welfare institutions, like Jewish orphanages, old age homes, Gemillus Hassodim and women's Benevolent Societies serve the philanthropic needs of the community. Our conservatism is reflected in our retention of a rather unique institution, the largest welfare body in Johannesburg, the *Chevra Kadisha V' Tomechei Yad*, which combines the functions of a burial society with those of a general welfare institution. It is also seen in the reluctance, until quite recently, of the welfare bodies to employ qualified professional welfare workers.

As new needs have emerged, secular Jewish bodies have developed, such as the Lodges of the Hebrew Order of David, the branches of the Union of Jewish Women and especially the Jewish sports clubs. These clubs, of which there are a relatively large number, were created in the first instance to provide sporting and out-of-door amenities for both young and old Jews, but they are incidentally also helping to strengthen Jewish group belongingness among their members.

Increasing stress has been placed latterly upon the need to create better facilities for the leisure-time activities of Jewish youth, in order to bring them closer to the community. It is significant, however, that apart from the Zionist Youth Movements, we have rather lagged behind other communities in this respect. We have not built youth centres or community centres, and have only recently taken steps to establish the beginnings of Hillel foundations at the Universities.

Notwithstanding the reputation which our community enjoys abroad for being unified and well organized, there are often manifestations of the spirit of division and of organizational rivalry. The Orthodox Hebrew

ORGANIZATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY

Congregations are loosely associated in two federations (one in the north and one in the south); the Hebrew schools and Hedorim are linked with two Boards of Jewish Education (one in the north and one in the south). On the other hand, the two major national organizations, the Zionist Federation and the Jewish Board of Deputies, are each truly nationwide in scope, and each in its own sphere does much to unify the community. At the local level, some of the middle-sized communities have achieved a measure of communal coordination which is, however, absent in the larger cities. We have little akin to the Federations or the United Jewish Appeals which are a feature today of Jewish life in the United States and Canada.

I shall now describe the organizational structure of the Zionist Federation, and the Jewish Board of Deputies, and later turn to the educational field and some overall organizational problems.

The Zionist Movement

The impact of the Zionist Movement has probably been greater on our community than upon any other of the English-speaking communities. It would be a fruitful study to explore the reasons for this. Among those which I would list are: (1) some of our most effective leaders—even as far back as 50 and 60 years ago—were staunch Zionists; (2) in the early days, when communal organization was weak and spiritual leaders few, the Zionist Federation was established, and served as a link with the scattered communities throughout the country; (3) economic and social projects established in the Yishuv by South African Jews already many years ago forged strong links between the two communities; (4) the sympathy shown by successive South African Governments to the Zionist ideal, and especially the intimate and sustained interest taken by the late General Smuts in the progress of the Yishuv; (5) the general climate in the country, which favours cultural pluralism; and (6) the effectiveness of the Zionist organization and of the Zionist press in South Africa.

Because of these and other factors, the Zionist movement and Zionist ideology have strongly influenced the development of South African Jewry. Zionist funds have always been very well supported. The Israel United Appeal has about 23,000 contributors, and it has been the boast of South African Jews—probably justified—that per capita they have contributed more to Israel than any other community, a very striking achievement in the light of the fact that there are no tax deductions for such donations. South African Zionists pioneered a number of important projects in Israel, notably the Garden-Village of Ashkelon. The contribution through Aliyah is reflected not only in the numbers, but in the quality and character of the immigrants. Five years ago, some 2,000 South African Jews had already settled permanently in Israel. Since then, there has been a steady increase. There were 90 settlers in 1957,

170 settlers in 1958, 260 in 1959, and 400 in 1960; and it seems likely that this year (1961) they will reach 1,000.

This is not the occasion to present a detailed description of the structure of the Zionist Organization, which has been held up as a model for other countries. The South African Zionist Federation is an all-embracing territorial organization and takes the lead in all Zionist endeavours, in fund-raising, in the promotion of Aliyah and tourism, in Zionist propaganda and education, and in numerous other activities. On the Federation are represented all shades of political Zionist opinion (with the exception, at the present time, of the Revisionists).¹ There are also included bodies like the Zionist Medical Executive Council, the Maccabi Council, the Zionist Youth Council, the Women's Zionist Council. Zionist activity among the women is especially significant, the Women's Council having a membership of 17,000. The Maccabi numbers 5,000 members and the Youth Movement 6,000. The Chairman of the Federation, Mr. E. J. Horwitz, recently asserted: 'The establishment of the State of Israel and the events which followed in its wake gave a new impetus to the Zionist Movement in this country. The Movement struck firmer and deeper roots, and its activities have become more ramified and widespread. It is stronger today than it has ever been.'

It is no derogation, however, from the solid achievements of the Zionist Movement to say that it may also have had the defects of its qualities. As contemporaries, our perspectives are subjective and limited; but I would offer the opinion that in its single-minded pursuit of the Zionist ideal, the S.A. Zionist Movement—or perhaps, more correctly, some of its leading spokesmen—have sometimes been less than just to some of the local aspirations of the community. Whether intentionally or not, they have sometimes tended to discourage projects and activities which could have strengthened the internal structure of the community. Two qualifying statements should be added: first, this criticism has least application to the most recent period, when a broad philosophy of Jewish life, which includes the strengthening of *both* Israel and the Diaspora communities, has come to be increasingly accepted; second, the Zionist movement may have drawn away material and human resources which might otherwise have been available for local activity, just because of the very virility of Zionist sentiment in our community.

The South African Jewish Board of Deputies

The relative homogeneity and unified outlook of the South African community is reflected in the existence of a single representative organization which claims, with substantial support, to speak on behalf of the total South African Jewish community. This is the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, the origins of which date back nearly sixty

ORGANIZATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY

years. As the name indicates, the inspiration in establishing this body came from Britain. In those early days the small and rather ineffective South African Board had little in common with its British prototype with its elaborate parliamentary procedures. However, it did useful work in preventing discrimination against Jews in such matters as immigration and naturalization and in initiating important projects, such as the Jewish War Victims' Fund in the First World War. At that time there were still sharp divisions between the older German and English Jews and 'green' newcomers from Russia, and these impeded the growth of the Board, the leadership of which was in the hands of the older elements. It was only in the thirties, under the impact of anti-semitic movements inspired from Nazi Germany, that our community began to build its Board of Deputies into an effective organization with an adequate administration.

It is interesting to note that we have not been involved in the controversy, which has divided the American Jewish community, on the question of principle whether a single representative Jewish organization is desirable. In South Africa the Board of Deputies has been accepted by both Jew and non-Jew as the authorized spokesman for the community. It is an interesting historical fact, however, that during the first decade of its existence the Board was challenged by the Zionist Federation, which then aspired to the role of representative body also in respect of local Jewish matters, although it later dropped that claim.

What *has* periodically caused controversy is the demand by certain minority groups in the community to change the constitution of the Board of Deputies by introducing the principle of a universal franchise for all individual Jews in the election of the governing body of the Board, the Executive Council. This demand has, however, been rejected, after full debate, by several congresses of the Board. Under the existing constitution the membership of the Board consists of affiliated organizations, and these, through their delegates appointed to the biennial national congresses, elect the Executive Council of the Board of Deputies. Strictly speaking, therefore, the body is the spokesman only for the *organized* Jewish community. But its right to speak on behalf of South African Jewry as a whole is generally acknowledged.

Having been personally associated with the development of the Board of Deputies for the last quarter of a century, I must not evaluate its achievements; but I can indicate some of its distinctive organizational features. Its membership of over 330 organizations includes all types of institutions: Hebrew congregations, welfare bodies, social and cultural societies, landsmannschaften, Zionist societies—indeed, any group of Jews organized for an authentic Jewish object may be admitted to membership. The Board's primary functions relate to its representative role: it acts on behalf of the entire Jewish community in matters where Jewish interests are involved, and it is especially concerned to

safeguard the equal rights and status of Jews as citizens. As new communal needs have emerged, however, which are national in scope and do not fall within the purview of existing bodies, the Board has either set up new bodies to take care of them, or has itself undertaken the additional tasks. In this way, many years ago, the Board was responsible together with the Zionist Federation in creating the Board of Jewish Education; it established funds for the relief and reconstruction of European Jewry in both World Wars; and set up a Restitution Office to assist victims of Nazism in preparing their claims for compensation.

In addition, the Board of Deputies has become a functional agency in various spheres. It promotes adult education programmes. Together with several other bodies, it provides religious and educational services to the small, isolated country communities. It maintains a communal archive and a well-stocked library of up-to-date Jewish information, and also fosters research in S.A. Jewish history. Recently it has begun to promote programmes for Jewish youth and university students. Twelve years ago it took the initiative in establishing the United Communal Fund for S.A. Jewry, a fund-raising organization to provide the budgets of the Board itself and of a number of national and semi-national organizations in the spheres of education, religion and related interests. As it has become increasingly aware of the need for improved communal organization, the Board of Deputies has in recent years endeavoured to stimulate greater planning and coordination.

In embracing so wide a range of activities, the South African body has moved far from its British prototype, which is largely confined by tradition and precedent to functioning in the spheres of Jewish defence and foreign affairs. It is more akin to the Canadian Jewish Congress, which also acts as both a representative and a functional body. Although the S.A. Board concentrates on its tasks on the 'home front', it keeps in touch with overseas developments through several channels. It is associated with the British Board of Deputies and the B'nai B'rith of the U.S.A. in the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (which has consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations); it has links with the World Jewish Congress, although not formally affiliated to that body; it is a member of the Conference of Jewish Organizations and is one of the member organizations of the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, Inc.

The relations between the Board of Deputies and the Zionist Federation, as might be expected, have varied with the temper of the times and the leadership of the respective bodies. There were times when the ideology of the Zionist Federation, or of its leaders, tended to be negative towards Golah survival, just as there were periods when the leaders of the Board of Deputies were lukewarm towards the goals of Zionism. For many years now, however, these factors have largely disappeared. No basic ideological differences divide the two bodies, in a

ORGANIZATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY

community which is so essentially Zionist in orientation. There has been an overlapping and sometimes an interchange of personnel in the leadership of the two organizations. There have frequently been consultation and cooperation on matters of common concern. There have even been a few projects conducted under joint auspices, such as the People's College (an adult education project) and latterly joint sponsorship of the programme for Jewish university students. Although it is inevitable that differences in emphasis should in some measure persist—especially among their individual members—each organization recognizes the separate sphere of the other and they normally complement each other well. If the opinion is sometimes expressed that local fund-raising projects are overshadowed by the many Israel campaigns, this is probably inherent in the traditions and outlook of our community.

Jewish Education

The community has recently made most progress in the field of Jewish education. The institution of the Jewish Sunday School hardly exists (except in a modified form in the Reform Movement). Most children who get Hebrew education attend afternoon classes a few times a week or receive private tuition. An increasing number, however, have been attending Jewish Day Schools. Indeed, the growth of these schools, under the direction of the Boards of Jewish Education in Johannesburg and Cape Town respectively, has been the outstanding education development. These two Boards together supervise and co-ordinate what is termed 'National Traditional' Jewish education. (The Progressive Movement maintains its own educational network, which is coordinated by a national council.)

A notable milestone in the field of Jewish education was the establishment, under the auspices of the Board of Deputies, of a Pension Fund for Hebrew Teachers. It includes provision for pensions for 'back service' prior to the establishment of the Fund. This was made possible by substantial grants from the United Communal Fund. The Pension Fund thus not only safeguards teachers for the future, but ensures that those already grown old in service may retire with adequate pension rights.

The shortage of qualified Hebrew teachers, which has not been experienced in South Africa as acutely as elsewhere, has been met partly by the 'importation' of teachers for short periods from Israel, and partly by the graduates of the Teachers' Training Seminary conducted by the S.A. Board of Jewish Education. Although, by comparison with other communities, our record is a good one, there is concern over a possible shortage of teachers in the future. Particular difficulties are encountered by the small communities in finding a functionary who combines the roles of *chasan*, teacher and *shochet*.

As already mentioned, the outstanding feature during the past

thirteen years has been the growth of the Jewish Day Schools (in which Jewish, primarily Hebrew, education is integrated with the secular curriculum). The two major day schools in Johannesburg and Cape Town provide education from nursery school through primary school to matriculation. In Johannesburg 1,250 pupils are attending the primary school (two branches) and 629 the high school, the corresponding figures in Cape Town being 283 and 517. A number of other communities, including Durban and Pretoria, have established Day Schools in the elementary stage.

While the popularity of the Day School movement reflects a positive interest by many parents in an improved Jewish education for their children, there are also other motives at work. Among these is the desire to take advantage of the good standard of secular education in the Jewish Day Schools, and the reluctance of many children to attend classes in Hebrew after the regular school hours. Although the time given to Hebrew studies is generally less than in the American Jewish Day Schools, the achievements to date are encouraging. It is interesting to note, however, that the Director of the S.A. Board of Jewish Education, Mr. Isaac Goss, recently wrote: 'It seems to me that the time is now coming when the content of Jewish education will have to be studied more fully and the type of personality that we are aiming to produce will have to be discussed in greater detail.'

The growth in popularity of the Day School movement has regrettably not been matched by success in stabilizing the finances of the larger day schools. They do not receive any financial support from the Government, but have to be maintained from tuition fees and from the voluntary contributions of members of the Jewish community. This has made great demands upon the communal purse. Indeed, for almost a decade there has been an annual crisis in connexion with the financing of these schools.

In the first few years they were financed almost completely by subsidies from a central communal fund, the United Communal Fund for South African Jewry; but when that Fund proved unable to finance the rapid expansion of these schools, other bodies had to rally in support. The Board of Deputies and the Zionist Federation periodically helped to make good the deficits, and during the last few years a separate Education Fund drive has been held in Johannesburg. Strong pressure has been brought to bear lately upon the Zionist Federation to assist out of the Israel United Appeal, on the plea that Jewish day schools are, or should be, the special concern of the Zionist movement. This has occasioned some controversy, as there is a resistance in some quarters to money being diverted from Zionist funds for this purpose.²

ORGANIZATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY

OVERALL PLANNING AND COORDINATION

The recurrent crises in the financing of Hebrew education and the measures being tried to overcome them are a reflection, in my view, of certain weaknesses in our communal organization. Despite the existence of various organizations exercising a coordinating role in specific fields—such as the Board of Deputies, the Boards of Jewish Education, the Federation of Synagogues, the Union of Progressive Judaism, the Union of Jewish Women, the Jewish Welfare Council, and several others—there is a tendency for our institutions to function in ‘water-tight’ compartments. They are unable or reluctant to think in terms of overall communal needs and to subordinate themselves to communal planning. Conditions are somewhat better at the local level, as exemplified in the ‘United Hebrew institutions’ which exist in some towns, but we do not have closely coordinated bodies like the Jewish Federations of many American cities. On the national level, we are still groping, rather tentatively, towards the concept of total communal planning.

Nevertheless, there is a growing awareness of the need for more planning and coordination in communal life. A big step forward in this direction was taken when the United Communal Fund for South African Jewry was created in 1949. The intention at that time was to set up a single fund-raising instrument for major South African needs, to parallel united fund-raising for Israel. The U.C.F. (as the Fund is popularly known) brought together for fund-raising purposes the Board of Deputies, the Boards of Education, the Federation of Synagogues, and other organizations—fifteen in all. It was a bold experiment, inasmuch as it included both ‘National Traditional’ and ‘Reform’ religious and educational institutions. The fact that the Fund has survived, despite recurrent troubles, indicates the communal desire for unity. Nevertheless, its inability to raise sufficient money to meet the budgets of its beneficiary agencies is disappointing, and reflects the failure of the community thus far to achieve overall communal planning.

South African Jewry has not favoured the establishment of United Jewish Appeals (as are now normal in the U.S.A.) combining in one campaign the needs of Israel, overseas relief, and local and national institutions. The biennial Israeli United Appeal does combine one drive for the Keren Hayesod and a number of major Israel funds, as well as the South African Jewish Appeal (which provides overseas relief and also supports O.R.T., O.S.E. and other causes). But in addition there are separate fund-raising efforts for W.I.Z.O. Magen David Adom, the Israel Maritime League, *Yeshivoth* and other Israel causes. There are also many separate appeals on behalf of local South African institutions, so that the fund-raising position is rather chaotic.

I have the feeling, however, that there is an increasing awareness of

communal interdependence and this, coupled with economic difficulties (which we trust will be transitory) is likely to accelerate the process towards better planning and coordination. I personally look forward to a period, in the not too distant future, when the major organizations in our community, more particularly the Zionist Federation, the Board of Deputies and the Boards of Jewish Education, will come together in an endeavour to reach agreement on basic communal objectives, and to work out a more coordinated system of fund-raising. In my view this is a necessary precondition to improved planning and coordination of our communal services. Several congresses of the Board of Deputies have called for action on these lines, but as yet we have made less progress than was hoped.

Coordination and overall planning are desirable in all communities, but particularly so in a relatively small one like the South African, which, because it is not likely to have its numbers increased by immigration, will have to rely increasingly on its own resources for maintaining and strengthening its Jewish life.

NOTES

¹ The Revisionist Party has since rejoined the Zionist Federation.

² Since this address was given, a national conference of the Zionist Movement in South Africa has decided to make a subvention (subject to the approval of the Jewish Agency) towards the 'national costs' of the Boards of Educa-

tion (which include the maintenance of their headquarters and the Teachers' Training Seminary). The conference expressly resolved, however, that the maintenance of the Jewish day schools is the responsibility of the *local* Jewish communities in each area.

EMERGING PATTERNS AND ATTITUDES IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE

C. Bezalel Sherman

THE most remarkable feature in present-day Jewish reality is the fact that we, a very ancient people, are now largely residing in new domiciles. Most of the old Jewish communities that were not destroyed by the Nazi hordes or ground to dust by the Communist regimes have either been evacuated to Israel or rendered impotent by Arab hostility. The overwhelming majority of the Jews of the world are now living in communities that did not exist, or barely existed, a century ago. These communities are all the product of the migrations of the past few generations—migrations that are vastly different from Jewish wanderings in former ages.

So far as internal Jewish life was concerned, Jewish migrations, until about the beginning of the nineteenth century, represented a mere change of address, an exchange of one ghetto for another ghetto. There were, to be sure, modifications and variations in the positions the Jews occupied in the lands of immigration as compared with the positions they held in the lands of emigration; but there had been little difference in their basic status, which was one of a disfranchised and discriminated against minority group. Political systems and economic conditions varied, but the Jewish way of life, regulated less by forces from without than by tradition from within, fundamentally remained the same. There was thus continuity in Jewish existence, despite the altered geographic areas and social climates.

Not so the migrations that created the present communities. As the Jews shifted from the Old World to the New World, they moved from persecution to security. They did not have to fight for emancipation in their adopted lands; nor did legal ghetto walls block their entry into the processes of adjustment. They were not excluded from the institutions that shaped the cultural life of their new homelands; quite the opposite, they were required to fit into those institutions as a first step on the road to accommodation to prevailing mores. It was no longer a question of transplanting an old way of life; it was rather a question of weaving into the new way of life which the non-Jewish majority developed. Recent migrations have thus been marked by a disruption of Jewish continuity.

This process is accelerated by the transformation of the roles the various Jewish generations play in the adjustment to new conditions. When it was a matter of transplantation, it was the immigrants of the older generations, as the bearers of the way of life evolved in the former homelands, that played the leading part; in the modern communities, on the other hand, it is the younger generations that are in the forefront as the bridgehead to the new way of life. The tables are turned: instead of the parents handing down to the children old modes of living, the children transmit to the parents new patterns of behaviour. To the extent that these patterns vary from land to land, they tend to widen the gap between the different Jewish communities, while narrowing the distance between Jew and Gentile in a given country. Moreover, even that part of the common Jewish heritage which is retained in the new lands takes on a distinct local coloration.

Nowhere do the changes that have taken place in Jewish life since the turn of the century stand out in bolder relief than in the United States. Here all factors distinguishing Jewish immigration of the past hundred years from the wanderings of the previous ages converge to create a situation that reflects both the dangers and the challenges, the pitfalls and the opportunities confronting the Jews of the free world. The American Jewish community, the tercentenary celebrations in 1954 notwithstanding, is also the child of the migrations since the mid-nineteenth century. It is doubtful if ten per cent of the Jewish population can claim more than three generations of residence in the United States, or an origin other than East European. Four in every five American Jews were born to political equality, and most of the Jews who had immigrated from other lands have since become naturalized and enjoy the full rights of American citizenship. Possibilities of unprecedented economic and cultural progress have unfolded for the Jews on a canvas covering the American continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. Nor are the Jews lax in utilizing the possibilities. With the younger generations heading the procession, they are moving forward on all fronts; on some fronts at an even faster pace than the country as a whole.

Two tendencies are to be discerned in their advance. On the one hand they seek further integration into the status-enjoying segments of the larger American society; on the other hand they want to preserve their group identity. The Jewish community structure reflects the difficulties the American Jews encounter in the efforts to compose the contradictions between these two tendencies.

Structurally, the American Jewish community rests on three pillars; the Synagogue, Jewish institutionalism, and preoccupation with Jewish welfare the world over. The emerging patterns and attitudes in American Jewish life are best mirrored in the weight these pillars are required to carry at this juncture of American Jewish history.

PATTERNS IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE

The Synagogue is now enjoying unparalleled prosperity in the United States. It is the beneficiary of a social windfall, which a Jewish consciousness—awakened by the Hitler catastrophe, heightened by the rise of Israel, and fashioned by American middle-class standards of behaviour—has produced. The growth the Synagogue has registered since the Second World War is truly phenomenal. The Union of American Congregations, representing Reform, and the United Synagogue, representing Conservatism, more than doubled the number of affiliated congregations and nearly trebled their individual membership during this period. The progress among the Orthodox groups, although slower, has also been spectacular. The boom in synagogue-building has assumed fantastic proportions, reflecting the quest for social prestige on the part of the Jewish middle classes on the one hand, and Jewish economic mobility on the other hand.

As we turn from the physical aspects of the synagogues to their content, we move from dazzling lobbies to spiritually dismal sanctuaries. We need not share the view that not a trace of religious motivation is to be found in the mounting membership rolls of the congregations to appreciate that the upsurge in affiliation stands in almost inverse proportion to the religious intensity of the new synagogues. Orthodox congregations, with hundreds of families belonging to them, find it increasingly hard to gather a *minyan* for the daily services. In the Conservative synagogues the going is even tougher. The Reform temples, not plagued with the problem of a daily *minyan*, attract a very small proportion of their membership to the two services a week they do conduct. There is an element of truth in the sardonic remark that the less the American Jews *daven* the more synagogues they build. This applies, as we shall see, to other traditional practices as well. For instance, the less observant the Jews become in matters of *kashrut* the more kosher processed products appear on the shelves of the super food markets.

This is not a purely Jewish phenomenon. A committee of prominent churchmen, headed by Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, president of the Union Theological Seminary, recently submitted a report to the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church which read in part:

The 'return to religion' in our day has produced no corresponding moral fruitage. On the contrary, while the curve of religious interests has been rising, that of moral health has been falling. Here is the most profound contradiction in our national existence—steadily rising attention to religion, steadily declining ethical practice (quoted in *Reconstructionist*, 16 June 1961).

Since worship and Jewish learning are not the mainstay of its existence, the Synagogue of necessity has to reach out to other areas. In this it is to a greater extent guided by the fads of the young than by the customs of the old. In the suburbs the synagogues provide more

facilities for leisure-time activities than for religious exercises. They are social club, amusement hall, civic centre, lecture forum, and a multiple of other things rolled in one. In these circumstances, the institution, rather than the purpose it is supposed to serve, becomes the primary consideration. We are thus witnessing the interesting phenomenon of the synagogues of the various trends drifting away from one another organizationally while drawing closer theologically. Here, too, the situation is not without analogy among the less fundamentalist Protestant denominations. America, it has been noted, is turning from religion of transcendental faith to cultural religion. This accounts for the paradox of the American people becoming more religious and more secular at the same time. In the Synagogue cultural religion is gaining steadily over other-worldly faith.

In its ramified activities the Synagogue comes into conflict with other Jewish institutions, particularly in the suburbs and new districts of Jewish residence. It encroaches upon territory the Jewish community centres have always regarded as their domain, and it even competes with commercial houses for catered affairs. The intensified desire on the part of parents of the younger generation to give their children a Jewish education is one of the chief factors in the growth of congregational affiliation. Exploiting this desire, the Synagogue has practically monopolized Jewish education, thereby all but destroying the Jewish community school. However, this is a knife that cuts two ways. In as much as Jewish education in the United States is *Bar Mitzvah* (in part also *Bas Mitzvah*) centred, many members, having originally joined a synagogue in order to see their children through the ceremony, drop their affiliation after the goal is achieved.

The changed position of the rabbi accords with the new functions of the Synagogue. In addition to the pastoral duties he performs and the ritual requirements to which he ministers, his main tasks are those of a public relations agent and congregation-builder. That is why so much value is placed on his physical appearance and histrionic gifts. Despite the dearth of rabbinical talent, it is getting ever harder for an unemployed rabbi over the age of 45 to find a pulpit.

The Synagogue is the centre of Jewish identification in the United States, but there are indications that its engagement in manifold secular activities is beginning to affect adversely its place in Jewish life. A tendency to bypass the Synagogue is making itself felt even in matters of a purely religious nature. The trend to attend holiday services in hotels and resorts is gaining momentum. A high-priced cantor is hired to conduct the *Seder* on *Pessah* or to chant the prayers on *Rosh Hashona* and *Yom Kippur* in a fashionable hotel; and the guests, having completed the religious rites, turn to the more worldly pleasures of a modern resort without loss of time, and with the exhilarating feeling that they have paid their full debt to the faith of their fathers.

PATTERNS IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE

Turning to Jewish institutionalism, under which term I include the Jewish social services, welfare agencies, philanthropic bodies, cultural centres, community relations, leisure-time facilities, etc., we note that they now operate within a frame of reference that is totally different from the one that brought them into being. These institutions are the collective assets that enable the Jewish community to deal with the non-Jewish communities on a basis of real equality in matters of public welfare and charitable endeavour. However, a declining number of these institutions still cling to their original purposes. Improved economic conditions have reduced to a minimum the charity phases of Jewish philanthropy. New methods of welfare have rendered obsolete the orphan home and the shelter society. Social security laws have revolutionized care for the aged. Subsidies from government—federal, state, county, and municipal—have changed the whole fiscal system of the welfare bodies. The trend toward the suburbs and residential mobility have given a new complexion to recreation and adult education.

Nor are external and material considerations the only factors pressing the Jewish institutions toward a reorientation in their philosophy and practices. The religious motivation that played so important a part in Jewish philanthropic effort in the past is fading perceptibly. This in turn adds plausibility to the new rationale with which important Jewish lay and professional leaders would like to underpin the Jewish social activities. According to that rationale, it is not the function of these activities to strengthen Jewish group life, but rather to provide a channel for the contribution of the Jewish community to the general welfare of the American people. From a Jewish *mitzvah* philanthropy is thus converted into an American patriotic act. The Jewish agencies, it is contended, except those dealing directly with Jewish religion or education, must continue to operate under Jewish supervision, but on a non-sectarian basis. The non-sectarianism here advocated goes beyond opening Jewish institutions to non-Jewish clients; it also suggests the inclusion of Gentiles on the governing bodies of the institutions, and the implementation of programmes that will give the non-Jewish clients a sense of belonging on a par with the Jewish recipient of service.

Non-sectarianism is making deep inroads into the field of community relations, a relatively young activity looming large in current Jewish affairs. With the diminution of discrimination against Jews in education and employment, with fewer social disabilities visited upon them in other fields, with the practical disappearance of overt antisemitism, and with their own sense of security, seriously impaired during the Hitler era, reinvigorated, the Jews have transformed their community relations agencies, originally formed mainly to combat antisemitism, into instrumentalities to promote civil liberties for the general population. These agencies not infrequently devote more of their time, energies, and

means to struggles on behalf of other minority groups than to issues directly affecting the well-being of the Jewish community.

One could take heart in this situation and see in it a manifestation of our prophetic tradition of social justice; but one must also wonder whether we are not dealing here with a subconscious acceptance of second-class citizenship in reverse. Jews have been wont to hear voices counselling them not to assert themselves too vigorously in general social and political affairs lest they supply more ammunition to the anti-semitic arsenals; now they are told that they owe a special obligation to cure all the ills afflicting their native lands precisely because they are Jews. Be that as it may, there is no gainsaying that community relations as at present carried on fortify the demand for a greater degree of non-sectarianism in Jewish institutional life. This brings us to the third pillar—relations with the Jews outside the United States.

Although the Jewish population of America is, as pointed out earlier, overwhelmingly of East European origin, it nevertheless consists in its totality of a veritable *Kibbutz Galuyot*, having recruited itself from all Jewish settlements on the face of the earth. This affected profoundly the attitudes of the American Jews towards their brethren in other lands. In aiding the Jewish communities abroad, they felt they were helping their own families. The *landsmanschaftn*, of which there were still 3,500 in New York alone in 1938, were perhaps the best example of relief in which community concern was combined with individual loyalties. It is questionable whether the American Jews would have raised the tremendous funds they had expended on overseas assistance had they not been able to draw on the personal ties that bound them to their friends and relatives abroad.

The period of personal kinship in relief is nearing an end. It was cut short by the destruction of the old Jewish communities on the one hand and by the rise of the native Jewish generations in the United States on the other hand. The need for financial support from America has been considerably reduced in the remaining communities in Europe; and the personal element is lacking in the aid rendered to the Jews in the oriental lands. There is a growing awareness among American Jews that the basic relief problem now is not the rehabilitation of the shattered old communities, but the construction of something new on a firmer foundation in the State of Israel. Israel thus emerges as the focus of the concern at the fate of the Jewish people as a whole. Whatever is left of the activities of the *landsmanschaften*, other than their cemeteries and mutual aid services, is now concentrated on establishing surviving *landsleut* in Israel, or on erecting there institutions bearing the names of the perished hometowns. Israel appears as not merely another Jewish community; it is regarded as the property of the Jewish people as a whole, and as the repository of the spiritual treasures Jews have accumulated through the ages. What it all adds up to is a realization that the

PATTERNS IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE

future of the Jewish people as a people is inextricably intertwined with progress in Israel. This is reflected in the attitudes of the individual American Jew as well as in the activities of the Jewish community, and it is to the individual that I should now like to direct attention.

A number of surveys recently carried out by different bodies, in different parts of the country, at different times, and by different methods all show that Jews attend religious services less frequently than either Catholics or Protestants. Even more significant is the fact that membership in a synagogue rarely, if ever, affects the style of life of the individual Jew. A very small percentage of the younger members of Orthodox *shuln* observe *kashrut* in their homes, and an even smaller percentage observe it outside their homes. The Sabbath is honoured in the breach by the members of all synagogues and temples. The traditional practices that are still adhered to are gradually losing their spiritual significance and become routine chores. Even circumcision is veering away from its religious moorings and taking on the form of a hygienic operation—performed by a doctor instead of a *mohel* in a rising number of cases, sometimes in the presence, at other times in the absence, of a rabbi. The eight-day requirement is often ignored owing to the shortened stay of the mother in the hospital after giving birth.

Illuminating in this connexion is the scale of values the Jew is guided by in his Jewishness. The American Jewish Committee conducted studies in a few cities to test the attitudes of Jews towards themselves and towards their Gentile neighbours. In many cases the respondents, when asked what they regarded as essential to being a good Jew, placed 'gaining the respect of Christian neighbours' first on their list. At the same time they shuddered at the possibility of their children marrying out of the fold. Granted that the studies are too limited in scope to allow for definitive conclusions, they do nevertheless strengthen the impression that the American Jew is trying to turn his Jewishness into an aspect of his Americanism.

In respect to Israel, all surveys and studies agree that the American Jew attaches to the State a significance he does not attribute to any other community. He approaches it with a feeling that Israel has a special meaning for him; that it enlarges his personality and enhances his human dignity. He becomes more and more convinced that Israel is the land where authentic Jewish culture and art are being created. The growing contributions from individuals to the Israeli institutions of higher learning and to museums and music and art centres flow from this conviction.

Israel is also beginning to have an effect upon the personal life of the American Jew. The singing of a Hebrew song and the dancing of a *hora* are now a regular feature at all Jewish public functions and private celebrations. Israeli artcrafts are indispensable in most home furnishings, and comparing notes on a trip to Israel is almost a required subject

of conversation at Jewish gatherings. An eagerness to bask in the reflected glory of Israel's accomplishments accounts, I believe, for the fabulous success of *Exodus* on the book market and of Theodore Bikel on the concert stage. The feeling that Israel has relevance for the Jews of America in terms of their own needs is also expressed negatively in the aforementioned surveys. The respondents are practically unanimous in stating that they would regard it as a personal tragedy were Israel to be destroyed.

The number of American Jews who would enlist to fight for Israel were she attacked by hostile forces is much larger than the number of Jews evincing the slightest desire to settle in Israel. Not five in a hundred conceive of the State of Israel as their potential individual home. We can probably best summarize the attitude of the third generation Jews toward Israel by stating that while they sense no inner compulsion to go on *aliyah*, they do want Israel to come to them as reinforcement in their struggle to retain their group identity in the United States and to make that retention worthwhile.

Whether the Jews of the following generations will share this attitude is a question that goes beyond my present discourse. Outside the tremendous scope of relief, it is still impossible to predict what the unique contribution of American Jewry to the creative continuity of the Jewish people will ultimately prove to be. Both optimists and pessimists will find much in the American Jewish scene to bolster their respective views. And both will be right. The outcome of the interplay of positive and negative forces will largely depend on the planned and organized measures that will be undertaken to strengthen the Jewish will to live. Of one thing there is no doubt: the American Jew does not feel that he has to sacrifice his Jewishness in order to be a good American. His Jewishness is to him, as mentioned before, a dimension of his Americanism. He is thus confronted with a threat and a challenge: a threat to become so conformist as to lose his own individuality; a challenge in that, almost alone among the American ethnic groups, he has it in him to demonstrate that acculturation may be achieved without dissolution. Will he submit to the threat or will he boldly take up the challenge? On the answer will in no small degree hinge the future of the Jewish people.

JEWISH FIGURES IN POST-WAR DUTCH LITERATURE

Henriette Boas

THE present paper tries to examine how Jews are portrayed in Dutch post-war literature, both by Jews themselves and by non-Jews. The term 'literature' will be taken in a broad meaning, as my point of view will be not so much that of the literary critic and literary historian as that of the historian and sociologist trying to discover if and how Jewish, and in particular Dutch Jewish, reality is reflected in Dutch writing.

Since the end of the Second World War many scores of works in Dutch have been written in which Jews figure in one way or another. In this paper, written largely for readers who do not read Dutch, I shall not try to be even relatively exhaustive. It is no use mentioning many minor names when even some of the Dutch Jewish authors of the older generation who are very well known in Holland are largely unknown abroad. The Dutch Jewish author is here at a greater disadvantage than the British, American, French, or German Jewish author. I shall limit myself therefore mainly to indicating general trends, to classifying the works, and to drawing some conclusions.

In dealing with this subject I am faced with the additional difficulty that not only can I not expect my readers to possess even an elementary knowledge of it, because of the language barrier and because few of the works I intend to mention have been translated, but, worse still, that whatever elementary knowledge some of my readers may have may well be wrong. Experience has taught me that even distinguished Jewish visitors to Holland know next to nothing about the subject of this paper and not much more about the history and present condition of Dutch Jewry. Their knowledge, as appears from their public statements, is usually confined to the glorious position of the Dutch Sephardim in the seventeenth century, the figure of Spinoza, the religious tolerance of the Dutch towards the Jews, the help extended to (a minority of) the Jews by (a minority of) the Dutch non-Jews during the last war, including the 'February Strike' of 25-26 February 1941, and the figure of Anne Frank—all of them facts, for that matter, far too complicated to allow full justice to be done to them in a brief general statement.

The number of Dutch post-war fictional works on Jewish subjects is large if we take into account on the one hand the present number of Jews in Holland, about 22,000 in a total population of some 11,750,000, and on the other hand the number of works devoted to any other specific group of the Dutch population. This excessive interest shows that in the eyes of many readers there is still something 'abnormal' or at least 'different' about the Jews. The Dutch Jews in themselves form no sufficient market for any publisher, the less so in that by no means all of them are avid readers. While the lack of reading habits may be regretted, it is understandable that Jews should avoid most of the present works on Jewish wartime suffering, of which they need not be again reminded. These works find their readers mostly among non-Jews.

Yet, despite the publication of so many works on Jews, not one, to my knowledge, gives an even approximate picture of present-day Dutch Jewry, its problems during the past seventeen years, and its social context, either generally or as exemplified in one particular family or individual from any section of the community. Worse still, the picture emerging from the novels published is often misleading, as they deal largely with a simplified past, or with the abnormal conditions of the Nazi persecution, and have been usually written by persons remote from Dutch-Jewish present-day reality, whether they are non-Jews or of Jewish origin. The absence of any work of fiction on post-war Dutch Jewry (except for a few products of sheer imagination) was matched until recently by the absence of any more scientific study of the subject.

I shall now mention the main categories of post-war Dutch works on Jewish subjects.

NOVELS, DIARIES, POEMS AND PLAYS ON WARTIME EXPERIENCES

This category is by far the largest. Two sharply separated periods of publication must be distinguished: one in the first two or three years after the end of the war, the second during the last six years or so.

Of works on wartime Jewish experiences, as of works on wartime experiences of Dutch non-Jews, a large number was published in the first two years after the war. Nearly all were written and published not with an eye to success and fame, but as a *cri du cœur* by persons who had often not earlier engaged in literature but now felt a need to testify to what they had seen and experienced, or wrote to free their minds from the nightmares still haunting them. Other works were started as diaries during the long monotonous years of hiding, or in order to retain a sense of individuality in the wilderness of the concentration camps. Valuable psychological observations on this type of writing have been made by S. Dresden, himself a Jew and now a professor of French literature at Leyden University, who spent a long period at Westerbork camp, in an essay 'De Literaire Getuige' (The Literary Witness), republished in a volume of essays of the same name in 1959.

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

The vast majority of works on the sufferings of Dutch Jews at the hands of the Germans which appeared in the early post-war years were written by Jews themselves. Some are by persons who were already known as authors. Josef Cohen published the trilogy *Mensen met Sterren* (People with the Yellow Badge), the first volume of which had appeared as early as 1930, and which describes the tragic conflict, in a provincial town, developing between two families, that of the Mayor who long before the war had already been a Nazi and antisemite, and his Jewish neighbours who are likewise local notables; the conflict inevitably leads to the destruction of the Jews. The left-wing author Maurits Dekker (1896-1962) wrote *De Laars op de Nek* (The Jackboot on the Neck) which has a strong autobiographical flavour. The 'I' of the novel happens to be half-Jewish, but is in the first place a militant anti-Nazi; most of the Jews appear either as timorous small fry, with little thought for or understanding of what is happening, or as 'bourgeois' (including the Zionists); both groups are mainly interested in their own personal safety. The same author wrote the play *Vonnis Voltrokken* (Sentence carried out) in which the heroes are the non-Jewish resistance workers, most of whom are killed by the Germans, while again the Jews are fearful and credulous. Dekker also wrote a satire on the selfish and greedy motives of some non-Jews in hiding Jews in *Joseph duikt* (Joseph in Hiding).

Maurits J. Vles, under the pseudonym of Eugene van Herpen, described in *Via Dolorosa* the vicissitudes of a number of cultured people of Jewish origin who are hunted from one hiding-place to another. This novel, in three solid volumes, which is now practically forgotten, contains the same motives as Marga Minco's very slight *The Bitter Herb* which twelve years later became an immediate success. Similarly the distinguished woman author Helma Wolf-Catz in *De Dreiging* (The Threat) describes the bitter experiences of a cultured couple of Jewish origin who had hitherto lived a sheltered life but who are now, with their young daughter, driven from one hiding-place to another, until, as in her own case, the husband is caught while covering the desperate escape of the mother and child. Other accounts of protracted living in hiding, being shunted from one address to another, until the eventual arrest through betrayal, are given in M. Coutinho, *De Stille Strijd* (Silent Struggle), M. Dekker's *Afscheid* (Farewell) and Salvador Hertog's *De Tuin* (The Garden).

Works by Jews who never before or afterwards attempted to enter the field of literature are, e.g., *De Beul Regeert* (The Henchman Rules), by D. Dresden, late professor at the Technical Academy at Delft (not to be confused with S. Dresden), on the relations between certain cultured Jewish families and their former non-Jewish friends, and S. van den Bergh, *Deportaties*, an account of his experiences first in Amsterdam, then in Westerbork, and finally in Auschwitz and other annihilation camps.

Most of these works are more a reaction against the senseless suffering inflicted by the Nazis, and sometimes also a bitter denunciation of betrayal, than positively Jewish. The same applies to the slight volume of poems *Orpheus and Ahasverus*, written by J. Presser who is to be mentioned later as the author of *The Night of the Ghirondists*, under the pen-name of J. van Wageningen, on the loss of his young wife who one day ventured out of their hiding-place, was caught, and deported to her death. Rosey Pool wrote the volume *Beperkt Uitzicht* (Restricted View) and Victor E. van Vriesland a long ballad *De Bevrijding van Dalfsen* (The Liberation of Dalfsen), published in his volume of poems *Tegengif*.

Written from a positively Jewish point of view and permeated with a deep love for her fellow Jews is the collection of short stories *Sterrekinderen* (Children with Stars), written by Clara Asscher-Pinkhof on a number of women, girls, and children she met on her own exodus from Amsterdam, through the collecting-point of the 'Hollandse Schouwburg' to Westerbork and Bergen-Belsen, and eventually to Palestine. Little noticed at its appearance in 1946 and then almost forgotten, it was translated into German and in the summer of 1962 received a prize of DM. 5,000—as the best German children's book of the year. The well-known Dutch-Jewish lawyer, Zionist veteran, and author Abel H. Herzberg described in *Amor Fati* and *Tweestromenland* (Two-River Land) his experiences in Westerbork and Bergen-Belsen against the background of his own historical and metaphysical convictions.

Sally Pinkhof (a brother of Mrs. Clara Asscher-Pinkhof) wrote a number of poems at Bergen-Belsen, where he perished, which were posthumously published under the title *Bergen-Belsen*. The well-known poet Maurits Mok wrote a volume *Aan de Vermoorden van Israel* (To the Murdered Ones of Israel) and individual poems on the death of Jews in other volumes of poetry.

Very few works by non-Jews were written during the first few years after the war on the suffering of the Jews. This applies not only to novels, but also to short stories and poems; this latter phenomenon is the more remarkable as a vast number of poems on the sufferings generally inflicted on Holland by the Germans were written during the war, and many of them were published soon afterwards. Of novels I may mention *Die van Ons* (Those of Us) by the woman author Willy Corsari, on the tragic experiences of a Jewish family trying to find a hiding place, and two long short stories by authors who were still in their late teens or early twenties when war broke out, both written in the first person. G. K. van't Reve in *De Ondergang van de Familie Boslowitz* describes the destruction by the Germans successively of all the members of a Jewish family who had been the author's neighbours and one of whose sons had been his friend for years. H. J. Oolbekkink in *Met Lege Handen* (With Empty Hands) relates how he and his father, in the hungry winter of 1944-5, went to the countryside in search of food; on their way back

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

they are joined by a Jewish boy of his own age, who is recognized by a Dutch Nazi neighbour at a check-post and arrested; the father and son continue their way home.

These novels do not attempt to describe more than what had or could have been seen by the authors themselves, with regard to individual Jews known to them, and do not indulge in detailed descriptions of 'the' sufferings of 'the' Jews and of the concentration camp horrors.

Some works deal with Jewish suffering as above all a Christian problem. Anthonie Donker (pen name of N. A. Donkersloot, Professor of Dutch literature at Amsterdam University and a leading Liberal Protestant) during the war wrote a verse drama, *Ahasverus of Ik Zoek Christenen* (Ahasuerus or I'm looking for Christians), which was published in 1947 and presents the persecution of the Jews as a Christian problem of guilt. Jan de Hartog's well-known play *Skipper next to God*, written and first produced in England during the war, deals with the efforts of a Dutch Calvinist master-owner of a vessel to land his cargo of German-Jewish refugees who have no visas for any country and are thus refused admission everywhere. The play, which was once more shown on Dutch television in 1961, is an effective plea for humanity and Christian brotherly love; yet the limelight falls not on the Jewish refugees in the holds, who remain but shadowy figures, but on the Calvinist skipper.

De Naamlozen van 1942 (The Nameless of 1942) a play by the well-known dramatist August Defresne, which was often performed immediately after the war, deals with a family of which the non-Jewish mother, the two sons and non-Jewish daughter-in-law all actively engage in resistance work which leads to the execution of the younger son; the Jewish father, on the other hand, is a timorous and even ridiculous character.

The paucity of Dutch non-Jewish fiction on Jewish wartime suffering written in or soon after the war does not of course mean that only those few authors took the fate of the Jews to heart. Fortunately, the number of those who offered active help was very much larger than of those who committed their feelings to writing.

By about 1948 the interest of the public in war literature and the Nazi occupation of Holland in general, and in Jewish suffering in particular, had ceased almost completely, so that no publisher dared to bring out works on these subjects any more. The interest in war literature re-awoke only after an interval of several years, and now often among different categories of readers.

The *Diary of Anne Frank* did not fare well at first either; it was only thanks to the unceasing efforts of her father, Mr. Otto Frank, that, after being rejected by many Dutch publishing houses, the manuscript was at last in 1948 accepted by a small publisher and printed in a rather limited edition, which did not sell too well. In Holland the subject of living in

hiding had nothing of the attraction of the unknown and mysterious, and those unfamiliar with it personally could read much fuller and much more mature accounts. The *Diary* would have relapsed into obscurity if Mr. Frank had not had it translated, first into German and then into other languages, and had started to make it known very effectively, so that it was eventually made the subject of a play and then of a film. For a long time practically the only book on Dutch-Jewish wartime suffering available to the non-Dutch-reading public, it also owed its success to the fact that it tells less of the horrors of this suffering than almost any other book on the subject; the manner in which Anne spent the war years, always in the company of her parents and sister, instead of cut off from all her relatives, and in a comparatively comfortable hiding-place owned by her father, instead of being thrown to the mercy of strangers and hunted down, or of living in camps, is relatively bearable; and Anne, not much more than a child and knowing very little of what was happening in the world outside, described events from the perspective of a non-adult with very limited Jewish awareness. Also, the expected death of the girl lends the story an added touch of tragedy. The teenager love story between Anne and Peter, and the caricatured portrayal of three of the adult Jews (Peter's parents and the dentist), which were duly emphasized by both play and film, may have been other factors making for success.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Anne, who was born of an assimilated German-Jewish family in Frankfurt-am-Main in July 1929 and whose life was cut short at Bergen-Belsen in 1945, has become the symbol of many different causes to many different people.

More than twelve years after the war two slight novels or long short stories, both written by people of Jewish origin and published as pocket books, met with immediate enormous success and have also been translated into English. They are J. Presser, *De Nacht der Ghirondijnen* (translated into English as *Breaking Point*) and Marga Minco *Het Bittere Kruid* (*The Bitter Herb*).

Presser, Professor of Modern History at Amsterdam University and a Governor of the Netherlands Government Institute of War Documentation, was not himself in Westerbork concentration camp, the scene of his novel, but spent the war years in hiding. Yet his description of camp life, as has been acknowledged by many who stayed there, is correct in almost every external detail. Yet the novel, and also its manner of publication (it was a Gift Book, Dutch Book Week, 1957), were received with very mixed feelings by the Dutch-Jewish public. Its tendency to place responsibility for the weekly deportations from the camp by death train on the shoulders of the remaining Jews and to represent them as a kind of collaborators is definitely unfair to many who stayed there in exceptionally difficult conditions, and even plays into the hands of antisemites.

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

Another Dutch literary prize was awarded that same year to Marga Minco for her sober and slight *Het Bittere Kruid*. These reminiscences of her wartime experiences, first together with her parents and then alone in hiding, told in a concise and factual manner, make no claim to being a contribution on the problem of metaphysical guilt, and describe no more than the average experiences of an average Dutch Jewish middle-class family, neither heroic nor privileged, neither orthodox, Zionist nor socialist. Yet this brief and simple story brought fame to its author who until then had been altogether unknown in the literary world except as the wife of the non-Jewish author Bert Voeten. She continued to publish a number of short stories on the same theme, some of them in her volume *De Andere Kant* (The Other Side) (1961). One of the best is 'Het Adres' on her bitter experiences when after the war she tried to recover some family heirlooms from a non-Jewish woman friend of her late mother.

Among works written much earlier but published only recently is *Twee Brieven uit Westerbork* (Two Letters from Westerbork), authentic letters written from that camp in 1942 by the late Etty Hillesum, a young Jewish woman graduate, to friends outside, shortly before she was deported, never to return. These letters, originally circulated privately, were printed in the April 1959 issue of the literary monthly *Maatstaf* and published in book-form in 1962.

Mirjam Blitz, *Auschwitz no. 13917* (1961), is actually nothing but the straight autobiographical account of her experiences by a determined lower middle-class young Amsterdam Jewish woman who survived Auschwitz. She wrote it immediately after her return to Holland, to free herself of her nightmarish memories, but could not find a publisher. The manuscript had been lying for fifteen years in the Netherlands Government Institute for War Documentation until in 1961 it benefited from the general demand for precisely this type of literature, was published, and became a success.

Likewise in the summer of 1961 another diary was published in Holland, written in German by a German 'non-Aryan' refugee boy in Holland during the first years of the war, *Die Tagebücher des Klaus Seckel*, edited by one of his former non-Jewish teachers. The late Klaus Seckel had been admitted to a Quaker boarding-school in Holland, leaving his parents in Germany, and was eventually deported.

It is perhaps worthy of note that in all works of this type which became a success, the 'hero' is either a child or a girl or young woman, at most in her early twenties.

In addition to these original Dutch novels on Jewish wartime suffering, a considerable number of Dutch translations of novels on Jewish wartime suffering elsewhere has been published in the last two or three years, a subject in which immediately after the war no interest whatever existed. They include works by Katzetnik (*Daniella* and *Moni*), Eliezer

Jerushalmi, Erwin Sylvanus, M. Ben Gavriel, Chr. Geisler, Eugen Heimler, as well as the documentary works by Poliakoff and Wulf, William Shirer, Lord Russell, etc. Also, at least four books on Eichmann, written by non-Dutch authors, appeared in Dutch translation in 1961.

The Eichmann trial was covered very extensively by most of the Dutch press. Special mention should be made of two series of reports, written from very different angles, which were both published in book-form in the summer of 1962. Mr. Abel J. Herzberg, mentioned earlier, reported the trial for the Roman Catholic daily *De Volkskrant* and has now (in 1962) published these reports, after revising them in the light of the distance of place and time gained since their original publication, as *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. A lawyer, an independent thinker, a man with a deep Jewish awareness and one who was interned in Bergen-Belsen himself, as well as an authoritative writer on the persecution of the Jews of Holland, he was qualified as few others to write on the trial, and he does so objectively, expertly, intelligently, and yet never concealing that he too is a Jew. Yet his book on Eichmann has so far not become a best-seller, in contrast to Harry Mulisch's *De Zaak 40/61* (Case 40/61) (1962) which has been a best-seller for the past few months.

Harry Mulisch, one of the most widely criticized and controversial as well as most avidly read 'angry young men' of contemporary Dutch literature, all of whose recent books have had a mass appeal; attended part of the trial for *Elsevier's Weekly*, and added his impressions of a trip, specially undertaken for the purpose, to Berlin, Warsaw and Auschwitz. With no interest whatever in the legal proceedings or in straight coverage, his reports are his very personal observations on Eichmann and on some of the other main characters at the trial, and on the Eichmann 'phenomenon' as a kind of philosophical or metaphysical problem. Though his entire approach is intentionally fully subjective, he is 'involved' as a human being only, though actually his mother is Jewish.

A similar position arose in regard to documentary works on the persecution of the Dutch Jews. The same Abel J. Herzberg's magisterial *Kroniek van de Jodenvervolgung 1940-1945* (Chronicle of the Persecution of the Jews, 1940-1945), written originally as part of the Government-sponsored series *Onderdrukking en Verzet* (Oppression and Resistance) and published separately in 1951, found few readers outside those personally or professionally interested, nor has this fully documented and illustrated survey ever been translated. H. Wielek (pen-name for H. Kweksilber), *De Oorlog die Hitler won* (The War that Hitler Won) (1947), and H. J. Sannes, *Onze Joden en Hitler's Greep naar de Wereldmacht* (Our Jews and Hitler's Bid for World Power) (1946) are now almost forgotten.

A television series of five programmes a year, over a period of five

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

years, by the Government Institute of War Documentation, and personally presented by its Director, Dr. L. de Jong, was started in the spring of 1960. These excellent programmes have rightly found widespread interest and approval. The programmes of the first and the second year have been published, as richly illustrated pocket books, under the title *De Bezetting* (The Occupation) *I* and *II* (1961 and 1962). Two chapters of Volume I deal respectively with the first stages of the Nazi persecution of the Jews in Holland, and with the pro-Jewish 'February Strike' of 25-26 February 1941. Dr. de Jong showed clearly that relatively few non-Jews opposed the anti-Jewish measures from the start, when the large majority was still inactive and indifferent. The first chapter of Volume II deals with the Dutch Nazi movement, and the first programme of the third series, which has already been broadcast, with the full impact of the persecution of the Jews in Holland.

A much more ambitious and likewise excellent illustrated documentary, published under the auspices of the same Institute in the autumn of 1961, and edited by Leonard de Vries, together with A. H. Paape and H. de Vries, is *De Jaren 1940-45* (The Years 1940-45); one chapter deals specifically with the persecution of the Jews.

Yet this increasing interest in Jewish wartime suffering is not a positive phenomenon only. This may be clear if we realize that practically nothing has ever been published, and certainly not as fiction, on the sufferings inflicted on tens of thousands of Dutch nationals, men, women and children, by the Japanese during their occupation of the Dutch East Indies in 1942-45, in which in particular large numbers of men perished. Apparently the Dutch are not keen to see their own kith and kin represented as the helpless victims of the Japanese, whereas Jewish suffering is somehow more remote, at least to the masses.

This excessive interest in wartime Jewish suffering during the past few years is also in striking contrast to the indifference towards it, and also towards the guilt of former Nazis, which had been prevalent in the earlier fifties.

The senior Dutch author and literary critic Victor E. van Vriesland, who is himself of Jewish origin, in January 1954, on the presentation of the annual prize of the Netherlands Artists Resistance Foundation, delivered an address *De Onverzoenlijken* (The Irreconcilable), which also appeared in print, in which he severely criticized this complacency, the spirit of 'forgive and forget' towards former Nazi collaborators among Dutch authors, musicians, artists, etc. who had long been reinstated to leading positions in Dutch cultural life, and even a certain aversion from former resistance workers. Van Vriesland was criticized for this address at the time by many responsible figures. He was likewise generally criticized as 'biased' for having excluded from his standard *Anthology of Dutch Poetry, Vol. III*, which deals with the period 1900-1940, work of those known to him as former Nazis. In his Introduction to this

volume, published in 1953, he stated explicitly that the responsibility for this decision was exclusively his and not his publisher's.*

GHETTO MEMORIES

A second category of Dutch books on Jews avidly read by non-Jews today are those on 'the typical Amsterdam ghetto-Jew', i.e. on Jews corresponding to the image of 'the Jew' which non-Jews, or certain groups of them, like to see represented. The success of these books is officially ascribed to two very respectable motives: nostalgia for and compassion with the Jewish poor who were deported to their death in their tens of thousands during the war, and a desire to preserve the memory of the former Amsterdam Jewish quarter which has not only lost nearly all its former inhabitants but where now also most of the houses and streets have been demolished in the interests of modern traffic. Weesperstraat, Jodenbreestraat, and Muiderstraat have not only become streets-without-a-soul, but now even streets largely without houses.

Yet part of the success of these books is, consciously or unconsciously, certainly due to less noble motives: the Jew whom they describe is a colourful, poor, somewhat pathetic little figure who speaks broken Dutch with an amusing accent.

Best-known in this category are the four volumes of short stories and sketches by the socialist journalist of Jewish origin Meyer Sluysers which at the end of 1961, after going through several editions, were republished together in a cheap omnibus edition. He published the first of

* How little this avid interest in novels on Jewish wartime suffering means in actual practice may be illustrated from two recent examples: (1) During the freshmen's initiation period of the Amsterdam Students' Corporation last autumn, two senior students in charge threatened that they 'would play Dachau' with some of the freshmen, including one or two of Jewish origin. Although the initiation of freshmen into the 'corporations' at the various universities has always been characterized by unsavoury incidents, manhandling, and even, as far as Jewish students were concerned, sometimes by outspoken antisemitism, this particular expression, when it leaked out to the press, aroused widespread indignation and caused scores of letters to the editor, editorials, and even investigations by the official University authorities. To excuse the senior students who had used the threat 'to play Dachau' it was stated by many that these young men, who had grown up after the war, were not fully conversant with the full horror of the meaning of 'Dachau'. The University of Leyden then decided to organize a public lecture on Dachau, addressed by four former inmates of that concentration camp, including two well-known authors, both of them non-Jews. The total number of students turning up was . . . thirty. (2) In the *Nederlands Juristen Blad* (Netherlands' Lawyers' Weekly) of 5 January, 1963, and again in a subsequent issue, a plea was made for the release of the last four war criminals still remaining in Dutch prisons (all of whom happen to be Germans) by Professors J. M. van Bemmelen and W. J. P. Pompe, professors of Criminal Law at the University of Leyden and the University of Utrecht respectively. They argued that these four men, who had been notorious for their extreme brutality, especially towards Jews, had, after all, acted under the influence of the ideology of their country and that, so many years after the end of the war, the Dutch people should show itself 'generous' and be animated by a spirit of true forgiving instead of a feeling of revenge and vindictiveness. Their plea aroused numerous protests, in editorials and also in letters to the editor, but also a certain amount of support.

these volumes *Die-en-Die is er nog* (So-and-so is still alive), shortly after his return from London after the war. This was followed in 1957, by *Voor ik het vergeet* (Before I forget), which appeared with a Foreword by the then Labour Premier Dr. W. Drees. In 1958 *Als de Dag van Gisteren* (As in Days of Yore) was published, and in 1959 *Hun Lach klinkt van zover* (Their Laughter Sounds from Afar). The stories, many of which had been published earlier in the Saturday supplement of the daily *Het Parool*, contain memories of the poorest part of the Amsterdam Jewish quarter where the author himself lived as a child in the early years of this century. Each of the last three volumes was made the subject of a full-length sympathetic radio play by the V.A.R.A. (Labour Broadcasting Organization) in which all 'Jews', however, necessarily spoke in a thick 'Jewish' accent. One story from *As in Days of Yore* was taken as the plot for a film documentary on the pre-war Amsterdam Jewish quarter, made at the official request of the Amsterdam Municipality.

Sluysen describes a quarter which had practically ceased to exist not long after the end of the First World War, when the Municipality condemned large numbers of its houses and in 1926 moved the inhabitants to a new suburb, the Transvaal-quarter. Further, even in Sluysen's childhood only a part of the Amsterdam Jews, and even only a part of the quarter's residents, corresponded to the types he describes.

According to the 'Statistical Data on the Jews of Amsterdam', collected in 1942 by the then Joodse Raad (Jewish Council), of the 80,000 Jewish inhabitants of Amsterdam, at the time only 7,088 still lived in the actual 'Old Ghetto', and another 6,590 in the Weesperstraat and adjoining streets.

Dr. Jaap Meyer rightly observes in *Het Jonas Daniel Meyerplein* (1961), pp. 23 f.:

... An interesting historical problem: The 'Ghetto' as the central Jewish quarter no longer existed in 1940 ... Yet in retrospect it often seems as if the destruction of the Amsterdam Jews has caused the destruction of the Jewish quarter. Often a feeble remnant of external Jewish life (the markets) is then regarded—entirely erroneously—as an original and picturesque part of Amsterdam Jewry. ... It is dialectically remarkable that in retrospect everything or nearly everything remembered of the Jews in this city is connected with a quarter which, the emptier it actually became in a recent past, is increasingly filled with memories and legends, with nostalgia and melancholy. Here too symbols are stronger than documents.

The books by Sluysen were received with as much enthusiasm by the non-Jewish public as they were disliked by many Jews.

'JEWISH HUMOUR'

Though not actually 'literature' and certainly not Literature, the unparalleled post-war success in Holland of the well-known old American

farce *Potash and Perlmutter* and of the Jewish jokes of the Dutch-Jewish comedian Max Tilleur may be mentioned here. *Potash and Perlmutter*, which had been performed in Holland earlier, was revived after the war and has been having a longer run than any other play in Dutch theatrical history; it has been shown with enormous success not only in Amsterdam but even in remote villages where other theatrical companies never stand a chance. When after more than a thousand performances the demand for the play did not cease, the producers invented further adventures for the two companions and their wives and have met with equal success. Even in July and August 1962, when most Amsterdam theatres closed down for the summer and the Dutch theatre-going public consisted mainly of visitors from the provinces, the play went on nightly. Messrs. Potash and Perlmutter also, some years ago, figured weekly in a radio variety programme where, with their 'Jewish accents', they made wisecracks entirely unrelated to the original play.

But the most sensational success has been the comedian Max Tilleur, who has become something of a national institution. Before the war an ordinary comedian, he found his way to fame and prosperity when about 1950 he opened a one-man cabaret, 'De Doofpot' (The Fire-Extinguisher) in the centre of Amsterdam where night after night, during the winter season, he tells his 'Jewish' jokes. In the summer months he has become a sort of Dutch goodwill ambassador abroad. He has published a number of his jokes in *Langs mijn neus weg* (Off my Nose), alluding to his very large 'Jewish' nose, and has made a long-playing record of others. To lend added success to these jokes he has now located some of them in Israel.

OTHER PRE-WAR MEMORIES

Works not describing the 'typical Amsterdam ghetto Jew' but middle-class Jewish families, and usually based on childhood memories, include Ida Simons (née Rosenheimer, 1908-1959) *Een Dwaze Maagd* (A Foolish Virgin) (1959), on her childhood in Belgium, Berlin, and Scheveningen around the First World War, which was praised by literary critics.

The main name in this field, both now and in the last pre-war decade, is Siegfried van Praag, who is mentioned elsewhere in this paper and who after the war, in addition to novels on non-Jewish themes, published, *inter alia*, *De Weg van het Heimwee* (The Road of Nostalgia) (1947), a collection of short stories, and *De Hebreeuwse Lichtekooi* (The Hebrew Prostitute) (1951).

His main work in this respect, and probably regarded by himself as the coping-stone of his entire *œuvre* of nearly forty years, is *Jerusalem van het Westen* (Jerusalem of the West), published in 1961. This large novel continues the theme of *De Hebreeuwse Lichtekooi*, but much more ambitiously. Ruben, a kind of *alter ego* of the author, revisits his native Am-

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

sterdam, from which he had been absent since 1939, and with the help of surviving friends, both there and in Israel, recalls memories and learns the ultimate fate of many of those he used to know who were senselessly killed by the Germans. The chapters are only loosely connected as one family after another is described, rich and poor, pious and atheists, intellectuals and diamond merchants, Zionists and non-Zionists, good men and bad men, men and women, old people and young. One of the problems haunting Ruben is that so many of the good and pious were senselessly killed while some of the bad, by mere accident, survived. From beginning to end the work is permeated by a profound nostalgia. Part of the scene is laid in Israel.

The novel was praised highly by all leading Dutch non-Jewish critics, including one of the most formidable among them, the author, poet, and essayist Jan Greshoff. In *Het Vaderland*, December 1961, while admitting that in composition and style the novel is weak, he writes that yet it is and will remain 'the epic of pre-war Dutch Jewry', and goes on to devote a full-page review to it.

None of these highly appreciative non-Jewish reviewers has asked whether the novel really gives an adequate picture of immediate pre-war Amsterdam Jewry, or at least of certain sections of it. Van Praag, who went to live in Brussels about 1930 and is still living there, and who spent the war years in London, actually describes situations and personalities whom he knew, say, between 1915 and 1925. A few of his figures are clearly recognizable as existing persons, with their specific virtues and defects; in others he has mixed traits of two or more generally known personalities; still others, at least as far as I can see, are entirely imaginary characters. While pretending to give 'history', the novel is not even *histoire romancée*. But its main defect is that it is anachronistic.

EAST EUROPEAN JEWRY AND YIDDISH

Somewhat related to the predilection for the 'typical Amsterdam ghetto Jew' is the interest in and admiration for a pre-war East European Jewry viewed in a very much simplified and romanticized light—that of the Hassidic type as portrayed by Chagall, a large exhibition of whose works in the Amsterdam Municipal Museum some years ago attracted a record number of visitors. Likewise the Hassidic stories of Professor Buber, some of which have been translated into Dutch, are very popular. L. Fuks, himself of East European origin and a Yiddishist, translated into Dutch Itzik Manger's *The Book of Paradise* and edited a volume of short stories *Meesters der Jiddische Vertelkunst* (Masters of Yiddish Narration). Translated soon after publication were Roger Ikor's *Les Fils d'Avrom* and André Schwarz-Bart's *Le Dernier des Justes*; the latter became a best-seller.

But really indicative of this romanticization of pre-war East European Jewry, without any desire for exact knowledge of this vast group in its many different sections, is the popularity of Yiddish songs on the Dutch radio: no week passes but one or other of the four competing Dutch radio organizations presents a programme of 'Yiddish' songs. Some women singers of Jewish origin have even specialized in this type of song; one, Channah Milner, has in addition published a pocket book with some well-known Yiddish songs and their music, *Rosinkes mit Mandeln* (1960). In the autumn of 1961 Paddy Chayefski's New York play *The Tenth Man* was performed in Holland with very great success by a Dutch theatrical company. As a counterpart to Max Tailleur's 'Doofpot' cabaret, mentioned earlier, a Jewish couple has been very successfully running a 'Yiddish songs' cabaret, 'Li-la-lo', for the past two or three years, in an entirely non-Jewish district of Amsterdam and frequented largely by non-Jews.

ISRAEL

The vogue enjoyed in Holland by writings on Israel points in the same direction. Non-Jewish writers and speakers on Israel in this country almost invariably contrast 'the ghetto Jew with bent back as we used to know him here' with 'the straight, blond, courageous and fighting' Jews they have seen in Israel. For years now the Israeli soldiers' group (including girl soldiers) participating annually in the Four Day March around Nijmegen at the end of July, have been the favourites of the press and the public among the 12,000 marchers. The Dutch translation of *Exodus* has been at the head of the Dutch monthly best-seller list for over eighteen months now, though according to Dutch standards its price is high; it was also serialized in two dailies, the Roman Catholic *De Volkskrant* and the Calvinist *Trouw*. The photo pocket book *Vrouwen van Israel* (Women of Israel) (1960), which also appeared in an English edition, by the American photographer and publicity expert of Dutch-Jewish origin Sam Wagenaar, and *Kindere van Israel* (Children of Israel) (1961), were highly praised, including their introductory stories, even by responsible Dutch critics. Other novels on Israel translated into Dutch include Yael Dayan's *New Face in the Mirror*, the title of which in Dutch is significantly *Ik slaap met mijn geweer* (I Sleep with my Gun) and M. Ben Gavriel's *Citizen Mahashavi*, which can only be understood against the background of Palestine of the Second World War.

Jan de Hartog's *The Inspector* (1961) has ridden the wave of the success of novels on Israel. The novel was published in the United States even before the Dutch original came off the press in Holland. De Hartog, who has been living abroad for over twenty years, and does not know the immediate post-war situation in Holland at first hand, and even less the immediate post-war Jewish situation, has here clearly looked

for and found a subject with a mass appeal at present, without giving much attention to the story's probability or to getting his facts straight.

Two original Dutch novels on Israel—or rather, which start in Holland and end in Israel—both written by Jews several years ago, did not receive much attention. Clara Asscher-Pinkhof, mentioned before, a life-long Zionist who has been living in Israel since 1944, describes in *De Koopbrief* (The Purchase Deed) an idealistic Jew from a Dutch provincial town who settles as a physician in a *kibbutz* many years before the last war; the last part of the novel takes place during the War of Liberation. Very unlike this simple book is Siegfried van Praag's *Serah*, one of his many novels about a passion-tormented woman: Serah hopes in vain to find in Israel the peace for which she has fruitlessly been searching in Holland and elsewhere. The novel and its description of Israel are more typical of Van Praag than of Israel.

Among original Dutch children's books on Israel is Clara Asscher-Pinkhof's *Tirzah*, the attractive story of a 14-year-old *sabra kibbutz* girl. The best Dutch book for young people with a Jewish and Israel theme is *Chaweriem*, by Leonard de Vries, whom we mentioned earlier as the editor of *The Years of Occupation*. It gives the true-to-life story of a Dutch-Jewish boy whose parents were deported and who is hidden by non-Jews. After the end of the war, with the help of soldiers of the Jewish Brigade then stationed in Holland, he makes his way to Palestine, where he is eventually joined by his young sister after she has recovered from tuberculosis contracted in the camps. The novel was circulated at a very low price by the Labour 'Arbeiderspers', and was recently translated into German.

It cannot be the object of this paper to enumerate the many original travel accounts of Israel in Dutch, a few written by Jews, the majority by non-Jews. One of the first, and reprinted several times, was *Jerusalem, eer ik U vergeet*, by Dr. J. A. Nederbragt, who arrived in Jerusalem in February 1948 as Consul-General and stayed throughout the siege and until 1950. It is a valuable diary of events in Jerusalem and Israel, particularly during 1948, though coloured by the author's personal Calvinistic views on the history and future destiny of the Jewish people. Other accounts too deal with relations between Christianity and the Jews, e.g. those by the Dutch Protestant clergyman Petrus Huygens, *Israel, Land van de Bijbel, Land van de Toekomst* (Israel, Land of the Bible, Land of the Future) (1960) and *Gesprekken in Israel* (Talks in Israel) (1961), which have also appeared in German.

Very much larger is the number of articles on Israel in the Dutch press; most Dutch newspapers have their own correspondent in that country, usually Israelis of Dutch origin, and also regularly publish features by visitors.

It is hardly necessary to add that Israeli songs and singers are even more popular than Yiddish songs and singers in Holland today; Israeli

singers frequently make their appearance on the Dutch radio and television, and also in night clubs, and receive an excellent press, though their songs are often out of date by Israel standards.

This exaggerated enthusiasm for Israel among non-Jews is by no means a positive phenomenon only, and often not devoid of a certain antisemitism. This was observed among others by J. B. Charles, pen-name of Professor W. H. Nagel, professor of Criminology at Leyden University, in an article in *Maatstaf*, April 1957. Charles, who was himself active in the Dutch wartime resistance, observed, writing shortly after the Sinai Campaign, that in much of Dutch 'hurrah-pro-Israelism' a good deal of antisemitism is hidden and that 'the same Dutch masses who were anti-Jewish during the last war, or at least insensitive to Jewish suffering, now approve of anything Jews do, at least in Israel'.

The negative side of this popular enthusiasm for Israel and for anything Jewish and Yiddish, even if devoid of any antisemitic undertones, was also commented on in the Netherlands Ashkenazi Congregation's Annual Report for the year 1961, issued in the summer of 1962. It observes that there is too much emphasis on the folkloristic element, and too little understanding of what is genuinely and specifically Jewish.

REFUGEES

During the thirties and afterwards German and other Jewish refugees were hardly ever the theme of a Dutch novel, except in Jan De Hartog's *Skipper Next to God*, written in London, and in one pre-war novel by Van Praag. But in the summer of 1961 two Dutch authors, both living abroad, published novels in Dutch on Jewish refugees, each story situated in a foreign country. Johan Fabricius in *Mijn Rosalia* sympathetically tells the story of a middle-aged German Jewish refugee in Lisbon who finds ultimate happiness with his landlady, Rosalia, a simple local washerwoman, for whom he embraces Catholicism. Marnix Gijsen, for many years now the Cultural Attaché of the Belgian Embassy in the U.S., who publishes mainly in Holland, where he is better known as an author than in his own country, includes in *Diaspora*, a collection of short stories on expatriates, some on German Jewish refugees.

ANTISEMITISM: JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS

Though antisemitism has not entirely disappeared in Holland even now, and Jewish-Christian relations are sometimes still considered a problem, very few post-war Dutch novels deal with this subject, and even fewer with contemporary local antisemitism, which theme seems more or less taboo. This applies to non-Jews and Jews alike. The best-known novel of this group is Adriaan van der Veen's *Het Wilde Feest* (The Wild Feast), which soon after publication in 1952 received a Dutch

literary award and was translated into English as *The Intruder*. Its scene, perhaps not accidentally, is not post-war Holland but war-time New York where the 'I' of this more or less autobiographical novel, a young Dutch non-Jewish author, finds himself stranded. The Dutch girl Vera he falls in love with and gets engaged to turns out to be of Jewish origin. From the reaction of many of his non-Jewish friends, both Dutch and American, even in war-time New York, he gets to understand something of anti-Jewish prejudice.

Much less known is F. H. Bordewijk's *De Bloesemtak* (The Blossoming Branch). This highly intelligent author of the older generation, a lawyer by profession, describes with penetrating insight the tragic conflict arising between an elderly Jewish couple who, because of their war-time experiences, are extremely sensitive to possible expressions of anti-semitism, and their young and sympathetic non-Jewish neighbours, which conflict ends in the death of the young woman. Bordewijk, who has close Jewish friends, particularly among his lawyer colleagues, gives the two sides of the case, with understanding for both sides, and also describes two other Jews, one a diabolical figure, akin to certain diabolical non-Jews in others of his novels, and one a truly noble lawyer.

In Siegfried van Praag's *Seizoenen* (Seasons) (1959) a Jewish teacher at a largely non-Jewish secondary school is the main character. The core of the book is, however, not the problem of Jewish-non-Jewish relations but relations at this school in general. Van Praag, who himself was a part-time teacher of French at a Dutch secondary school for several years after the war, undoubtedly made the main character a Jew because, a Jew himself, he could so do more psychological justice to his hero. The novel contains two interesting minor 'Jewish' plots, but neither is essential.

A novel with a character all of its own is Siegfried van Praag's *Jesus and Menachem*, a beautiful allegorical conception of the parting of the ways between Christianity and Judaism, strongly identified with the Jewish standpoint. Surprisingly, it has attracted little attention in Holland and has not been translated.

Outside the field of literature proper is the interest taken in the Jews and the Jewish people by certain Dutch Protestant, and lately also by certain Roman Catholic, theologians. The establishment of the State of Israel and the return of the Jews to the Holy Land poses a problem which most theologians try to ignore but others try to solve. Two publications with a more or less official character are *Kerk en Israel* (Church and Israel) by the Dutch Reformed Church's Council for Church and Israel (1960), and *Het Mysterie van Israel* (1959) by a Roman Catholic group.

The essays collected in each of these publications reflect many different points of view; moreover, the contributors to *Het Mysterie van Israel* represent only a minority among Dutch Roman Catholics. Further,

however valuable these works may be as a contribution to theological discussion, and however sincerely some of these authors try to create among their co-religionists a better appreciation of the Jews who, as these authors observe, are even today still often maligned and despised by Christians, in Holland as elsewhere, yet these works hardly contribute to a better understanding of the individual present-day Jew or of the social conditions in which he lives. The Jews in these works are too frequently viewed from the point of view of Christianity only and as potential sons of the Christian Church.

JEWISH HISTORICAL NOVELS

Several Dutch-Jewish authors published Jewish historical novels after the war, often to express, in an historical character or situation, certain of their own ideas.

Abel J. Herzberg, mentioned earlier, wrote two dramas, *Herodes* and *Saul's Dood* (Saul's Death), which both received literary prizes and were performed, although, being too rhetorical, they were no great success on the stage. Siegfried van Praag wrote *Saul* (1947) and Manuel van Loggem *Mozes*, which is strongly influenced by Freud.

The main Jewish post-war historical novel is Sam Goudsmit's *De Gouden Kroon van Beieren* (The Golden Crown of Bavaria) (1953), to some extent a sequel to his pre-war *Simcha, de Knaap uit Worms*. Both novels are located in the Rhineland in the Middle Ages and deal with the persecution of the Jews, one during the Crusades and the other at the time of the Black Death. Both are permeated by a militant and burning, though unconventional, Jewish awareness.

Since the war the most fertile Jewish author of Jewish historical novels in Holland, all with a Dutch-Jewish background, has been M. Wertheim. A businessman in private life, and outside the mainstream both of Dutch literature and Jewish affairs, he started publishing rather late in life and only after the war. The scenes of his novels are usually business and shipping circles in seventeenth-century Amsterdam or early nineteenth-century Rotterdam; they include *Isaac de la Fuentes*, *Vorst der Ballingschap* (Prince of the Exile), and *De Soete Basinne*.

His most recent novel, *De Laatste der Levano's* (The Last of the Levano Family) (1961) may also be mentioned here, though dealing with a contemporary theme, as actually it is as much a product of historical fiction as his earlier novels. It describes the only survivor of the ancient and noble Sephardi Levano family, who is confronted, among other things, with the State of Israel. He thus combines a number of 'acknowledged' Jewish themes, without, however, approaching existing Jewish reality.

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

NON-FICTIONAL HISTORICAL STUDIES

The non-fictional historical studies on Dutch Jewry which have appeared since the war are not only much less numerous than works of fiction, but have had a much smaller circulation and are hardly known, as a rule, outside either Jewish circles or a small circle of experts.

It cannot be the object of this paper to list them all. I shall mention only the best-known.

The main Dutch-Jewish historian today, at least potentially, is Dr. Jaap Meyer who is both a professional historian and a Jewish expert and combines the methods of the trained historian with an original and often unorthodox approach. Unfortunately, he sometimes shows a predilection for marginal figures of Dutch-Jewish history, such as the early nineteenth century Amsterdam Sephardi poet and convert to Calvinism, *Isaac da Costa*, to whom he devoted his doctoral thesis, and the controversial Dutch-Jewish poet Jacob Israel de Haan, who was murdered in Jerusalem in 1924, of whom he is now making a comprehensive study.

His *Maandblad voor de Geschiedenis van de Joden in Nederland*, which he founded single-handed in 1947 and which existed less than a year, contains valuable biographies of a number of Dutch-Jewish scholars and men of letters who perished during the war. On the 275th anniversary of the Amsterdam-Sephardi Congregation in 1950 he re-issued D. Henriques de Castro's *De Synagoge der Portugees-Israelietische Gemeente te Amsterdam*, 1875, adding three chapters on the history of the congregation in the past seventy-five years. The same author, in 1961, on the 325th anniversary of the Amsterdam Ashkenazi Congregation wrote, at the latter's request, *Het Jonas Daniel Meyerplein*, a number of brief, illuminating, and sometimes provocative chapters on various episodes of this congregation's history. Both works contain many valuable illustrations. Both were published with substantial subventions by the respective congregations.

Earlier, in 1948, Jaap Meyer had devoted an excellent monograph, *Het Verdwenen Ghetto* (The Ghetto that Disappeared), to the pre-war Amsterdam Jewish quarter, with a wealth of historical information, combined with the author's own memories. A companion volume to this work is H. Beem, *De Verdwenen Mediene* (The 'medina'—i.e. the Jewish communities outside Amsterdam—that Disappeared) (1950), likewise illustrated with many precious photographs, and also written by a Jewish insider, addressing himself in the first place to a Jewish public. Both books rightly have a place on the bookshelves of many Dutch-Jewish homes, but are largely ignored in non-Jewish circles.

Since the war, the Dutch-Jewish *Genootschap voor de Joodse Wetenschap* (somewhat a counterpart of the Jewish Historical Society of England) twice published a volume of its *Mededelingen en Bijdragen*. But, in contrast

to the pre-war situation, most contributions are short and of no great importance, or do not deal with Dutch-Jewish history.

The most important monograph on a Dutch-Jewish historical personality is that written by A. S. Ryxman on *A. C. Wertheim* (1832-97), the once famous Amsterdam-Jewish banker, philanthropist and liberal politician, as a Ph.D. thesis in the University of Amsterdam, 1961. It is characteristic of the situation that this thorough and scholarly, yet also very readable, research, which is of interest also for nineteenth-century Amsterdam history generally, could not find a commercial publisher and had to be issued privately, in a limited number of copies, though it was widely reviewed in the Dutch press. A Ph.D. thesis in the University of Amsterdam, 1960, was Menachem E. Bolle, *De Opheffing van de Autonomie van de Kehilloth in Nederland*, 1796.

Collections of memorial essays by a number of friends, mostly non-Jews, were published in the first post-war years on the Socialist leader *Henri Polak* (1868-1943), on the leading Neo-Kantian philosopher Professor *Leo Polak* (1880-1941), and on the publisher and author *Emanuel Querido*, all of whom perished at the hands of the Nazis and whose activities were largely outside the Jewish sphere.

The growth of the Amsterdam ladies' fashion trade, in which Jews played an important part, and in particular of Gerzon's Fashion Shops, was described by Mrs. A. Wolf née Gerzon in *Au bonheur des dames*. A history of the growth of the men's ready-made wear industry in Groningen, and in particular of Levie Bros., was written at that firm's request by Mr. E. Elias, *Met Naald en Draad* (With Needle and Thread).

Leaving out a number of minor works and articles we may mention in conclusion a welcome series of detailed articles on the past and present of the various Dutch-Jewish provincial congregations which the young amateur journalist Manfred Gerstenfeld has been publishing for the past year or so in the *Nieuw Israelietisch Weekblad* and which is being continued.

SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES

A Demographic Survey of Dutch Jewry as of 1 January 1954, prepared under the auspices of the Dutch Jewish Social Welfare Board, was published in English in this Journal (Vol. III, no. 2 and Vol. IV, no. 1) as 'Dutch Jewry, A Demographic Analysis'. As a sociological contribution, its value is limited because (a) it is, in its present form, largely statistical and makes no attempt at sociological analysis, (b) it represents the state of affairs of eight years ago, and (c) the criterion adopted for 'Jew' is doubtful: a large number of persons are included with a Jewish mother only, and also persons still automatically registered as Jews by the official Jewish congregations, but no longer with any positive attitude towards their Jewish origin, so that the number of 27,000

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

Jews which the Survey arrives at may be several thousands higher than in actual practice. As a result, the estimated needs for future Jewish charity and social and cultural 'planning' are exaggerated, as also the conclusions and forecasts about the degree of assimilation of the more 'central' Jews. The weaknesses of the Survey were discussed in detail by Professor S. Kleerekoper, Professor of Economics at Amsterdam University, in the *Nieuw Israelietisch Weekblad* of 20 and 27 January 1961. When the results of the population census held in Holland at the end of May 1961 are eventually published, in which people were asked to state their religious affiliation, more reliable figures may be obtained. This latter figure, however, may be rather lower than higher than actual reality as some Jews, with memories of the Nazi period, may have feared to declare themselves officially as Jews for governmental registration purposes.

The only sociologically valuable survey of post-war Dutch Jewry was undertaken by a young American Jew, Mr. Malcolm D. Rivkin, who in 1953 stayed eight months in Holland as a Fulbright scholar for the express purpose of conducting this survey. His conclusions appeared in three successive issues of the *Nieuw Israelietisch Weekblad* in the autumn of 1954. Based *inter alia* on extensive personal interviews and the answers to a few hundred detailed questionnaires, he limited himself, for technical reasons, to the Jews of Amsterdam who constituted rather more than half of Dutch Jewry but who, living more concentrated, are not typical of the whole country. Further, his survey was conducted only eight years after the war. Today, twice as many years have passed, and the situation has accordingly been stabilized and neutralized.

The only local Dutch-Jewish sociological contribution, which however does not profess to be a work of scholarship, is the text written by M. L. Snijders as an introduction to the pictures of the American Jewish photographer L. Freed in M. L. Snijders and L. Freed, *Joden van Amsterdam* (1958). Yet Snijders, a graduate of the Faculty of Politics and Sociology of Amsterdam University, who once worked in the office of one of the Jewish organizations concentrated in the Amsterdam Johannes Vermeerstraat, and who is an experienced journalist, has, in some thirty slight pages, made valuable observations on the present position of the Dutch Jews. As the text was apparently written some time before the booklet came off the press, a number of his remarks were, however, already out of date on publication.

CONCLUSION

We may in conclusion briefly examine in what way post-war Dutch-Jewish literature, the post-war portrayal of Jews, and post-war Dutch-Jewish writers differ from pre-war, and discuss the reasons for these differences.

Certain themes which were frequently treated by pre-war Dutch-Jewish authors (and are still by several Anglo-Jewish and American Jewish authors) are absent today. There is no longer the description, loving or critical, of a certain Jewish milieu, either contemporary or of the author's youth, as already briefly observed before. There is no post-war Carry van Bruggen (1881-1932) (the sister of the well-known poet Jacob Israel de Haan) who in *Het Huisje aan de Sloot* and other novels described life in an orthodox home in a small Dutch provincial town (Zaandam) where her father was a poor Jewish teacher and cantor. Sam Goudsmit (1884-1954) described in *Jankef's Jongste*, *Jankef's Oude Sleutel*, etc., the ever-harassed small Jewish shopkeepers in his native town Kampen; the famous Israel Querido (1872-1932) and his lesser-known brother Emanuel (1841-1943), who wrote under the pseudonym of Joost Mendes, described middle-class Amsterdam Sephardi families, Israel Querido in *Het Volk Gods* and *Aron Laguna* (a play), Emanuel Querido in *Het Geslacht der Santilhano's*. A few of the works of the well-known socialist author of Jewish origin Herman Heyermans (1864-1924) deal with Jewish subjects, e.g. *Diamantstad*, a scathing and very subjective indictment of the orthodox and the well-to-do; M. H. van Campen (1874-1943) in *Bikkurim* wrote on the Amsterdam Jewish diamond workers among whom he once belonged; Siegfried van Praag (born 1899) wrote several books on Amsterdam middle-class Jews and some lower-class ones who worked their way up, e.g. *Sam Levita's Levensdans en De Weegschaal*. The late Rabbi Meyer de Hond (1882-1943), the 'rebbe' of the Amsterdam Jewish quarter, in *Kiekjes* gave pen-pictures of figures of the quarter which he loved above everything. Jacob Hiegentlich, a native of Roermond in the solidly Roman Catholic province of Limburg, wrote on a category of Jews different from those elsewhere in the country, e.g. in *Schipbreuk in Luik*.

One reason for the absence of such works is perhaps that many of the characteristic Jewish groups described by an earlier generation hardly exist any longer, as the vast majority of their members were deported. This applies to the inhabitants of the former Amsterdam Jewish quarter, to the diamond workers, to the Sephardim, and also to the Jewish groups in the provincial towns. According to the Annual Report of the Netherlands Ashkenazi Congregation for 1961, published June 1962, there were, outside the large cities of Amsterdam, The Hague, and Rotterdam, some 5,000 Jews living scattered over fifty-two local communities. Yet this is no fully satisfactory explanation for this absence. Another reason may be that two of the other themes of these pre-war works have lost their meaning, viz. the struggle of the generations, and social indignation at the extreme poverty in which part of the Jewish 'masses' was living. There is very little of a struggle between Jewish generations in Holland today, as children now usually follow in their orthodox or non-orthodox parents' footsteps, or are even more orthodox

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

than their parents. Nor, though a certain proportion of the adult Jews, mainly in Amsterdam, is of East European origin, is there much conflict between them and their Dutch-born or Dutch-educated children. Also, with general prosperity, the development of the welfare state and of Jewish social work which has reached a very high degree of perfection in Holland and suffers from only one defect (the present lack of Jewish social workers) there is little abject poverty any longer: the problems confronting social workers among the Jews today are no longer in the first place financial.

As to a third theme of these pre-war works, especially those on small Jewish groups in provincial towns, viz. antisemitism, this certainly still exists, but has become less outspoken. Further, since post-war Holland, to a much higher degree than before the war, has been divided into what in Dutch parlance is called 'columns', viz. a Roman Catholic, a Protestant and a non-confessional 'sector', each with its own organizations in various fields, its own 'key' for appointments to Government and Municipal offices, its own schools, etc., much actual antisemitism is disguised as 'columnal' interest. As to antisemitism at school, many Jewish children, at least in Amsterdam, now attend Jewish schools. Moreover, in clear contrast to Britain and the United States, many Jews no longer desire close social contacts with non-Jews, and even less a distinguished position in general society, as war-time experience has shown that the Jews most highly placed in general society were the first Nazi victims. As to job competition, owing to the very small number of Jews in the 17 to 25 years age-group who sought access to the Dutch labour market in recent years, coupled with the attraction of Israel for several of them—until a few years ago—and the continuing general prosperity and expansion of the labour market, finding employment presented no difficulty; on the contrary, Jewish institutions have been experiencing great difficulty in finding Jewish staff, especially female. The situation may change, however, when the first post-war generation presently enters the labour market.

As to non-Jews, with only some 20,000 to 25,000 Jews left in a total population of eleven to twelve millions, most non-Jews never meet a Jew, and even less a clearly recognizable one. This applies even more to the young non-Jews who have grown up after the war, even in Amsterdam where some sixty per cent of the Jews are concentrated, as over half of the Dutch school-going population today attend Protestant or Catholic schools, while many Jewish children attend Jewish schools (the Maimonides Secondary School in Amsterdam has some 270 pupils).

The situation was ably summed up by Malcolm D. Rivkin in his paper mentioned earlier when he observed that after the war a clear gap had arisen between Jews and non-Jews, even the well-disposed among the latter. Many of them preserved a sense of guilt for not having done more to save Jews—sometimes accompanied by a feeling of

irritation. At the same time the Jews had become and felt themselves strangers. They had gone through experiences different from those of the non-Jews while not having shared their experiences. Many of the non-Jews have accepted the idea that the Jews are 'different' and continue to do so today in 1962. Rivkin wrote in 1954:

With the passing of the years, these tensions have lost their intensity, but not altogether. What antisemitism exists . . . is less outspoken than before the war, also because today even less than before the Jews seek social contacts with circles where they might meet social antisemitism. Today Jews see as their primary interest to secure social security rather than climbing the social ladder. On the other hand, non-Jews have become more cautious regarding antisemitic deeds and expressions.

The reason why so few Jewish, and even fewer non-Jewish authors, have described Dutch-Jewish post-war reality is partly that very few of them know it. Let us therefore examine who the post-war Dutch-Jewish authors are.

Most of the Dutch-Jewish authors writing about Jewish subjects since the war were not only fully grown up at its outbreak, but, as e.g. Van Praag, Herzberg, Goudsmit, and Sluysen, had already made a name for themselves as authors. The few younger ones who have written on a Jewish subject have done so only once or twice (e.g. Marga Minco), and mostly under the impact of the war; nor can they be expected to continue doing so in the future. The reason for this relative absence of younger authors is not altogether unsatisfactory from a Jewish point of view, or at least was not unsatisfactory until a few years ago. At least during the first seven or eight years after the war, young Dutch Jews with a really strong Jewish interest and aware of or suffering from the existence of a Jewish problem, largely settled in Israel; moreover, they usually belonged to the Jewish intellectual elite which in Holland, far more than in any other Western country, settled in Israel until a few years ago. What remains is the product of a counterselection, both from the Jewish point of view and intellectually, if by 'intellectuals' we understand not the very high percentage of Jewish young men and girls who today attend the Dutch universities, mainly to study technical subjects, but those who are both critical and sensitive and not concerned largely with 'succeeding' and 'conforming'.

In this connexion we must point out, however, the curious phenomenon of the last few years that some Jewish students who started their writing career by writing Zionist articles in or obtaining a paid part-time position with a local Jewish paper, had their journalistic ambitions whetted and have found their way as regular contributors, on non-Jewish subjects, to the Dutch general press—usually the more progressive weeklies. This phenomenon would have been out of the

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

question for Jewish students with the same Zionist background even a few years ago.

On the other hand, several older authors who before or shortly after the war under the impact of the Nazi persecution sometimes wrote on a Jewish theme, have long ceased to do so, e.g. Maurits Dekker and Josef Cohen. Still other Dutch authors of Jewish origin have never in their life written anything connected with a Jewish theme. At least a dozen names could be mentioned in this connexion, many of them of women authors.

The silence of so many authors of Jewish origin is partly due to their lack of sufficient Jewish background and partly to their conscious avoidance, even today, of all Jewish problems. Even from the period through which the Jewish people, they themselves included, have gone during the past twenty-five or thirty years, with all its sufferings and joys, they have derived no inspiration, but preferred, for instance, to write on China. Even more disturbing, perhaps, than the silence of those who always had a negative attitude towards their Jewishness is perhaps the fact that some younger journalists and authors who were rather active in Jewish affairs only a few years ago have now completely 'disappeared'.

We may point out in this connexion that Holland today has proportionately a substantial number of experts of Jewish origin on some foreign literature, e.g. on French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, English, and German, most of them even University Professors, and several among them even maintaining their Jewish identity. But their joint contribution to the field of Jewish literature and studies (not to mention Hebrew) is infinitesimal. Likewise, some of Holland's foremost literary critics are of Jewish origin even today, and some of them are certainly positive Jews at heart. But none of them occupies himself with Jewish themes with the exception again of Siegfried van Praag.

Though the proportion of Jews of East European origin is much larger in post-war Holland than it was before the war, and though several of them are in the forefront of Jewish activities in this country today, no author of East European Jewish origin has come to the fore in Holland, in contrast, for instance, to the situation in France. The only partial exception is L. Fuks, librarian of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana and of 'Etz Hayim'. Even poorer is the contribution of Jews of German origin.

Another remarkable phenomenon is that nearly all authors of Jewish origin who have written on Jewish subjects after the war belong to the periphery of present-day Dutch Jewry, either spiritually or geographically.

An author on the geographical periphery is, for instance, Siegfried van Praag, who settled in Brussels in the early thirties, spent the war years in London, and has been living in Brussels again since the end of the war. Towards Dutch Jewry he has the attitude of the émigré who left his native country many years ago and continues to remember it as

it was, and in particular as it was in his own eyes, with all the limitations of his own personality and environment, without correcting his memories by later experience. Van Praag's memories of pre-war Amsterdam are much more vivid than those of many who continue to live and work there; on the other hand, his memories lack the living link with present-day reality and problems.

Yet the large majority of Dutch authors of Jewish origin today stand at the extreme periphery of Dutch Jewry, and of Jewry and Judaism in general, both religiously and nationally. Very few of them, if any, are members of a Jewish religious congregation, whether 'orthodox' or liberal, or of the Zionist organization. One of the few exceptions is Mr. Abel J. Herzberg who, though a strong individualist, is definitely not peripheral and is even considered by many non-Jews as the most authoritative spokesman for Dutch Jewry; yet during the last decade or so he has become very much more peripheral than he was. Other writers, such as Sluysers, Dekker, the late Sam Goudsmit, Maurits Mok, and Presser, are much more strongly socialist than Jewish; with their origin in the old Dutch socialist movement they have few links with the Jewish community and sometimes also very little knowledge of Jewish affairs; even if sometimes animated by warm and strong Jewish feeling, they may consciously or unconsciously be governed by an antipathy towards anything officially Jewish. Several of these authors have married out of the faith.

The situation therefore arises that the public is informed about Jewish life largely by 'marginal' authors, who are very well acquainted with Dutch literature and Dutch culture in general, but not so well with Judaism, Jewish affairs, or post-war Jewish life in Holland. Few if any of them will ever read a non-Dutch Jewish periodical, and perhaps not a Dutch-Jewish periodical either. From a Jewish point of view they are extremely provincial.

If writers of Jewish origin publishing Dutch fiction have in common, generally speaking, their remoteness from Jewish affairs and the non-central place of Jewish problems in their thoughts and emotions, this applies even more to non-Jewish authors. In contrast to the immediate pre-war and the wartime period, there are no convinced antisemitic authors any more, or rather, if there are, they stand no chance of having their writings published. On the other hand, apart from a few professional theologians, the existing interest in Jews usually remains rather shallow, and a Jewish theme is often chosen in the first place for its popular appeal.

In addition to the counterselection exerted by Israel, already mentioned, there are other causes for the absence of expert Dutch-Jewish authors. Some of those still taking an active part in Dutch-Jewish affairs are too much absorbed by practical problems to have time for reflection or writing, supposing they have the ability for it. On the other hand,

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

some potential Jewish authors may refrain from writing out of a feeling of inferiority towards Israel, which feeling is, or was until recently, very real in certain positive Jewish circles in Holland: that anything local was of no interest as compared to the mighty events happening in Israel. These potential authors may also be prevented from writing and publishing by a certain reluctance to noise Jewish matters abroad, a diffidence often the deeper the closer Jewish matters are to one's heart. The absence of a Jewish reading public of a sufficient size may also be a handicap. No Jewish commercial publisher exists in Holland any longer, except in name, and works intended mainly for the Jewish public, often of an educational character, have been published only thanks to subventions by the Jewish Claims Conference, the Jewish Agency's Education Department, etc. No publisher will dare to publish a work, at his own expense, intended mainly for local Jews.

Finally, in a relatively closed community such as Dutch Jewry is to-day, where most of the leading personalities are known to everyone, a Jewish insider-author may soon be suspected of having written a *roman à clef*, even if he did not consciously do so. For the sake of peace he may therefore not even start such a dangerous enterprise.

The present set-up of the Jewish community which, some sixteen years after the war, has again long become stabilized, with its own vested interests, and which has largely lost its pre-war respect for intellectuals and intellectual achievements, except when recognized by the non-Jewish world, is no suitable breeding ground for authors. This applies not only to the conservative circles of the Jewish official congregations, but also to circles who before the war considered themselves intellectually progressive, such as the Zionists and the Liberals. The erstwhile non-conformism of these latter has also become a tradition, and even the roles of non-conformists within these non-conformist movements can only be played by those whose internal non-conformism has become a time-hallowed tradition. This applies even, and to no small extent, to the Dutch-Jewish press. The absence of Dutch-Jewish authors writing Jewish fiction was commented upon in the *N.I.W.* of 10 November 1954 by W. Hijmans, a journalist of the younger generation who was still active in Jewish affairs in the first decade after the war but whose voice is never heard there any longer at present. He wrote:

There are no longer any Jewish authors in Holland. . . . It seems as if with Sam Goudsmit the generation of Dutch Jewish authors who occasionally wrote on a Jewish subject has died out. A good modern novel dealing with a Jewish theme has not been published in Holland for years, in sharp contrast to the situation in the United States. . . . Maybe the real problem is that not a single author exists in Holland today who dares to write about a Jewish theme, though there are still authors who are Jews. Certainly, it is the problem of the small Jewish community; yet the Dutch Jewish community is active in other fields. Is it unwillingness, lack of interest, or

complete impotence? At any rate, it is one of the factors which have impoverished Dutch Jewish life after the war.

In the years since these words were written the situation has become even bleaker, despite the spate of works on Jews, Israel, the Bible, etc., referred to above, and despite the expenditure in energy and particularly in money by the Jewish Agency's Education Department. The programmes of festive evenings of most Jewish societies are almost entirely non-Jewish today, with the possible exception of some Jewish or Israeli songs and Israeli dances. The programmes for Israel Independence Day cause great headaches to Zionist Societies, as do the once-a-month twenty-minute Jewish radio programmes to the Amsterdam Ashkenazi Congregation, which is in charge of them and often limits itself to providing cantoral music. This situation among Dutch-Jewish adults is the more striking as Jewish education for children has been organized in an exemplary manner in post-war Holland, and is both much more extensive and more intensive than before. The Jewish Agency's Education Department has already been mentioned.

Likewise, Jewish social welfare work has magnificently overcome enormous difficulties after the war, and is coordinated in the overall organization 'Joods Maatschappelijk Werk', which should be a fine example for Jewish social welfare organizations in many other countries, except for its relative shortage of Jewish social workers.

In the cultural field, however, the situation is quite different. Even an initiative taken by circles in Israel and elsewhere abroad to achieve for Dutch Jewry a counterpart of what the Leo Baeck Institute is for German-speaking Jewry, has failed. As a result, it is unlikely that within living memory Dutch Jewry will have the counterpart of a work like S. Katznelson, *Juden im deutschen Kulturbereich* or H. G. Adler, *Die Juden in Deutschland*. This is the more regrettable as not a single comprehensive study exists on the history of the Jews of Holland after the year 1799, in which year Volume I of the standard work by H. Brugmans and A. Frank, *Geschiedenis der Joden in Nederland* (1940), ends; owing to the deportation and death of the late Rabbi Frank the second volume, which had been planned, and was to cover the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, never appeared.

Whether such a history from the year 1800 onwards will ever be written is doubtful. Not only were many archives destroyed during the war, but, even worse, the present generation of Dutch Jews has little sense of history or piety towards its immediate predecessors, or interest in them, but for an extremely 'general' one. One sign of this lack of piety is the near absence of monographs on or even modest obituaries of Dutch-Jewish personalities who were still alive at the outbreak of the war. Even their names are often no longer known to the present generation, who are partly too young to have had personal contact with well-

JEWISH FIGURES IN DUTCH LITERATURE

known pre-war Jewish leaders, or belong to circles which before the war had no direct contact with these figures. Also, there are often no longer parents and grandparents to form a 'living link' with the past and keep the sense of history alive.

In the absence of more historical works Dutch Jewry will remain known to posterity, both to the general Dutch population and to Jews abroad, mainly from fiction. We may fear that Jewry abroad will continue to see for ever the symbol of Dutch Jewry in Anne Frank; in the mind of the average Dutch non-Jew the image of 'the Jew' may remain a composite picture of Old and New Testament memories, of the Jew as a permanent subject of suffering, whether through his own fault or not, of the associations conjured up by Max Tilleur, Sluyser, and 'Potash and Perlmutter', and of an image of the Israeli, idealized out of all proportions.

In both cases the image of the Dutch Jews in the eyes of others is the product of a myth. It must be feared that the time for demythologizing is still very remote, if it is ever to come.

SICKNESS AND DEATH IN THE HEBREW NOVEL OF THE HASKALAH*

David Patterson

THE twenty years following the death of Abraham Mapu, namely 1868–88, represent a period of transition and experimentation for the Hebrew novel. Mapu's historical novels, while comprising a notable contribution to the development of Hebrew literature, and constituting a remarkable attempt to utilize the elements of the Bible, especially its linguistic treasures, for the creation of a new *genre* in Hebrew fiction, had virtually exhausted the possibilities of such stringent criteria. Although far less satisfactory from an artistic point of view, and crudely naïve in form and content, Mapu's long and rambling novel of contemporary life entitled '*Ayiṭ Ṣabhu'a* (*The Hypocrite*) served as a model—at least in terms of subject matter—for all the writers, both major and minor, of the succeeding period.

During the twenty years under review, apart from works by such major writers as Smolenskin, Braudes, and Abramowitz, Hebrew novels were composed by a number of minor writers, for example J. Leinwand, S. F. Meinkin, B. I. Zobeizensky, M. Manassewitz, N. M. Sheikewitz, A. S. Rabinowitz, I. J. Sirkis, and I. Weisbrem. Many of these writers have subsequently been forgotten so completely that their names are not mentioned even in the various histories of modern Hebrew literature, while their works, in some cases, are now almost as rare as manuscripts.¹ Nevertheless, in spite of the wide variation in both the length and quality of the stories, and the great differences in literary talent displayed by the authors, all the novels are characterized by two principal features, which endow them with certain common elements, thus enabling them to be treated as a whole.

In the first place they are all concerned with the techniques of unfolding an imaginative story—sometimes in serial form—even though the author may, on occasion, attach only incidental importance to the plot.² Directed towards an audience of unsophisticated literary tastes, most of the stories³ abound with crudely exciting and melodramatic episodes, as unconvincing as they are unexpected, but calculated to rivet

* A Hebrew version of this paper was presented at the Third International Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 1961.

SICKNESS AND DEATH IN HEBREW NOVEL

the attention of a public only too willing to escape a drab and poverty-stricken life to a world of adventure and romance. Secondly, they are so passionately involved in the social, religious, and economic problems of contemporary Jewish life in Eastern Europe that a harsh didactic note is rarely lacking even in the most fanciful of the stories.

As a result the novel of the period bears a hybrid stamp, in which serious reflection, social criticism and bitter satire nestle uncomfortably in what is frequently a wildly improbable framework. Such a fusion of realist and romantic elements stems, partly via Mapu, from the early nineteenth-century French and English novel. In the absence of an appropriate literary tradition as well as anything like an adequate linguistic medium, however, it remains very much inferior to its Western European counterparts. On the other hand, this fusion explains in some measure the ambivalent attitudes common to most of the novelists under review. The principle themes, which are highly repetitive, must frequently serve a dual purpose, at once exciting and instructive. The extreme difficulty of harmonizing blatant moralizing with subtlety of construction is largely responsible for the constant employment of thematic material of a somewhat crude and obvious nature.

Of the many themes which occur time and again within these novels, such as love and marriage, conspiracy and intrigue, theft, forgery and imprisonment, persecution and violence, jealousy, revenge and remorse—to mention only some of the more obvious—sickness and death in a variety of forms occupy a leading place, furnishing the novelists with two apparently inexhaustible sources of inspiration. As familiar and universal phenomena they may be introduced, wherever necessary, with a minimum of subtlety either to bolster a flagging plot or in the interests of crude melodrama. In this respect they frequently appear as highly exaggerated reactions to unexpected misfortune ranging from mere fainting to prolonged and incurable illness, insanity, or even sudden death.

Amid this weighty catalogue of human suffering the heavy incidence of fainting is particularly noticeable. The malady affects a wide variety of characters, male as well as female, at every conceivable opportunity,⁴ and affords a convenient method of concluding a dramatic episode, or preventing revelations or actions which might otherwise prematurely unravel the plot. Again, the device enables the novelist to emphasize or underline the enormity of misfortune or the stark horror of a situation, in the face of which the only saving reaction is loss of consciousness. The very prevalence of the device, however, seems to indicate that this propensity for fainting may well reflect a fairly familiar pattern of contemporary social behaviour. In Victorian England ladies were equally prone to faint at the slightest provocation—and often with less reason than the characters in these novels.

The hero of Smolenskin's long novel *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*,

for example, faints on four occasions in the course of the story—on hearing that his friend Gideon has been press-ganged into military service,⁵ on hearing that another friend Dan has been sentenced to life-imprisonment,⁶ after shooting an opponent in a duel, and finally on realizing that the man he has killed was his own step-brother!⁷ In similar vein, many of the female characters may readily be conceded ample justification for fainting at the sight of their husbands or lovers about to be married to another woman,⁸ or on learning that their betrothed is already a married man with children.⁹ Again, the victims of such villainies as false arrest and imprisonment,¹⁰ abduction,¹¹ or desertion¹² may well be forgiven for a temporary lapse of consciousness. At the other end of the scale, however, mothers will faint merely because a son dares to express his own views concerning the choice of a bride¹³ or—in the case of one particularly tight-fisted woman—as a result of minor obstacles to her plan for arranging a suitable match for her daughter. The latter instance is outlined with slapstick humour:

Zibiah went to the door and reached out for the handle. But at that moment the door burst open violently, and Malkah's two daughters, together with the woman who had accompanied them, all tripped over the threshold, and the crockery they were carrying smashed into smithereens; for the one girl stumbled and fell on her sister, who in turn fell over the third woman, so that all three hurtled into the house with a tremendous clatter, while the elder daughter sprained her arm as well. Malkah was so frightened by the shock that she collapsed on the floor and fainted!¹⁴

For all their frequency, however, the many instances of fainting are heavily outweighed by the examples of more prolonged and serious illness with which these novels abound.¹⁵ In most cases sickness is introduced as a dramatic device, either as an integral element in the development of the plot, or to emphasize the impact exerted by a particular situation on the character concerned. Elsewhere it may serve to arouse the emotional sympathy of the reader or direct his attention towards some social abuse which the novelist is anxious to castigate. Again, resort is sometimes made to the device merely to introduce an element of action, no matter how peripheral, and thereby lend some slight momentum when the plot is manifestly wearing thin. Most of the above categories, however, lend themselves to a variety of treatment, and embrace a wide range of physical and mental ailments.

Of the numerous instances in which sickness is employed as an integral and motivating element in the plot, a number have far reaching consequences. In the very first chapter of Smolenskin's *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, Josef's mother contracts an unspecified fatal illness which throws the young hero on the mercy of a hostile world and turns him into a penniless and homeless wanderer, in which role he dominates the entire novel. Similarly, the hero of a later novel by the same author breaks his leg in falling from a wagon, and is thereby fortuitously com-

mitted to the care of a family which subsequently occupies a central place in the story¹⁶. Again, the epileptic tendencies and failing health¹⁷ of the prospective bridegroom chosen by her parents for the heroine of Sheikewitz's *Ha-Niddahath* in spite of all her protests, induce her to seek salvation in the elopement from which stems the long series of misfortunes that comprise the remainder of the novel. In similar vein the heroine of Weisbrem's novel *Bein ha-Zemanim* contracts a nervous disorder¹⁸ after being deserted by her fickle lover, and thereby makes the acquaintance of the other heroine, Miriam, their subsequent friendship becoming a decisive factor in the plot.¹⁹ An interesting example of feigned illness occurs in Leinwand's novel where Gershom, an eminent lawyer, advises his old but foolish client, Abihail, whose villainous enemies have indicted him on a false charge, to write to the magistrate that he is unable to attend court because of a dangerous illness, and that he is protesting his innocence at death's door. It is indicative that even the heroes are allowed to indulge in such a dubious practice.²⁰ Elsewhere, sickness is used as an instrument of poetic justice in punishment for previous crimes.²¹

No less frequently however, sickness is employed as a device to emphasize the role of other motivating forces in the plots. On a number of occasions frustrated love must bear responsibility for a sudden malady. Jacob Hetzron, the hero of Braudes's second novel, for example, although a married man with children, falls in love with Liza, and is so deeply affected that he begins to waste away, neither eating nor sleeping. His condition is described by his friend, Jorab, to Liza's brother as follows:

I told you before that Hetzron is in love with your sister, Liza: but how can I give you any idea of what that love signifies? I simply cannot find words to describe it. . . . I have seen plenty of lovers in my time and heard of many more; I've read of love and lovers in stories and novels, and seen many an example at the theatre—but never in my life have I seen or heard of a love such as this. After all, Hetzron isn't a young lad; he wasn't born yesterday. Yet the love he bears Liza knows no parallel. . . . Ever since the scene that occurred when Barzillai brought the letter about his wife to your father's house, he has been going about bent double, all gloom and depression. But since I comforted him and encouraged him sufficiently to visit your father's house again, and Barzillai stirred up trouble a second time so that he has been forbidden to cross the threshold again until he has divorced his wife—since that day his depression has grown worse. It is quite impossible to console him. He weeps so bitterly that I'm afraid for his life. . . . I'm frightened he will go insane. . . .²²

Liza, meanwhile, and another heroine, Shiphrah who finds herself in similar straits languish for love in a manner no less dramatic.²³ A similar stratagem is utilized by Smolenskin,²⁴ Manassewitz,²⁵ Sheikewitz²⁶ and—as previously mentioned—Weisbrem.²⁷

Sometimes the novelists resort to sickness in order to emphasize the tragic effects of villainy or crime. Smolenskin is particularly prone to the device, and many of his characters succumb to illness because of the machinations of the villains.²⁸ On one occasion a family is devastated on reading a newspaper report of their son's conviction for theft. When the young man makes his way home after escaping from prison, he is confronted with the tragic consequences of his crime:

The newspaper had preceded him by three days. His intended bride, who looked after his sick old father like a daughter, had been reading the news to him. When she noticed the report, the paper slipped from her hand, and she fell off the chair in a faint. Terrified, the sick man shouted for help at the top of his voice, and his old wife hurried in fright to the rescue. After they had revived her and put her to bed, the patient asked his wife to see what had so upset her in the newspaper. Obediently the old woman sat down with the paper. But no sooner had she read a few lines than she too collapsed, but not merely in a faint, for she suffered a stroke and died. Nor did the old man long survive her, for on the very next day he was delivered from all earthly sorrow. Saul arrived home in time to see his father and mother being carried to the cemetery, and his betrothed in a strait-jacket—for she had gone insane.²⁹

On the other hand, however, the illness of one of the heroes of Leinwand's novel, which compels him to stay at home for three months, enables him to learn of the villainies planned by his wicked step-mother against his aged father.³⁰

On occasion the illness is contracted as a result of financial worry, bad news, or personal problems.³¹ Of the latter the most interesting, perhaps, is the sickness of spirit experienced by Josef, the hero of *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, as a result of an incestuous passion for his sister, to which he readily confesses.³² But no less frequently resort is made to sickness in order to arouse the emotional sympathies of the reader by presenting a harrowing scene of pain and sorrow.³³ In this latter respect, perhaps the most successful example occurs in the novels by Manassewitz and Sirkis, where the fatal illness of a child is presented in very moving terms which arouse a feeling of genuine pathos.³⁴

The great majority of instances of sickness, however, appear to have been introduced as incidental elements in the plot with the primary purpose of adding an element of action, in order to maintain the reader's interest.³⁵ This aim explains the many cases of raging fever, hallucinations and insanity which the novels contain,³⁶ all of them calculated to arouse excitement and violence in word or action, and thereby exert a certain fascination as self-contained episodes. It is significant that both Sheikewitz and Weisbrem (in *18' Aghoroth*) conclude their novels with an attack of insanity. It must be admitted that the ravings induced by high fever are often expressed in vivid and even gripping terms. But on one occasion Smolenskin introduces ingenious, if crude, psychological over-

tones into the ravings of one of his characters—a technique which represents a significant advance in modern Hebrew literature.³⁷

The various motives which determine the introduction of sickness by the novelists are closely paralleled in the frequent resort to death encountered in these stories. Here, again, the main purpose lies in the utilization of death as a convenient ingredient of the plot,³⁸ whether merely to introduce an element of action or remove unwanted characters on the one hand, or in order to portray an exciting, melodramatic episode or provide a significant development in the story on the other. Villainy, of course, remains the most lurid device for the promotion of sudden or untimely death,³⁹ but financial collapse,⁴⁰ grief,⁴¹ shock,⁴² or even a father's curse⁴³ all add their quota of fatalities. Death, too, constitutes a well-tried device for arousing the emotional sympathies of the reader, particularly in death-bed and graveyard scenes,⁴⁴ or in the lonely, unmourned passing of some righteous but misjudged and ostracized old man.⁴⁵

Again, death may serve as a most convenient instrument of poetic justice. In *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, for example, Josef's wicked aunt, who was responsible for all the misfortunes of his childhood, recognizes him during a violent storm at sea, and is dramatically washed overboard.⁴⁶ The effect is further heightened by the prior death of her own husband and eldest son.⁴⁷ In similar vein the wicked wife in Leinwand's novel dies of fright when her evil plans are finally discovered.⁴⁸ Zobeizensky, too, contrives the death of a murderer immediately after his confession of guilt.⁴⁹ Of greater significance, however, are the deaths of two of Smolenskin's heroes in a pogrom while courageously resisting the onslaught of a bloodthirsty mob.⁵⁰ In these instances, at least, death plays a deliberate and very serious role.

The melodramatic flavour of the great majority of the novels is emphasized by the many instances of violence, both real and threatened, which they contain. Although five of the six cases of actual suicide are confined to Smolenskin's novels,⁵¹ there are many other examples of threatened or attempted suicide.⁵² In these latter cases, love plays an important if, perhaps, satirical role. A love-sick friend of the previously mentioned Josef, for example, declares that he is prepared to wait for one more year, but that if his love still remains unrequited he will then commit suicide as thousands do in London!⁵³ It is of interest that when Josef is himself contemplating suicide, he also maintains that the number of suicides in London is enormous.⁵⁴ Similarly, *Simhath Haneph* closes with a letter from the delinquent hero, David, protesting his love for the heroine and threatening to commit suicide.⁵⁵ In this example, at least, the influence of Goethe's *Werther* seems highly probable. The love-sick hero of Braudes' novel *Šelei ha-Qesawoth*,⁵⁶ at one point also contemplates suicide—a solution, he has read in many stories, and seen many times at the theatre.⁵⁷ The most facetious instance, however,

occurs in Sheikewitz's *Ha-Niddahath*, which opens with a declaration by the heroine that she intends to commit suicide as soon as she has completed her story, while the final scene portrays her with a glass of water containing arsenic by her side fondly bidding farewell to the world, including her readers. Fortunately, however, she is enabled to change her mind at the last moment, and frankly admits her indifference to the reader's disappointment!

More violent, still, are the numerous instances of murder⁵⁸ or attempted murder⁵⁹ which occur in many of these novels, of which the favourite method would appear to be by poison.⁶⁰ On occasion, such episodes are introduced with considerable dramatic skill, especially in Smolenskin's *Qebhurath Hamor*, where the hero is murdered most unexpectedly by a peasant who bears him a grudge, and subsequently receives the 'Donkey's Burial' from which the novel derives its name. Unaware that his enemy has bribed the peasant to kill him, the hero Jacob Hayyim desperately attempts to convince the peasant of his identity. The dramatic irony of the situation may be readily appreciated:

How can I be sure that you are not deceiving me?

I swear by the Lord that I'm speaking the truth.

I don't trust an oath in the name of your God. Give me real proof. I know that Jacob Hayyim wears a ring on his right hand given to him by the provincial governor.—Jacob Hayyim showed him his hand, and the peasant took hold of it to look for the ring. Once having examined it, he shouted: That's all I wanted to know!—At the same moment Jacob Hayyim pitched headlong, with only the words Oh! Esther! escaping his lips, and then silence! For on grasping his right hand, the peasant struck him on the head with his axe with such force that no second blow was necessary. A few moments later he was dead.⁶¹

It is hardly surprising that in many of these novels the characters seem to die like flies!

Not infrequently, however, sickness and death are also employed for didactic purposes, and used to castigate a wide range of abuses in society. Both devices are admirably suited for illustrating the consequences of the widespread, crushing poverty in terms of hunger, slum-conditions and malnutrition;⁶² while the demoralizing effects of poverty are emphasized, for example, by Smolenskin's grotesque depiction of a band of travelling beggars deliberately disguising themselves so as to appear the victims of all sorts of physical deformities.⁶³ But sickness and death are equally valid as methods of showing the evil results of forcing young girls into marriage against their will,⁶⁴ or the disastrous consequences of intermarriage and conversion,⁶⁵ while unpleasant personal characteristics such as snobbery⁶⁶ or miserliness⁶⁷ are equally liable to end in dire catastrophe. Rabinowitz, again, resorts to both devices in order to pour scorn on the irresponsibility of the new

SICKNESS AND DEATH IN HEBREW NOVEL

generation of so-called 'enlightened' doctors,⁶⁸ while Braudes makes the death of a child the starting point of an attack on excessive Rabbinical stringencies.⁶⁹ In similar vein both Manassewitz and Sirkis emphasize the tragedy of a child's death by depicting the harsh demands for payment of the burial fee in advance. As a result the poor heroine of the former tale is forced to leave her child unburied.⁷⁰ More powerful still is Smolenskin's treatment of the fatal illness of a young schoolboy as a result of seeing his brother press-ganged into military service.⁷¹

Most effective, however, is Abramowitz's humorous and biting satirical attack upon superstitious remedies for healing the sick. For all their grotesque nature, the author must clearly have been familiar with such practices as witnessed by the explanatory footnotes which he supplies.⁷² After consulting her *Ṣaddiq* (holy man) Sarah proffers the following remedy to her sick husband, insisting that she has been commanded to '... stand a dove on your navel, and make you drink gruel made of *Hosh'anoth* [willow branches used for ritual purposes] and recite this charm backwards and forwards seven times:

"ינא ה' כאפור, אל הנאת כילא הער. הער כילא הנאת אל, כאפור ה' ינא."

And you must also change your name. No longer shall you call yourself Ephraim, but Isaiah Moses. I have no doubt that by means of these excellent remedies you will soon be cured. Now listen to your wife's advice, Isaiah Moses, and drink plenty of *Hosh'anoth* gruel.⁷⁴ Clearly, the treatment of the themes under review is by no means universally morbid.

One further point seems worthy of mention. The overall dissatisfaction of the novelists with their environment is, perhaps, unconsciously expressed by the inordinate incidence of death when viewed against the very small number of births which grace these novels. It is of interest that in violent contrast to the facts of the society which they describe, which witnessed a dramatic and, indeed, unparalleled increase in the Jewish population, the portrait which emerges from their novels is of a rapidly depopulating world!

NOTES

¹ A list of the novels consulted is given here, together with the date of first publication where different from the editions cited.

P. Smolenskin, *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, Warsaw, 1905 (1868-70); *Simḥath Haneph*, Warsaw, 1905 (1872); *Qebhurath Hamor*, Warsaw, 1905 (1874); *Ga'on we-Ṣebher*, Warsaw, 1905 (1874); *Gemul Yešarim*, Wilna, 1903 (1876); *Ha-Yerušah*, Petersburg, 1898 (1878-84). S. J. Abramowitz, *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-*

Banim, Odessa, 1868. R. A. Braudes, *Ha-Dath we-ha-Hayyim*, Lemberg, 1885 (1876-7); *Ṣetei ha-Qešawoth*, Warsaw, 1888. J. Leinwand, *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, Lemberg, 1876. S. F. Meinkin, *'Ahabhath Yešarim*, Wilna, 1881. B. I. Zobeizensky, *'Ahabhath Ṣaddiqim*, Warsaw, 1881. M. Manassewitz, *Haḥath Horim*, Warsaw, 1884. N. M. Sheikewitz, *Ha-Niddahath*, Parts 1 and 2, Wilna, 1886, part 3, Warsaw, 1887. A. S. Rabinowitz, *'Al ha-Pereq*, Warsaw, 1887. I. J. Sirkis,

Esther, Warsaw, 1887. I. Weisbrem, *Bein ha-Zemanim*, Warsaw, 1888; 18 'Aghoroth, Warsaw, 1888.

² See, e.g. Braudes' remarks in the preface to the third part of his *Ha-Dath we-ha-Hayyim*, where he confesses that he has resorted to novel form only in order to sugar a rather distasteful pill. Cf. D. Patterson, 'Some Religious Attitudes Reflected in the Hebrew Novels of the Period of Enlightenment', in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 42, No. 2, March 1960, p. 400.

³ With the possible exceptions of Braudes' *Ha-Dath we-ha-Hayyim* and Sirkis' *Esther*, although even the latter contains an example of attempted kidnapping! (*Esther*, ch. 8).

⁴ See, e.g. *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, chs. 18, 25, pt. 2, chs. 17, 22, 24, 29, pt. 3, ch. 38; *Simhath Haneph*, chs. 13, 23; *Qebhurath Hamor*, chs. 11, 14, 20, 21; *Ga'on we-Sebher*, chs. 5, 8, 10; *Gemul Yesarim*, pt. 1, ch. 11, pt. 2, chs. 11, 12, 14, pt. 3, chs. 2, 13, 21; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 1, chs. 3, 20, pt. 2, ch. 7, pt. 3, chs. 3, 7; *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, ch. 32; *Setei ha-Qesawoth*, pt. 1, ch. 20, pt. 2, ch. 25; *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 1, ch. 18; *'Ahabhath Yesarim*, chs. 18, 19, 24; *'Ahabhath Shaddiqim*, pt. 1, chs. 3, 13; *Ha'tath Horim*, ch. 2; *Ha-Niddahath*, pt. 2, chs. 15, pt. 3, chs. 15, 19, 21; *Esther*, chs. 5, 7, 8; *Bein ha-Zemanim*, chs. 6, 11; 18 'Aghoroth, pt. 1, chs. 2, 3, pt. 2, ch. 18.

⁵ Pt. 2, ch. 17.

⁶ Ibid., ch. 29.

⁷ Pt. 3, ch. 38.

⁸ Cf. *Simhath Haneph*, ch. 23 (the husband, a would-be bigamist, also faints!); *Gemul Yesarim*, pt. 3, ch. 21; *Setei ha-Qesawoth*, pt. 2, ch. 25; *'Ahabhath Shaddiqim*, pt. 1, ch. 13.

⁹ *Setei ha-Qesawoth*, pt. 1, ch. 20.

¹⁰ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, ch. 18, pt. 2, ch. 24 (twice in a single chapter); *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 3, ch. 3 (twice); *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 1, ch. 18; *Ha'tath Horim*, ch. 2.

¹¹ *Gemul Yesarim*, pt. 2, chs. 11, 12; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 2, ch. 7; *'Ahabhath Yesarim*, pt. 1, ch. 18; *Esther*, ch. 8 (twice).

¹² *Bein ha-Zemanim*, ch. 6.

¹³ *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 1, ch. 3; 18 'Aghoroth, pt. 2, ch. 18.

¹⁴ Ibid., pt. 1, p. 15. For a comparable example Cf. *ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁵ Cf. *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, chs. 1, 2, 25, pt. 2, chs. 14, 24, pt. 3, chs. 21, 22, 25, 37, pt. 4, chs. 7, 8; *Ga'on*

we-Sebher, ch. 10; *Gemul Yesarim*, pt. 1, chs. 9, 11, pt. 2, ch. 7; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 1, chs. 7, 8, 16, pt. 2, chs. 1, 2, 10, 15, 17, 24, pt. 3, chs. 6, 9; *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, chs. 31, 33; *Setei ha-Qesawoth*, pt. 3, chs. 1, 2, 33; *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 1, chs. 7, 10, 16; *'Ahabhath Shaddiqim*, pt. 1, chs. 8, 13, pt. 2, ch. 1; *Ha'tath Horim*, chs. 2, 3, 4, 8; *Ha-Niddahath*, pt. 1, ch. 11, pt. 2, ch. 8, pt. 3, chs. 1, 3, 20; *'Al ha-Pereq*, chs. 4, 8; *Esther*, ch. 7; *Bein ha-Zemanim*, chs. 6, 9, 10; 18 'Aghoroth, pt. 1, chs. 2, 6, 7, 12, pt. 2, chs. 14, 18, 19, 22, 24. Also see below, notes 23, 24, 36.

¹⁶ *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 2, ch. 1, chs. 10-21.

¹⁷ *Ha-Niddahath*, pt. 1, ch. 11, pt. 2, ch. 8, pt. 3, ch. 3.

¹⁸ Described as *Ma'alath dalleketh ha-'asabbim*.

¹⁹ See D. Patterson, 'Israel Weisbrem: A Forgotten Hebrew Novelist' in the *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1, January, 1959, p. 40.

²⁰ *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 1, ch. 7.

²¹ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 3, ch. 21. Cf. pt. 2, ch. 20.

²² *Setei ha-Qesawoth*, pt. 3, p. 260. Cf. *ibid.* p. 212, p. 215.

²³ Ibid., pt. 3, ch. 26, pt. 4, ch. 43.

²⁴ *Ga'on we-Sebher*, ch. 5.

²⁵ *Ha'tath Horim*, ch. 2.

²⁶ *Ha-Niddahath*, pt. 3, ch. 1.

²⁷ See above no. 19.

²⁸ Cf. *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, ch. 25, pt. 2, ch. 24; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 1, chs. 8, 16, pt. 3, ch. 9.

²⁹ *Ga'on we-Sebher*, p. 186.

³⁰ *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 1, ch. 16.

³¹ Cf. *Ga'on we-Sebher*, ch. 10; *Gemul Yesarim*, pt. 1, ch. 9, pt. 2, ch. 7; *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, ch. 31.

³² *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 4, chs. 7, 8.

³³ Cf. *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 3, ch. 6; *Ha'tath Horim*, ch. 8; 18 'Aghoroth, pt. 1, ch. 7.

³⁴ *Ha'tath Horim*, ch. 4; *Esther*, ch. 7.

³⁵ Cf. *Gemul Yesarim*, pt. 1, ch. 11; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 2, chs. 2, 15, 17, 24; *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 1, ch. 10; *'Ahabhath Shaddiqim*, pt. 1, chs. 8, 13, pt. 2, ch. 1; *Ha-Niddahath*, pt. 3, ch. 20; *'Al ha-Pereq*, ch. 4 (in this case as elsewhere—e.g. *Ha'tath Horim*, ch. 8—the illness is consumption or *Ma'alath ha-Shapheth*); *Bein ha-Zemanim*, chs. 9, 10; 18 'Aghoroth, pt. 1, chs. 2, 6, pt. 2, ch. 14, pt. 3, chs. 22, 23, 24.

³⁶ Cf. *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 20, pt. 3, chs. 24, 25; *Ga'on we-Sebher*, chs. 5, 6, 8; *Gemul Yesarim*, pt. 2, ch. 15;

Ha-Yerushah, pt. 2, chs. 8, 15, 24, pt. 3, ch. 9; *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, chs. 9, 13; *Haṭath Horim*, ch. 2; *Ha-Niddaḥath*, pt. 3, ch. 22; *18-'Aghoroth*, pt. 2, ch. 24.

³⁷ *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 3, ch. 9.

³⁸ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, chs. 1, 11, pt. 2, chs. 21, 24, 29, pt. 3, chs. 25, 32, 38; *Qebhurath Hamor*, ch. 17; *Ga'on we-Sebher*, ch. 11; *Gemul Yešarim*, pt. 3, ch. 12; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 2, ch. 21; *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, chs. 33, 34; *Ha-Dath-we-ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, chs. 2, 4, pt. 2, ch. 2; *Setei ha-Qešawoth*, pt. 1, ch. 1; *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 1, ch. 10, pt. 2, chs. 1, 2, 7, 14; *'Ahabhath Yešarim*, chs. 7, 13, 22; *'Ahabhath Šaddiqim*, pt. 1, chs. 2, 3, 13, pt. 2, chs. 16, 18, 23, 24; *Ha-Niddaḥath*, pt. 1, ch. 15, pt. 2, ch. 12, pt. 3, ch. 20; *'Al ha-Pereq*, chs. 11, 13; *18 'Aghoroth*, pt. 1, ch. 8, pt. 2, ch. 16.

³⁹ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 24, pt. 3, ch. 32; *Qebhurath Hamor*, ch. 17; *Ga'on we-Sebher*, ch. 6; *Gemul Yešarim*, pt. 3, ch. 12; *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 2, chs. 1, 2, 7, 14; *Haṭath Horim*, pt. 1, ch. 13, pt. 2, chs. 16, 18, 23; *'Al ha-Pereq*, ch. 13.

⁴⁰ *Ga'on we-Sebher*, chs. 5, 6.

⁴¹ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, ch. 23, pt. 2, ch. 14; *Gemul Yešarim*, pt. 3, ch. 1; *'Ahabhath Yešarim*, ch. 4; *'Ahabhath Šaddiqim*, pt. 1, ch. 1.

⁴² See above no. 29.

⁴³ *Gemul Yešarim*, pt. 2, ch. 12.

⁴⁴ *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, ch. 34; *Haṭath Horim*, ch. 8; *18 'Aghoroth*, pt. 1, ch. 12, pt. 2, ch. 15. Cf. above no. 34.

⁴⁵ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 17.

⁴⁶ pt. 3, ch. 24. Cf. A. Mapu, *'Ayit Šabhu'a*, pt. 4, ch. 17.

⁴⁷ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 3, ch. 22. Cf. above no. 21.

⁴⁸ *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 2, ch. 12.

⁴⁹ *'Ahabhath Šaddiqim*, pt. 2, ch. 23.

⁵⁰ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 4, ch. 24; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 1, ch. 1.

⁵¹ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 29, pt. 3, ch. 32; *Ga'on we-Sebher*, ch. 11 (three instances); *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 2, ch. 4.

⁵² *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, chs. 23, 25, pt. 3, chs. 19, 24; *Simḥath Haneph*, ch. 24; *Setei ha-Qešawoth*, pt. 4, ch. 41; *'Ahabhath Yešarim*, chs. 20, 21, 22;

Ha-Niddaḥath, pt. 1, ch. 1, pt. 2, ch. 10, pt. 3, chs. 21, 22.

⁵³ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 3, ch. 19.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, ch. 24.

⁵⁵ Ch. 24.

⁵⁶ See above no. 22.

⁵⁷ Pt. 4, ch. 41.

⁵⁸ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 3, ch. 32; *Simḥath Haneph*, ch. 13 (see below no. 61); *Qebhurath Hamor*, ch. 17; *Ga'on we-Sebher*, ch. 6; *Gemul Yešarim*, pt. 3, ch. 12; *'Oseh Mezimmoth*, pt. 2, chs. 1, 2, 7, 14; *'Ahabhath Šaddiqim*, pt. 1, ch. 13, pt. 2, chs. 16, 18, 23; *'Al ha-Pereq*, ch. 13.

⁵⁹ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 3, ch. 32; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 3, ch. 1; *'Ahabhath Yešarim*, ch. 10; *'Ahabhath Šaddiqim*, pt. 1, ch. 13.

⁶⁰ *Ga'on we-Sebher*, ch. 6; *Gemul Yešarim*, ch. 12; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 3, ch. 1; *'Ahabhath Šaddiqim*, pt. 1, ch. 13 (2), pt. 2, chs. 18, 23.

⁶¹ *Qebhurath Hamor*, p. 159.

⁶² *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 3, ch. 37; *Ha-Yerushah*, pt. 1, ch. 7; *Haṭath Horim*, chs. 3, 4; *Esther*, ch. 10.

⁶³ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 1, ch. 2.

⁶⁴ *'Ahabhath Yešarim*, ch. 22.

⁶⁵ *Simḥath Haneph*, ch. 13; *Gemul Yešarim*, pt. 2, ch. 15; *18 'Aghoroth*, pt. 1, ch. 12.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pt. 2, chs. 18, 19.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pt. 2, ch. 24.

⁶⁸ *'Al ha-Pereq*, chs. 8, 9.

⁶⁹ *Ha-Dath we-ha-Hayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 6. Cf. D. Patterson, 'Some Religious attitudes Reflected in the Hebrew Novels of the Period of Enlightenment', op. cit., p. 401.

⁷⁰ *Haṭath Horim*, ch. 4; *Esther*, ch. 11.

⁷¹ *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Hayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 14; the illness is described as *מחלת הירקן מכאב לב*, and the victim depicted as quite green with blood streaming from his nostrils.

⁷² *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, p. 144 f.

⁷³ A footnote explains this charm to be a back to front version of the following line compounded of phrases from Ex. 15²⁶ and Ps. 91¹⁰: *אני ה' רופאך. לא חאנה אליך. רעה.*

⁷⁴ *Ha-'Abhoth we-ha-Banim*, pp. 144 f.

YOUTH AND YOUTH MOVEMENTS IN ISRAEL¹

Jochanan Peres

IN ISRAEL, both under the Mandatory regime and since its attainment of independence, there have evolved several youth cultures of a unique character which merit the attention of sociologists and educators. These movements, which today comprise between thirty and forty thousand boys and girls, are an extraordinary combination of scouting organization, religious order, and political party. What distinguishes the youth movement in Israel from similar movements in other parts of the world is its insistence that every one of its members 'fulfil the values of the movement in his own life'. In other words, he is required to link his future as an adult with a *kibbutz* (collective village).

For the sake of clarity it should be stated at the outset that, even in the heyday of the pioneering movements (from 1930 to 1948), not more than 20 or 25 per cent at most of their members joined *kibbutzim* and remained there permanently; whereas in recent years this proportion has dropped to between 5 and 10 per cent.

Nevertheless, the spiritual and organizational ties with the various *kibbutz* movements have left a decisive imprint upon the youth movements. The majority of youngsters who have passed through youth movements spend their period of army service (which in Israel is compulsory also for women) in frontier settlements within the framework of a special army formation which combines military training, farm work, and an intensive social activity. An appreciable proportion of these young people stay on in the *kibbutz* for several additional years, some even founding families there, *before* embarking on a professional or academic career or going in for commerce or industry. Members of *kibbutzim* form the leadership of the youth movements, and they also predominate among their senior guides.² The summer vacations of the senior members of the youth movements (14 to 18) are mainly devoted to farm work on *kibbutzim*, and the problems of collective settlement occupy a central place in their ideological training programmes. Each one of the *kibbutz* movements³ has a pioneering youth movement affiliated to it. The constant need for additional manpower for the *kibbutzim* and of leaders for the youth movements necessarily makes this connexion a vital 'symbiosis'.

YOUTH IN ISRAEL

From the point of view of educational demography, the greater part of the youth movement membership is confined to secondary school pupils whose parents are not newcomers to the country (i.e. they came before the establishment of the State in 1948). Only one movement has succeeded in breaking through to the children of recent immigrants and to the working youth. However, the branch that engages in educating youngsters of these types is based upon ideological and organizational principles that differ from those accepted in the other sections of the youth movement. It is to the latter that the main part of the present study is devoted.

The youth movement organizations cut across the schools. In other words, one branch of a movement will contain pupils from different schools, and conversely, members of different youth organizations will be found in a single class at school. The internal regime in the youth movements can aptly be described as a 'guided democracy'. The institutions vested with formal authority are the councils elected by the members of the movement in their local branches. The adult leaders, who constitute a minority in these councils, guide the discussions and the adoption of resolutions by means of a combination of argument, persuasion, and organizational contrivances. The executive body which carries out current organizational and educational activities is composed of the senior leaders, who are members of *kibbutzim*. The person at the head of this body is someone with a recognized status in political life who participates regularly in the deliberations of party and other bodies. The ties between most of the youth movements and the political parties are less explicit and obvious than those linking them to the *kibbutz* movements. In some movements political indoctrination is forbidden. In practice, however, each movement is dominated by the influence of one of the parties.

The chief motifs in the ideology of *all* the movements, as reflected in their constitutions and conference resolutions, are as follows:

- (a) Total and vigorous Zionism; negation of Jewish life in the Diaspora; and the aim of concentrating the greatest possible number of Jews in Israel.
- (b) Emphasis on farming and manual labour as a desirable way of life for mankind in general and the Jewish people in particular.
- (c) The aspiration to build a new society on the foundations of freedom, justice, and economic equality.
- (d) A radical and socialistic outlook on world affairs.
- (e) The fostering of a youth culture based on scouting, simplicity, closeness to nature, self-restraint, and self-discipline.

The points that distinguish the movements from one another are mainly their attitude to the following issues: religion, Communism, and

Arab-Israeli relations. Far-reaching as these differences are, a discussion of them would lie outside the scope of the present paper. Our purpose here is mainly to deal with those features which are common to all the pioneering youth movements.

These movements educate towards a deep identification with broad national aims, and at the same time towards a strong party and sectional consciousness. They make use of formulas cast in novel and revolutionary moulds in order to ensure continuity. They develop a unique youth culture, by means of which they direct towards a specific way of life led by a section of the adult community.

How, it may well be asked, have these apparent contradictions been fused into an enduring social framework? What were the formative factors of the Israeli youth movement during the Mandatory period? And how has it been influenced by the deep processes of change that have been at work in the young State since its establishment?

TYPOLOGY OF YOUTH CULTURES

The first step in an attempt to answer these questions is to set up a universal typology of youth cultures, and to determine the place of the Israeli type within it.

We suggest classifying youth cultures according to the following four criteria:

- (i)⁴ *Conformity/Deviation*. To what extent are the values of this sub-culture identical with the accepted values and norms of the surrounding culture? To what extent does the youth culture educate towards increasing the stability and ensuring the continuity of the society; or to what extent does it seek to bring about changes in it?
- (ii) *Organizational Cohesiveness/Diffuseness*. To what extent does the youth culture constitute an organized and stable body with an internal division of tasks and well-defined delegation of powers? To what extent are the movement's activities run along prescribed lines, and to what extent are they improvised?
- (iii) *Dependence/Independence*. To what extent is the effective control of the youth culture vested in the hands of adults? This question can be further sub-divided: (i) What is the number of key positions held by adults? (ii) What is the degree of adulthood of these adults, i.e. to what extent are they removed from the youngsters entrusted to their care in respect of age, maturity, and family and social status?
- (iv) *Valuational/Neutral Content*. To what extent is there a conscious and explicit system of values at the centre of the youth culture's activities? What are the areas of life comprised by that system of values? How severe are the demands it makes upon its adherents?

Using these criteria, we offer the following classification of youth cultures:

(a) *The School*. We have chosen to include the school in this typology mainly in order to establish a frame of reference. For in the school the three first criteria are displayed in the fullest measure possible. There is complete *conformity*, since the school usually educates towards the accepted values of the society. There is full *cohesiveness*, since the division of functions and powers within the school is clearly defined, and its activities are conducted in accordance with prescribed regulations. Finally, the school offers an example of complete *dependence*, since all real power and key positions are reserved for adults, who fully represent—in respect of their age, views and family status—the adult community as a whole.

Obviously this description is largely schematic and does not include experimental schools, children's villages, and the like. However, we believe that the State Primary School, as familiar to the Western world—including Israel—approximates to the type described. It is possible that this close resemblance between the principles upon which the school functions to those underlying bureaucratic organizations is to some extent responsible for its success in imparting knowledge and skills, as well as for its failure to explain the wider perspectives of social activity, such as status image and deep attachment to values.

(b) *Scouting and Sports Organizations*. Scouting organizations generally conform to the ultimate values of the society in which they operate, as well as to the norms that govern everyday behaviour. The valuational-ideological aspect is not stressed in the scouting organizations. However, it sometimes finds expression in an exaggerated emphasis of certain norms (the daily 'good deed', a chivalrous attitude towards women and the weak, 'fair play', and so on). These organizations may sometimes provide fertile ground for the growth of a less conforming youth culture.⁵ In situations of tension or social change in the surrounding society, every youth culture, even if conservative in origin, is a potential focus of ferment. Dynamic developments of this nature generally bring about a change in the character of the scouting movement and/or the detachment of nuclei of new movements from the parent body. The scouting movements are distinguished by a considerable degree of organizational cohesiveness, though their structure is far less compact than that of the school. Adult control of scouting activities is more indirect and remote, and many educational functions are carried out by the youngsters themselves. Consequently the scouting organizations furnish opportunities for 'training for leadership', and for the conferment of status awards within the framework of the youth culture in recognition of ability and effort.

(c) *The 'Innovating' Youth Movement*. In the 'innovating' youth movement ideology occupies a central position. The movement's tenets, its

internal struggles, its organizational structure, and its uniform—all bear the imprint of an ideology and express it verbally or symbolically. The movement's ideology usually encompasses most areas of human life, from the family circle to national and international affairs. In ideologies of this kind stress is laid upon matters which are generally regarded by society with ambivalence, e.g. sex education, social deviation, and inter-party struggles. These considerable pretensions make it necessary to issue pronouncements on most of the spiritual and social questions that divide mankind in our times. A total ideology of this kind, naïve and superficial though it may seem to most adults, nevertheless serves the adolescent as a support and guide.

Within the continuum of conformity/deviation these movements occupy a special place. They are distinguished by a strong attachment to the ultimate values of their societies. There are, however, some differences in emphasis and priority. They criticize norms of everyday life and stress the distance between these norms and the values they espouse. The innovating movements create a status image that depends more largely upon qualities like loyalty or service than upon the accepted status symbols and rewards.

The organizational structure characteristic of the movement of the 'innovating' type is not so crystallized or rigid as that of the school or of the scouting movement. There is no clear, unequivocal chain of authority, nor is there any uniformity of rule or practice in its different branches. However, this lack of bureaucratic crystallization is partly compensated for (a) by the greater possibilities of expression available in a more elastic organizational framework (ideological discussion circles, art circles, democratic institutions within the movement, and the like); and (b) by the self-assigned task of the movement to guide and direct its adult members for a number of years after leaving secondary school. The implementation of such a task obviously calls for an extension of the movement's organizational instruments and the exercise of effective authority over hundreds of young people. Connexion with adults in this type of movement is partial, for the following two reasons: (a) there is a connexion with only a section of the adult community (a particular political party, intellectual group, religious sect, etc.); and (b) such connexion notwithstanding, there is a strong emphasis on the autonomy of the world of youth and its individual culture.

(d) *The Revolutionary Youth Movement*. This is characterized by an attachment to higher values than the accepted ones. There is a total rejection of the existing society and a contempt for norms, which are partially obeyed only in order to avoid sanctions. The revolutionary youth movement is so opposed to any attempt to acquire status in the existing society that it elevates certain sanctions (e.g. imprisonment) to the rank of positive symbols. A strong tendency is manifested to forge close links with adult revolutionary movements. As a result of this con-

nexion, the senior movement assumes the leadership of the junior movement and merely assigns it roles to perform. The degree of cohesion and the form of association between members, as well as the degree of extremeness of the revolutionary ideology, depend to no small extent upon the forms of reaction and social control operating through the society.

(c) *'Drawing-room' Youth Culture.* From an organizational point of view, this type of youth-culture is not cohesive. There is no real connexion between the various groups that compose it, and within it the individual group membership is not permanent or steady. The 'drawing-room' culture is a manifestation of conformity within an individualistic society. As a rule it is characterized by a certain apathy towards values (although, of course, values exert a latent influence). Stress is laid on relaxation of tension, entertainment, and limited sexual activity. As a rule, the adults do not participate actively in organizing the 'drawing-room' culture, but they give it their approval as being 'necessary to every healthy youngster', and furnish the conditions for its existence.

(f) *Delinquency.*⁶ This type is characterized by limited cohesion and organized into gangs with their own internal discipline. As a rule there is no 'roof organization'. There is a deviation from norms and from most accepted values. While this culture approves some of the usual status symbols (such as conspicuous consumption) it likewise develops unique status symbols of itself. There exists the possibility that the gang will be influenced by adult elements of the underworld.

(g) *'Gilded Youth.'*⁷ This culture combines elements of the 'drawing-room' and delinquent cultures. It is characterized by a reluctance to assume adult roles (especially economic roles). It displays an inability to defer fulfilment of satisfaction, and so it stresses immediate enjoyment. It indulges in deviations simply 'for fun', and not in order to attain material objectives. There is a general apathy to values, which is displayed by a shirking of all valuational demands, not necessarily only those of the existing society.

Within the framework of the above typology, it is not difficult to place the type of youth movements prevailing in Israel as 'innovating' movements. It will no doubt be asked why this particular type of youth culture came to occupy such a central position in Israel.

FIVE PERSPECTIVES ON ISRAELI YOUTH

The next stage in our discussion will therefore be to make closer acquaintance with the Jewish youth in the pre-State era, i.e. in Mandatory Palestine, for that was the formative stage of the youth culture characteristic of present-day Israel. We start out from the initial assumption that the uniqueness of human phenomena is not a result of the appearance of new elements, but of a new combination of existing

elements. We propose, therefore, to view the Jewish youth in the Mandatory era from five comparative points of view, each of which illuminates one of its aspects only, so that all five are needed to give a full and balanced picture.

1. *Adolescents in a Modern Industrial Society*

Youth and adolescence in modern society have been dealt with extensively in sociological and psychological literature, and we have here no intention of adding to it. We shall rely mainly on two comparatively recent theories which sum up, respectively, the psychological view (from the aspect of the individual adolescent) and the sociological view (from the aspect of the adult society).

E. H. Erikson defines normal adolescence as the successful solution (i.e. socially recognized as legitimate) of three problems by the adolescent personality: the problem of identity; the problem of intimacy; and the problem of creativity.

The adolescent has to find his own identity, i.e. to *choose* between alternatives in the spheres of sex (male or female), occupation (choosing a vocation), politics (choice of party), and the spirit. But, once this choice of alternatives has been made, the right ways of communication have to be found with persons with a differing identity—to break the isolation that encircles one's identity without losing it and being dragged down to the level of *dependence* on someone else. Full maturity, in Erikson's view, demands, in addition to self-identification and ability to communicate, what he terms 'generativity', i.e. the power to create something new and a readiness to accept responsibility for it.⁸

S. N. Eisenstadt,⁹ basing himself on a comparative intercultural study, comes to the conclusion that the difficulties of adolescence (and the need for a youth culture) are a function of a non-familial division of labour within the economic and political bounds of society. The gap between the characteristic attitudes of the family, and those prevailing in the 'outside world', call for a bridge to ease the process of transition from youth to adulthood. The official school system and the youth cultures can provide such a bridge. Regimes having task-oriented and collectivistic values utilize the needs of the young to be organized in order to harness them to their own ends. In such regimes, therefore, one may expect to find conformist youth cultures with a considerable degree of cohesion.¹⁰

These two approaches help us to understand the process of adolescence in a modern industrial society, which is characterized by the following main features:

- (a) Enrichment of sources of knowledge and skills that can be transferred from one generation to another.
- (b) Extension of the period of childhood and youth, which finds

YOUTH IN ISRAEL

practical expression in delayed assumption of sexual-familial, vocational, and political roles.

- (c) Intensification of the contrast between the family (the reduced size and functions of which have led to a strengthening of the emotional elements within it and to a greater degree of intimacy), and the economy of the rationalistic market, which is undergoing a constant process of development, differentiation, and expansion.
- (d) Cultural and political pluralism, which presents to the adolescent individual the necessity of identifying himself with particular groups, but in such a manner that he does not, at the same time, lose his capacity to co-operate with other groups.

These four characteristic features are to be found within Israeli society, though not with the same degree of intensity with which they are manifested in the pre-eminently industrial societies of the west.

2. *Children of Immigrants*¹¹

The founders of the Israeli youth cultures, and indeed the overwhelming majority of Israeli adolescents as a whole, are the children of immigrant parents. Whether they were actually born in the country or were brought there by their parents at an early age, they are the first generation to grow up and be educated under local conditions, and in this respect they can be compared with their counterparts in other countries.

The first and most important feature that characterizes the children of immigrants in all societies is a decline in the authority of the parents and a weakening of identification with them. The immigrant parents are not capable of directing their children effectively in the ways of the new society. On the contrary, very often the children display greater adaptability, and it is they who direct the parents. This lack of orientation on the part of the parents is not confined to the practical sphere only: their cultural heritage and values also seem to their children to be irrelevant in the new conditions. Hence the values which originate in the various home cultures are perceived as a dividing factor, while attainments in the practical sphere strengthen the common basis within the new society.

From a psychological point of view it might be possible to describe this in terms of a weak internalization of the father image, which is held by many to be the source and impulse for the internalization of values. According to this line of thought, 'Big Brother', or 'Group leader' is capable of taking the place, for the immigrant child, of the internalized father figure. It is to be supposed that the influence of a friend of more or less the same age will be more specific and conscious, and less profound and extensive, than that of the father.

If one looks carefully, one will find that these characteristics of immigrant children are one of the formative features of Israeli youth as well. Rejection of spiritual conflict and emphasis upon practical performance are accepted as a stereotype characterizing an appreciable section of the youth of Israel.

Anyone studying the literature produced by writers born in Israel¹² will be struck by the absence of a powerful and convincing father figure in the overwhelming majority of works. There are fathers who are 'despatched' by the author to a distant land, and there are fathers who are quite simply ignored. In hardly any instance does the father explicitly participate in the shaping of the plot or of the hero's character. On the other hand, the indigenous Israeli literature is influenced by the figures of young youth leaders and army commanders, who make their impress upon the hero. Some of the heroes are mundane, hard, and superficial, while others are endowed with poetical and impressionable souls; but all alike share the view that spirituality is a weakness that hinders a person in devoting himself to the main assignment, namely, realizing a practical task.

3. *A Revolutionary Movement's Second Generation*

In order to soften the unduly sharp outline of the comparison of Israeli youth with immigrant children, let us take another approach. Jewish immigration to the Land of Israel was never a migratory movement in the usual sense of the word. Zionism had predominantly revolutionary aims, since it negated the basis of existence of Jewish society in the Diaspora. The geographical distance between the society it aspired to (i.e. in the Land of Israel) and that actually existing in the Diaspora did, in fact, take the rough edges off the conflict and made possible the 'co-existence' of Zionist and non-Zionist institutions; but it did not change the essentially revolutionary character of Zionism. The social attributes of the second generation of the movement puts the vision of the first generation to the test. There is a constant tension between the revolutionary myth of early memories and the concrete demand put to the young generation to continue ploughing the furrow opened up by its fathers.

The second generation of a revolutionary movement has no first-hand knowledge of the factors that gave rise to the revolutionary ideology and it is consequently removed from the source of its values in actual experience. The reality with which the second generation is confronted is the institutionalization of the revolutionary movement. The consideration of maintaining stability and continuity, of 'protecting assets created by dint of hard work', becomes uppermost, and it is liable to prevail over the demand for strict fulfilment of abstract values. Once it is in the throes of growth and becoming established the movement no longer arouses the same faith and enthusiasm as in days of yore.

Nevertheless, the second generation is also subjected to influences that make for a belief in values and a deepening of identification with the movement. The fact that a youngster was 'born into' a movement and did not join it through the exercise of his own free choice relieves him of the necessity of constantly having to offer verbal justification of his act of choosing. On the other hand, it confronts him with the concrete results of the revolution within a natural framework of existence that is not called into question, while the ideological principles of the revolutionary movement are taken for granted as the 'basis of human morality'.

In the literature mentioned above we find on the one hand a disdain for *verbal expression* of ideological loyalty yet, on the other, a well-developed sense of responsibility towards the aims of the movement.

4. *Young Intelligentsia under a Colonial Regime*

Palestine under the British Mandate could not be regarded as a typically colonial territory. The classic picture of a primitive country with its natural resources and cheap man-power being exploited by an imperialistic power does not give a faithful description of the Palestinian reality of twenty to thirty years ago. Nevertheless, there are certain distinctive features in common between Palestine and the more typically colonial territories with regard to the young generation and the problem of its adaptation.

Motivated by a variety of considerations—humanitarian, administrative, and economic—the colonial power 'plants' knowledge, skills, and sometimes even Western ideologies in the territory under its rule. As a consequence, aspirations and demands are created which the framework of colonial rule is incapable of satisfying.

In Palestine there was no need for the Mandatory Government to disseminate knowledge or modern ideas. The Jewish immigrants from Europe were to a great extent well-educated and adhered to radical ideologies. The aspirations of the Jewish youth to mobility in an upward direction were, under the Mandate, thwarted by objective factors. For the key positions in the Government service were occupied by British officials, with the assistance, on the intermediate and lower levels, of Arab, rather than Jewish, officials. Nor did institutions of learning, commerce, or industry furnish sufficient opportunities for advancement, owing to their restricted dimensions. The immigration of a Jewish intelligentsia from Europe frequently involved changes of occupation and a lowering of both professional and economic status. Had the locally born youth occupied key positions, the absorption of immigrants of that type might have been rendered even more difficult.

The youth, which did not find an outlet for its status aspirations in the usual way, sought compensation in an age-group culture. This culture was designed to diminish status anxiety by stressing the intrinsic value

of adolescence and by allotting responsible tasks to those being educated within its framework. Such tasks provided a temporary and limited status. The Israeli youth movement, in addition, furnished a status image for the future. This image—that of the *kibbutz* member—was admittedly not rich in economic rewards, but it held out the promise of an élite status and a sense of performing a vital service to the community as a whole.¹³

As we explained earlier, the *kibbutz* status has in many cases remained merely an 'image', and members of youth movements have not permanently linked themselves to that form of life. But even in these instances the tendency of the youth to assess the surrounding society according to the structural and evaluational principles of the youth movement has not disappeared. In other words, prior education in a youth movement has not infrequently acted as a delaying factor in the process of full integration in adult society. During the Mandatory period there were several forms of compromise and ways of deferring a decision. The various underground movements furnished a kind of continuation of the youth movements, which they resembled in atmosphere and procedure, though they did not demand the same long-term commitment to a collective way of life on the land. Secret training, organizing illegal immigration, conducting propaganda campaigns, and supplying the funds for all these activities, offered ample scope for a desire for action and furnished a sense of service, progress, and importance.

Thus there emerged from the youth movements an entire stratum of young people anxious for a further moratorium (i.e. deferment of the complete integration into the occupational and familial structure) who were ready to be recruited for all kinds of tasks, in return for minimum material rewards. This stratum contributed greatly to the dynamism and resilience that characterized the Jewish population in its political struggles. On the other hand, the youth movement's ability to persist in its educational path became a function of the political struggle between the Mandatory Power and the Jews of Palestine.

5. *Jews or Israelis?*

From the very outset Zionism was characterized by tension between its Jewish and universal elements. The first generation strove for 'normalization', namely the creation of a new type of personality differing from that typical of the East European township. That generation was, however, saturated with the values of the culture against which it had rebelled and imbued with pride in the Jewish uniqueness that it sought to destroy. Most Zionists' attitude to traditional Judaism was compounded of rational opposition and concealed sentiment.

When the second generation, born in Israel, made its appearance, difficulties cropped up in transferring this ambivalent attitude from

parents to children. The transition from a scattered religious community to a nation dwelling upon its own soil entails three far-reaching processes of change: (1) secularization; (2) migration; (3) change of occupational structure. These processes have brought about a deep gulf between the Jews of Israel and the Diaspora.

Up to the Second World War, as long as European Jewry constituted a spiritual and political centre, and the second generation of Jews in Palestine was still small in numbers and influence, the gulf could be bridged; but since the end of the war it has become apparent to its full extent.

Knowledge of the terrible fate that overtook European Jewry has, as we see it, given rise to two contradictory reactions:

(a) The first generation was imbued with a kind of guilt feeling mixed with romantic yearnings for the Diaspora Jewish culture that had been destroyed. This reaction may possibly be one of the motivating factors behind such manifestations as the demand to strengthen 'Jewish awareness' in education, or the tendency in some circles to return to some form of 'amended' tradition.

(b) In the eyes of the young generation, the destruction of European Jewry finally set the seal of historical approval on the precedence of the land and people of Israel over the Diaspora and its way of life. The immigrants from Europe are now regarded as 'refugees' and the feeling of pity evinced for them has not always been raised to the level of sympathy and identification. To a young generation for whom action and achievement are of central importance, the passivity with which the majority of European Jews accepted persecution, humiliation, and suffering presents a very difficult problem. At times, it seems as though the European Jewish disaster appears to the Israeli-born generation more in the light of a humiliation than a calamity.

In a study¹⁴ designed to inquire into the reactions of different circles in Israel to the Eichmann trial, those interviewed were asked to express their opinion about the behaviour of the Jews during the period of the destruction. Four alternative evaluations were offered them:

- (1) The period of the destruction of European Jewry was one of Jewish heroism.
- (2) In the circumstances prevailing, the majority of Jews could not have behaved differently.
- (3) If it were not for several manifestations of heroism, I would regard the period as one of humiliation for the Jewish people.
- (4) Most of the Jews went like sheep to the slaughter and were incapable of defending their lives and honour.

We have classified the answers to 1 and 2 as 'understanding', and to 3 and 4 as 'criticism'. The following table shows a clear difference in the extent of criticism expressed by Israelis and Jews of American origin, as

well as an internal difference between Israeli Jews born in the country and immigrants from European countries.¹⁵

TABLE I
Evaluation of Behaviour of the Jews during the Period of the Nazi Holocaust

| | <i>Under- standing</i> | <i>Criticism</i> | <i>No data</i> | <i>Number</i> |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Jewish Students from U.S.A. | % 70 | % 24 | % 6 | 170 |
| Israelis born in Europe | 62 | 28 | 10 | 170 |
| Born Israelis | 55 | 39 | 6 | 140 |

In the same study, we asked each person interviewed to define himself as an Israeli or Jew. Table II indicates differences in self-definition between immigrants and born Israelis.

TABLE II
Jewish vs. Israeli Identification

| | <i>Identifies himself as 'Jewish'</i> | <i>Identifies himself as 'Israeli'</i> | <i>Unidentified</i> | <i>Number</i> |
|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------|---------------|
| Israelis born in Europe | % 48 | % 38 | % 14 | 170 |
| Born Israelis | 19 | 58 | 23 | 170 |

This emphasis on Israeli self-identification at the expense of Jewish self-identification is also manifested in a number of cultural phenomena:

(1) Archaeology has become a sort of national sport. High-ranking army officers, young teachers, and members of *kibbutzim* engage in it as a hobby, and many university students choose it either as a major or a minor subject. Many youngsters volunteer to help in archaeological excavations and in the technical tasks connected therewith.

(2) A small group of poets, writers, and journalists has, for the past two decades, been trying to engender a cultural movement which regards the ancient Canaanites as its spiritual forebears. This movement does not recognize any connexion between world Jewry and the Israelis, and it seeks to become integrated into the Middle East and to build a culture free of all religious influence.¹⁶

These and other manifestations are witness to a partially conscious desire to find identity symbols that make it possible to by-pass two thousand years of Jewish history and renew direct links with the fore-

YOUTH IN ISRAEL

fathers of the nation, who, though remote in time, are geographically and politically close.

CONCLUSION

In order to explain the unique character of the Israeli youth-culture we have tried to obtain a picture of those who created it, namely, Jewish youth during the period of Mandatory rule in Palestine, from five angles.¹⁷

Let us centre this explanation around the four criteria for the analysis of youth cultures suggested in the earlier part of this paper, namely, Conformity, Organizational Cohesiveness, Dependence upon Adults, and Valuational Content.

(1) The considerable difference between the experience of life and childhood impressions of the first-generation Zionist immigrants and those of the second generation makes complete conformity hard to attain. At the same time, the external factor of political and military tension, and the rigorous ideological indoctrination from within, go a long way towards bringing the basic aims, as visualized by the two generations, closer together.

(2) The problematic character of the post-revolutionary education, which seeks to fuse open advocacy of continuity with the fostering of the myth of (and nostalgia for) revolt, makes it necessary for the second generation movements to assume a certain amount of organizational independence and to develop an 'innovating' style that emphasizes their own unique contribution to the Zionist enterprise rather than their harmonious integration with it.

(3) The surplus immigration of people with higher education and professional skills on the one hand, and the absence of political independence on the other, required a voluntary limitation of aspirations towards social mobility on the part of the youth. Only intensive ideological activity providing an almost religious meaning for rural life and manual labour was likely to curb to some extent the ambition, so deeply rooted in the tradition of the East European Jew, to assure himself or his children of a high economic or intellectual status, even at the price of migrating from one country to another.

(4) The negative, or ambivalent, attitude to the Diaspora Jewish heritage confronted the young Hebrew-speaking Jew of Palestine with acute problems in defining his own identity. Hence the attachment to all-embracing ideologies and/or idealistic forms of life holding out the promise of providing meaningful status symbols.

(5) Finally, the implementation of the pioneering ideology, i.e. the directing of many senior members of the movement to communal forms of life, or to national service, called for an organizational structure capable of controlling and organizing its members.

Thus we have seen how the forms of youth culture took shape under the combined influence of individual psychological needs and socio-political requirements.

To what extent do these social characteristics apply to adolescent youth in Israel during the 1960's, ten to fifteen years after the establishment of the State? Within the scope of the present article we can only hint at an answer. The processes of urbanization and industrialization have intensified the 'modern' character of Israeli society, at any rate with reference to the sons of the veteran and well-established elements. The increase in juvenile delinquency among the youth of these circles, which bears an amazing resemblance to developments in certain Western countries, indicates that the need for bridge mechanisms to ease the process of adolescence has grown more, rather than less, acute.

By the side of the second generation of the immigrant population there is beginning to emerge a third generation.¹⁸ The ability of parents and educators who have themselves been educated in Israel to serve as effective and authoritative instructors for the youth has grown appreciably.

The establishment of the State was a point of convergence for several processes of change that were reflected in the character of the youth and its movements:

(1) Attainment of the political aim (in Israel as in other liberated countries) led to a disenchantment with messianic hopes. The feeling that only external forces were preventing the establishment of an exemplary society was undermined, and the contradictions between abstract values and the day-to-day requirements of an actually existing human society were laid bare.

(2) A government machine was set up capable of enlisting material resources and manpower for the performance of social tasks. The importance of voluntary action therefore dwindled in the public consciousness.

(3) The character of immigration changed. Instead of groups of newcomers with a high proportion of educated and skilled people, capable within a short time of supplying themselves and others with services, there was a mass influx of people with little, if any, formal education who stood in need of vocational, organizational, and cultural services.

(4) Agricultural development—the high road of Zionism in general, and of the pioneering youth movements in particular—encountered a number of objective limitations all at once. By the end of the 1950's most of the country's land and water reserves had been exploited, and the home market was saturated with farm produce.

(5) The avenues of social mobility were opened up, and able Israeli-born youngsters were confronted with plentiful opportunities for personal advancement in industry, science, and administration.

These changes, however, have not transformed Israel into a 'normal' country. A constant state of emergency in the sphere of defence, absence of economic self-sufficiency, and a social and cultural gap between immigrants from different countries—all these factors combine to create a unique set of conditions of existence and development.

The plan for the social development of Israel, as outlined by the majority of its responsible leaders, comprises an unusual combination of elements: loyalty to collectivist aims, and preservation of the rights of the individual; raising scientific and technological standards, and maintaining a relatively modest standard of living; and fusing people of different provenance and with different cultural backgrounds into a single nation.

It is clear that the attainment of these aims, even in part, calls for the existence of a broad élite with an appropriate 'collective personality'. To what extent is the Israeli youth movement capable of broadening its aims and producing from its ranks a versatile élite of this kind? This is a basic problem confronting educational planning in Israel.

NOTES

¹ I am grateful to Dr. Y. Talmon-Garber, Mr. H. Adler, and Mr. O. Shild for their helpful remarks.

² In some movements non-kibbutz members are not allowed to act as leaders at all. In others, they are restricted to the younger age groups or to youngsters who do not attend secondary schools.

³ There are four main kibbutz movements. Two of them are connected with out-and-out socialist parties, one with the social-democratic party (Mapai) in power, and one with the religious movement.

⁴ Criteria (a) and (b) were introduced by S. N. Eisenstadt in his book *From Generation to Generation*, Glencoe, Ill., 1955.

⁵ Sports and scouting organizations in various colonial territories turned into foci of resistance towards the colonial regime, despite the fact that their establishment was usually due to its initiative.

⁶ See A. K. Cohen, *Delinquent Boys: the Culture of the Gang*, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955, and F. M. Thrasher, *The Gang*, Chicago, 1947.

⁷ This term denotes a deviation on the part of middle-class youth that is to be found, with varying intensity, within practically the entire orbit of Western civilization (including the Soviet Union). See the article on this subject (in Hebrew) by S. N. Eisenstadt in *Megamot*, Vol. IX, No. 2.

⁸ See E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*, London, 1951. In this book Erikson mainly describes the sexual aspect of adolescence as well as the three dilemmas bound up with it, whereas the broader implications are dealt with in a recent article: E. H. Erikson, 'The Problem of Ego-Identity', in *Identity and Anxiety*, edited by M. R. Stein et. al.: The Free Press, Illinois, 1960.

⁹ S. N. Eisenstadt, *From Generation to Generation*, Illinois, 1955.

¹⁰ Fisher R. Talcott, *Patterns of Soviet Youth—the Komsomol*, 1954; and H. Shelsky, *Die skeptische Generation*, Düsseldorf, 1958.

¹¹ See C. Wittke: 'German Immigrants and their Children', *Annals of the American Academy of Social Science*, 1942, pp. 85-91; C. Corsi, 'Italian Americans and their Children', *Annals of the American Academy of Social Science*, 1942, pp. 100-6; E. P. Hutchinson, *Immigrants and their Children*.

¹² The reference is mainly to the works of Moshe Shamir, S. Jizhar, N. Shaham and their followers. The English reader can form his own impression through the following pieces of literature:

M. Shamir:

1. *King of Flesh and Blood*;

2. *He Walked in the Fields*

Published by the Jewish Agency (stencil);

3. 'The Road to Jerusalem'
in *The Israel Argosy*, Jewish Agency
Annual, 1954.
- S. Jizhar:
1. 'A Warm Hike'
in *The Israel Argosy*, 1956.
- N. Shaham:
1. *Border Stones*, 1953;
 2. *They were Seven*, 1953.
- A. Meged:
1. *Hedva and I*
Published by the Jewish Agency,
1954;
 2. *Fortunes of a Fool*
Published by Gollancz, 1958.
- ¹³ The functional connexion between
the youth movement and the question of
status image has been suggested and de-
veloped by Y. Ben-David in his article,
'Membership of the Youth Movement
and Social Status', published in *Megamot*,
1957 (Hebrew).
- ¹⁴ S. Herman, J. Peres, and E. Jucht-
man: 'The Eichmann Trial—A Study in

high "Involvement"', *Scripta Hierosoly-
mitana*, 1963.

¹⁵ All those described in our study as
immigrants had been in the country for
at least 15 years, and most of them for
20 years and over.

¹⁶ The fact that some of the leaders of
this group were born in Poland and
other parts of Eastern Europe does not
prevent them from experiencing a feeling
of identity with the ancient Canaanites!

¹⁷ Most attempts to describe or
evaluate the social aspect of Israeli
Jewish youth are based upon only one or
two of these perspectives and ignore the
others. Hence the danger of a one-dimen-
sional view or of a generalized and hasty
judgement. See, e.g., Spiro, Melford E.,
'The Sabras and Zionism; a Study in
Personality and Ideology', *Social Prob-
lems*, Vol. 5, 1957.

¹⁸ See M. Hansen: 'The Third Genera-
tion in America', *Commentary*, Vol. 14,
1952.

ZIONISM AND *ALIYAH* ON THE AMERICAN JEWISH SCENE

Edward Neufeld

IN SEARCH OF A NEW APPROACH

THERE is hardly an American Jewish publication, particularly a Zionist publication, in which the issue of search for a new approach to Zionism and *Aliyah* (emigration to Israel) has not been considered in various lights. It has been investigated more extensively from diverse points of view in recent books published in this country and in Israel and at Zionist conferences. Various, and in some respects conflicting, theories have been set forth. Inevitably, they are searching for a fresh approach, one that is more readily understandable and likely to be more effective. It is difficult to organize these views into groups of thought, yet they seem to reflect a consensus on a number of basic points. One of these is serious self-criticism for the lack of accomplishments. The second is a unanimous agreement that *Aliyah* and *Halutziyut* (pioneering) are a feasible objective for the Jewish community in the U.S. With the exception of Eliezer Livneh,¹ all of them overlook the fact that *Aliyah* and *Halutziyut* on the one hand, and the perpetuation of the Diaspora on the other, are not merely compatible, but have a tangible reciprocal influence in a multitude of ways.

Discussing the position of American *Aliyah* and *Halutziyut*, Ben Halpern states:²

... there is no doubt, that in practice, the American *Chalutz* movement has grown and maintained itself largely as a spontaneous, self-generated activity. The American Zionist organizations have not by far been the driving force or inspiration behind it. . . . What we have had so far in the way of an American *Chalutz* movement is of no consequence. It is not an achievement worth measuring against existing possibilities, nor does it provide any experience worth learning from.

S. Halkin³ presents the situation in much more critical terms. He maintains that

no *Halutz* movement worthy of the name has ever developed there [in America]; for American Zionism violently, consciously, and of set intent,

rejected the generally accepted Zionist point of view, and did not consider that it applied to those living within the boundaries of the United States. . . . When the American Zionist envisaged first the National Home and afterwards the State, he assumed that his dream would be fulfilled by those who were or would be compelled to become 'idealists' and *Halutzim* by virtue of conditions in their countries of origin or hostile environments. He was very proud of *Halutzit*, that singular Eretz Israel pioneer spirit, which enabled the obstinate idealists who built up the National Home, and afterwards the State, to suffer with a devotion that was truly moving for those who watched from afar. . . . He held that his own share was fully and satisfactorily finished when he provided adequate economic support and effective political aid. . . . The thought of *Aliyah* to Eretz Israel on his own behalf, never entered his mind; while the very idea of any kind of *Aliyah* on the part of his children struck him as fundamentally absurd in theory and entirely to be rejected in actual practice.

Carl Alpert⁴ speaks of 'timorous' opposition to *Aliyah*, stating that 'by far the greatest harm to any possible *Aliyah* movement has been done by those who, in another area, have been laboring zealously by Israel'. Benjamin Wohlman⁵ says that

paradoxically enough, among the factors hampering *Chalutzic* work in America are the adult Zionist organizations themselves which lack preparedness for Zionist realization. They were good and loyal in the role of supporters, friends, political fighters and fund raisers, but when the matter of personal realization came up—that was a different matter. There is a great opposition to the idea of *Aliyah* and *Chalutzit*, and many Zionists will prevent their children from emigration to Israel . . .

S. Margoshes⁶ referring to *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* maintains that 'the term *Halutzit* in the United States has almost become a dirty word'. Somewhat similar opinions have been repeatedly expressed in various American Zionist youth publications like *Furrows*, *The Labor Zionist Youth*, *Israel Horizons*, *Youth and Nation*, *The Jewish Horizon*, etc. In fact, American Zionist leaders concur in these observations. Thus, Emanuel Neumann, in an article published in *The Zionist Movement in the New Era*⁷ says that 'there is a danger that Zionists are permitting the very idea of *Aliyah* from America to Israel to become almost taboo in Jewish life'. Similarly Rose Halprin, in an article published in the same pamphlet, states with regret that 'many of us American Zionists repudiate the doctrine relating to *Halutzit*'.

It is an established fact that the American Zionist movement has never brought the concepts of *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* into the focus of its activities. Their specific identity and their distinctive character and individuality never existed in the U.S. Some of the explanation given is the fear that *Aliyah* might conflict with American patriotism. S. Margoshes⁸ rightly states that 'in many American Jewish circles, *Aliyah* had almost assumed the character of subversion. To leave the shores of the

country in order to help the struggling democracy of Israel had been regarded as a sort of desertion of the American fatherland and all it stands for.' This position is generally accepted as a matter of course, though whenever responsibly discussed its logic is greatly questioned.

The real background of the indifference, and sometimes even negative attitude, towards *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* is to be found in some of the sociological factors governing the American Jewish scene. Despite the many shortcomings of the American Zionist movement, its failures in the sphere of *Aliyah* were not primarily its own fault. It was due less to its errors than to basic conditions of American life which the Zionists could do little to change. America is a country of immigration; emigration of whatever nature was somehow looked upon as an act of low prestige. American Jewry enjoys economic and political security, while in Israel these are goals yet to be achieved. Zionism in the U.S. operates within a Jewish community deficient in the deeply rooted Jewish cultural orientation which could easily lead to an idealistic level of *Aliyah*. All this created a number of peculiar conceptions, obsessions, and prejudices which the Zionist movement could not combat.

In principle two fundamentally different ways of dealing with the whole issue exist side by side. The discrepancy between them is clear. Thus, in pure theory, no Zionist group in the United States, or, for that matter, no Zionist leader or writer, denies the basic importance of *Aliyah*. None rejects the axiom that pioneering is the very essence of Israel's present and future. In addition, expression is repeatedly given to a justifiable disapproval of a negative approach to *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* based on a fear of antisemitism, on the equation of Diaspora with Exile, or on the theory that Zionist identification is equivalent to *Aliyah*. It is rightly pointed out that such an approach can succeed only with those who are maladjusted and unhappy and who would obviously be of no great value to Israel. This is about the total extent to which the American Zionist movement concerns itself with this matter. Only such a line of negative passivism is brought into the focus of consciousness of Zionist activities.

At the same time, however, carefully worded resolutions concerning *Aliyah* and even *Halutzit* are passed on various occasions by Zionist parties and organizations. Even new organizational instruments, on a small scale, are sporadically formed. However, proper examination shows that all these, and for that matter anything at all positive concerning *Halutzit* or *Aliyah* in general, are pursued in a half-hearted manner, as a mere outward conforming with the official principles of Zionism. It is a kind of ritualistic obeisance to unfashionable idols, gestures which serve as substitutes for real activities. The pronouncements are superficial and high-sounding and commit nobody, nor do they lead to action. They therefore cannot have an influence, nor can they serve as an impetus for a new or creative force. This state of affairs

has led American Zionism into great disappointments, damaging, if not fatally injuring, its effective dynamic life.

CHARACTER OF AMERICAN ZIONISM

On the American scene, in form and in essence, in outlook and in activity, the working of Zionism has been heavily affected by a high standard of charity and liberality. In fact, the same applies to the present character of the Jewish pro-Israel financial assistance. On the American scene, this aid rarely has a distinct Zionist colouring. It is philanthropic or semi-philanthropic, impersonal, and it lacks self-involvement. Essentially this contribution was and remained predominantly an expression of American Jewish social action.⁹ Broadly speaking, the character of American Zionism was and has remained basically sentimental and charitable in its essence. It centred around the idea of providing with great liberality for those in need abroad. These features have invariably attained a high, idealistic level. Zionism in the U.S. adopted a quantitative rather than a qualitative approach. These original characteristics have remained its almost sole substance up to this day. This type of Zionism seems to embody symbolic and intuitive values which correspond closely to the emotional requirements and attitudes of American Jews. It consists of rational and irrational elements which, as usual, are interwoven and range from a level of a deep-seated permanent state of feeling to one of a superficial nature. Their durability depends on a number of factors, many of which are beyond our control.

Owing to specific sociological factors, Zionism in America has worked as a propaganda device and not as a *Weltanschauung*. It offered no doctrine, but only slogans; it did not formulate a programme of ends, nor did it prove that the means which are to realize those ends are relevant to the purposes its leadership avows. The Zionist approach has largely been a doctrine of defence. It did not insist on ideological commitment. It was timid, it did not aspire to great goals; it proposed no generous policy; it was not engaged in building Jewish cultural or education institutions, nor did it cherish, or even influence, cultural activities. It produced no Zionist literature nor did it stimulate intellectual understanding of current Jewish problems. It did not create the tools for transmitting Jewish ideas and the philosophy of Zionism. It greatly neglected Jewish youth and it never had *Aliyah* at heart.

Following the destruction of East European Jewry and the rise of the State of Israel, American Zionism became the decisive factor in the Zionist movement of the Diaspora. The relative weight of American Jewry was still more enhanced by the assumption of leadership by America in the free world. Zionism in this country could no longer reflect the sun of European Zionism, but it had to 'shine with its own light, to the extent to which light exists in the Diaspora'. All this meant

a new responsibility for the Jews of America. However, the new situation has not yet brought about any new reaction which would contain anything significantly different from the previous pattern of Zionism. Everything continues on the basis of old emotional traditions. The total configuration is continuing.

On the other hand, American Zionism intensified the sense of Jewish solidarity and of group consciousness among American Jews. By its mere existence it sharply opposed assimilation. It was preoccupied with the salvaging of the remnants of European Jewish tragedies. On the whole the movement concentrated greatly on political activities. In times of crises it fought many political battles. Up to 1930, American Zionism was, at most, a force of secondary importance in the establishment of the political platform of Palestine. After that date, and particularly during and following the Second World War, its contributions were of historic magnitude. In this field Zionism in the United States was aggressively Jewish, positive and constructive in its approach. During those days and only in the political field, its leadership was often unshakable and indifferent to praise or blame. It displayed a unique quality of perseverance often in the face of considerable discouragement and disappointment. There can be no doubt that the preoccupation with salvaging the remnants of European Jewish tragedies, the continuous mobilization for financial support, and the concentration on political work are partly responsible for the neglect of other important areas.

In terms of organizational activities, the Zionist movement—which was and still is the greatest and most popular movement that modern Jewish history has ever known—touched only the institutional surface of American Jewish life. The organizational impact cannot even be compared with that of the values of Zionism upon American Jewry. Its weaknesses lie in a variety of directions. On the whole it underestimated both its own actual function and the potentialities of American Jewry. In many important fields, it never entered into the contemporary streams of American Jewish life nor found its distinctive place. Thus the various Zionist organizations never penetrated into the general Jewish framework of local communal institutions, nor did they ever become an organizational part of the American Jewish educational systems or of synagogue life. They ignored the vast and important field of providing Jewish youth with leadership in order to evoke their potentialities and imbue them with a sense of purpose of living as Jews. In this respect, the Zionist movement has chosen the line of least resistance. It rarely endeavoured to transform but only to conform. While the associative impulse is strong in America, and the drives behind 'joining' or 'becoming a member' are very powerful, the Zionist movement finds it difficult to retain its membership. The movement is narrow, it does not offer facilities for individual or collective expression in a deeper and more

affirmative sense. Its conventions fail to build morale or to give a personal touch to an otherwise impersonal organization. Its range of leadership is very restricted. As an inevitable result of this situation, Zionist organizations lack standing and prestige within American Jewry. Eliezer Livneh¹⁰ observes that 'it is doubtful whether we could have avoided a resurgence of anti-Zionist feeling similar to that generated in various guises in other countries where a Zionist movement assumed serious proportions. The absence of any significant anti-Zionist reaction in the United States is largely conditioned by the absence of a genuine Zionist movement . . .'

Ideological issues rarely came to the fore on the American Zionist scene. They were seldom felt to be of consequence. In its non-ideological quality, American Zionism differed—and continues to differ—from Zionist movements in other countries. The only exceptions were divisions of opinion in political thought and tactics in time of crises. Only during such periods were analyses made, often revealing conflicting views and at times evoking deep emotions and passions.

Ideological divisions between the various Zionist parties were and remained—among the rank and file—of such a level that they do not warrant a discussion. They simply have no content or meaning. Zionist parties did not absorb new energies and new points of view; nor were they engaged in fashioning a philosophy and strategy of planning. They were not the basis for transmitting broad ideas and convictions to their membership. They seem to be afraid of new ideas, bewildered at the new temper, and view with apprehension changes which require radical new adjustments. The present idle polemics provide no foundation for a new programme. None of them has any clear notion which orientation to choose. Present party debates have been increasingly concerned with unreal issues of a dead past. The frequent discussions over things that do not matter hide the poverty of ideas about those issues that do matter. Never have men differed more and more about less and less. The unreality of party debates is making American Zionist public opinion increasingly cynical about the party system as it operates. Its cynicism is entirely unconstructive; apathy and disillusionment rather than opposition are the obstacles.

Most unfortunately the movement never paid much attention to the recruiting of talent from the best brains and energies of the community. As a result, at present, it desperately lacks a dominant cultural element which could offer initiative, orientation, and guidance. There is no doubt that the presence of such an element could greatly assist in arresting the alarmingly swift process of running out of ideas. The late Karl Mannheim¹¹ rightly said that the 'masses always take the form which the creative minorities controlling societies, choose to give them'. Eli Ginzberg¹² puts it even more explicitly when he says 'all significant change in social life is the result of the work of a believing minority

which finally convinces an unbelieving majority of the wisdom of a particular approach'. Without entering into a discussion of the precise function of a 'creative minority' or 'believing minority', we may agree in general that little progress can be made without such an element. Thus a movement which does not facilitate such developments can neither direct its potentialities nor further its creative powers.

The present so-called ideological tendencies in American Zionism can best be described as representing a concept of 'Zionism without Israel'. This may sound exaggerated, but, in essence, it sums up the situation. This approach is very popular and in fact it is as old as American Zionism. It was never formulated as a theoretical position, nor was it presented in ideological terms; it was never ostentatious and therefore it did not excite alarm. It was just taken for granted. However, at present, 'Zionism without Israel' reaches the level of proper definition within the framework of the current situation. It is being dignified by an ideological approval and by the claim that it meets realistically the prevailing conditions. This manner of thinking is the extension of a long-continuing series of social transformations which have changed the profile of Zionism and have shifted the axis of its actual values. There is no single clue that will unravel the logic behind this shift.

'Zionism without Israel' consists of the following three characteristics: (a) it shifts the focus of Zionism towards Jewish life in the Diaspora; (b) it stresses the indispensable function which Zionism as an ideal and Israel Jewry as a living reality have to play in the physical and cultural perpetuation of the Diaspora; and (c) it is, at the same time, emphatic in its negation of *Halutzit* and *Aliyah*. Thus, in essence, it assumes and projects a division between Zionist philosophy on the one hand and *Aliyah* on the other as two independent foci. The theoretical underpinning of this dichotomy is rather sketchy. It may also be added that this approach does not offer any new philosophy for the future character of the Diaspora within the oneness of Jewish peoplehood. While it regards the future existence of Jewish life in the Diaspora as an end in itself, it merely hopes for some spontaneous or miraculous adjustment of all the pertinent forces.

It is within this framework of thought that *Aliyah* to Israel has become almost taboo and the doctrine related to *Halutzit* repudiated. The total substance of 'Zionism without Israel' is not only an expression of self-satisfied complacency, but in essence it is the opposite extreme of some egocentric views prevailing in Israel. I refer to those which, partly as a result of being out of touch with contemporary Jewish life in the Western world, regard Zionism as strictly synonymous with personal settlement in Israel.

There is no doubt that both viewpoints, like all extreme doctrines, are dangerous. They open the door to irrationalities where rational direction is indispensable. Both are narrowly pragmatic and without

adequate perspective for the complex involvements and inter-relationships in the contemporary Jewish situation. Both are bound to lead to a situation in which Israel and the Diaspora would exist, each for its own sake, in mutual isolation and non-identification. This approach is contradictory. In fact, it is a perversion of the old Diaspora patriotism put forward by Nathan Birnbaum, Simon Dubnow, and Hayim Zhitlowsky. Essentially it is a travesty of the creative possibilities embodied in the idea of combination of attitudes and intelligently understood co-ordination of values. However, to some it seems natural and to others unpleasantly artificial or pathetically naïve. Moreover, enough of it sounds intelligently sincere to force attention.

'Zionism without Israel' ignores the basic fact that the perpetuation of the present Diaspora on the one hand, and that of *Halutzit* and *Aliyah* on the other, are not merely compatible but have a tangible reciprocal influence in many ways. These two factors are strongly interwoven and their activities are bound to lead to stabilization and to an equilibrium. In the long run the positive effect which *Aliyah* is bound to have upon Jewish life in the Diaspora might be of no smaller value than its effects upon Israel. The presence of a pioneering vanguard of young men and women is bound to have a powerful impact on the American Jewish scene. It would increase American Jewish self-esteem, add new values to its cultural activities, and stimulate its life in general. *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* are the tangible force which can give to the Diaspora vigour, values of idealism, distinct character, direction, and means of attack and defence. The continuation of *Halutzit* is bound to discover and motivate within the Diaspora Jewry potentialities which are necessary for a change of its inner character. In this sphere of activities lies a great opportunity for past experience and hope for the future to be welded together into a meaningful whole, offering new tools and armaments for fortification against the strains of conflicts. Martin Buber¹³ rightly says that 'one cannot even understand the development of Judaism in the Diaspora in the last decades without recognizing the educational influence of the *Halutzim* and of the new settlements on the Diaspora and especially on the youth of the Diaspora'.

The extraordinary and far-reaching changes in the global situation which are in full stride radically altered the destiny of many powerful nations. They obviously affected small ethnic minorities to an even larger extent. Diaspora Jewry has at length emerged from a horrible scene of genocidal destruction and moral devastation, the like of which has not been seen in past centuries. At present it numbers over twelve million with a natural annual increase of less than one per cent. Its future is beclouded with heavy forebodings. With minor exceptions, all present Jewish communities are young. Outside Russia, over 90 per cent of the Jewish people have been living in their present countries less than a hundred years, fortunately with little antisemitism. Thus their newly

emerging cultural patterns are uncertain and obviously not deeply rooted. Paradoxically enough, it is precisely the lack of experience in maintaining a positive sense of Jewish peoplehood in an environment free from antisemitism which constitutes one of the gravest challenges facing Diaspora Jewry, and in particular American Jewry. In this situation, the historical continuity of Diaspora Jewry depends greatly on the moral strength and inspiration which can be derived from the impact of *Aliyah*, and from Israel in general. Mordecai Kaplan¹⁴ maintains:

Had we not been able to count on a State of Israel to serve in time as a reservoir of Jewish thought and creativity, in the same way that East European Jewry served for the Jews of the Western World until the beginning of the Second World War, there can be no doubt that Diaspora Jewry would be culturally and spiritually doomed to disappear. Without the State of Israel, there would have been no choice to make as Jews. There simply would not be a ghost of a chance of Judaism to survive at all.

Any attempt to strengthen and to develop fresh initiative in the Jewish life of the Diaspora is obviously imperative from the standpoint of Diaspora Jewry itself, of Israeli Jewry, and from the overall Jewish and Zionist position. This is true even if one assumes that the existence of the Diaspora is not to be regarded as an enduring phenomenon. However, any Diaspora-centred cultural and educational activity must be balanced and wholesome and must embrace all the pertinent requirements of the current situation and thus produce a healthy equilibrium. It cannot be confined to a particular convenient goal. In passing it may be mentioned that this, in fact, applies equally to the nature of the obligations of Israel towards the Diaspora, a matter which, so far, has been largely overlooked.¹⁵

The problem of *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* bears significantly upon the Diaspora-Israel relationship. This is a difficult and complicated matter and the issue has no bearing upon the genuine and exclusive political allegiance of Diaspora Jews to their respective countries. Apart from various implications, it cannot be ignored that the pattern of life, the social structure, and the cultural configuration of Israel diverge from those of the Diaspora. In essence, the crux of the Israel-Diaspora inter-relationship lies in this socio-cultural realm.

Israel is about to create its own distinct culture, its own synthesis of humanism, Hebraism, and social and ethical tenets. This organized effort is being vigorously pursued by a majority community in terms of its national sovereignty, and because of this it produces basic differences from those cultivated and developed in Diaspora communities under complicated minority complexes. Only to a limited degree does this nascent Israeli culture incorporate Diaspora standards and values. In addition, both Israel and American Jews are undergoing divergent and crucial cultural changes. These developments tend to widen the gulf between the two.¹⁶ At present they do not seem to understand each other.

The mutual sympathy between them, which was in the past perhaps their greatest strength, is in danger of being lost. The centre of significance is no longer the search for unity, but rather what the unity makes. In some instances the differences have already become almost irreconcilable. Fortunately, however, so far this applies more to interpretations than to fundamental issues.

In spite of these diversifications, Israeli Jewry and that of the Diaspora constitute one indivisible people. There is a community of fate which implies organic co-existence, close interdependence, and mutual responsibilities. The unifying factors are infinitely stronger than those which create divergence; they imply high survival values. In a final analysis, the destinies of Israeli and Diaspora Jewries—apart from the general world scene—depend greatly on a positive interaction between them. There is no doubt that the key to a living and creative Israel-Diaspora relationship lies in the sphere of *Aliyah* and *Halutzit*. These are bound to create a spiritual tradition of real and sincere co-operation; they will greatly reduce the dangers of divergence and alienation. When we realize the implications of this unifying process we begin to get a view of Jewish life at every point different from that which sees it as a people sharply divided into two estranged camps.

The narrow approach of 'Zionism without Israel' is based on the illusory assumption that the State of Israel is a solid accomplishment. The fact, however, is that not only its stabilization and its security but its very survival depend greatly on the readiness and willingness of Diaspora Jewry to supply *Halutzim* and *Olim* in general. Only one-fifth of the country's soil—about four million dunams—is at present under cultivation. Eighty per cent of Israel's territory still remains barren. Much of this is potentially fertile land. The opinion that agricultural settlement has reached a saturation point is incorrect although, on the other hand, the concept of settlement need not be limited to agriculture alone.

The overall development of Israel depends on the influx of Western-trained *Halutzim* and *Olim* in general, among them scientists such as soil experts, agronomists, engineers, medical men, etc. The need for *Aliyah* remains basically valid in spite of the fact that at present the natural increase of Israel's population exceeds 32,000 per annum, that 40 per cent of it is below the age of nineteen, and that the number of Israeli children is relatively twice as large as that of England.¹⁷ As far as Israel is concerned, *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* are bound to stimulate the sense of Diaspora-Israel unity. They will increase the feeling of reliance so badly needed by a State located in a hostile area. In the sphere of cultural activities, they can add new motifs to Hebrew literature and safeguard Israel's cultural life against provincialism. Great importance must also be attached to the fact that the raising of the cultural level of the *Olim* from the Middle Eastern and North African countries depends greatly on a continuing *Aliyah* from the West. The newly settled Oriental

ZIONISM AND ALIYAH IN THE U.S.A.

groups—no matter how valuable they are—coming as they did from technologically and economically underdeveloped societies, constitute a threat to the expected standard of living of Israel.

In spite of the fact that at present the strength of nations is 'measured not by bulk of population or mass of territory, but by intensity of scientific and intellectual effort' there is no exaggeration in Ben Gurion's words that 'we must settle the land or we shall lose it'. Thus it is impossible to deal responsibly with the problem of the function which Israel can fulfil in relation to the Diaspora and simultaneously ignore the undeniable fact that such a function is primarily conditioned by *Aliyah*. In other words, to negate *Aliyah* on the one hand, and enlist at the same time Israeli Jewry in the support of the Diaspora's future is illogical, since it ignores the essential interdependence of the two.

CHARACTER OF PRESENT-DAY AMERICAN JEWRY

American Jewry is relatively a young immigrant community. Jacob Lestschinsky¹⁸ rightly observed that 'the rise of the great Jewish centres in the United States of America has taken place in the last hundred years and for the most part in the last fifty years'. However, at present 80 per cent of American Jewry are natives of the United States. Its socio-economic and cultural features are conditioned predominantly by its middle-class element. It is estimated that in 1961 there were approximately 5,510,000 Jews in the U.S.A. Only 27 per cent of the general American population inhabits the northeastern section of the country, but in that area are found 69 per cent of America's Jews. The Jews stick to the city life. Only 11 per cent of all American Jews live in rural communities, while 89 per cent reside in urbanized areas of populations hardly less than 250,000. Among the heads of American Jewish households, 22 per cent are college graduates and 61 per cent high school graduates. They are the most professionalized group of all the American ethnic groups. More than three-quarters (78 per cent) of American Jews are white-collar workers, a high percentage of them professionals.

It is repeatedly quoted that only 7.2 per cent of Jewish marriages are outside the Jewish group. However, this percentage covers only a few communities and does not seem to reflect the general current conditions. There is no doubt that the percentage is considerably higher.¹⁹ Inter-marriage is rapidly increasing, particularly in smaller cities and rural areas. The reproduction rate of the American Jewish population falls considerably below that of other sections. Unless the Jewish birthrate undergoes a profound change, or a more fertile Jewish stock is added by immigration, the future of American Jewry is threatened.

In its contribution to American prosperity, culture, and scientific accomplishments, American Jewry plays a prominent role. Its character

is shaped in a climate where old certainties are gone; the old values are in a melting pot and religious faith no longer offers a secure rock upon which one can rest. American Jewry shares with the general environment its peculiar anti-intellectualism, materialism, and empty conformism. Similarly, it shares in the general growth of an undefined religious regime which tends to produce patterns of formal religious compliance and performances of time-honoured rituals. The authority of religious tradition is in sharp decline; it loses the last vestige of meaning for the majority. Its place has not yet been taken by any alternative binding influence. Regardless of the statistical optimism relating to Synagogue membership, the present so-called religious tendencies lack the germ of great possibilities.

American Jewish cultural output and Jewish scholarly productivity are of a very limited nature. Their media of mass communication in the form of journals and news publications are, with some exceptions, on a distinctly lower level. The standard of interest in Jewish matters is very superficial and the number of students of Jewish problems and readers of books of Jewish nature is very small indeed. American Jews lack a unified central organization. Their communal life is of a distinctly parochial nature. The overall Jewish educational and welfare organizations represent a powerful structure of potential education, yet its duplication of effort and its confusion in orientation is astonishing.

In spite of the above there is ample evidence to show that a new type of ethnic-cultural conduct is emerging. This is largely the tendency among the generality, with the conspicuous absence of the professional intelligentsia. Jews value a status in a Jewish milieu. The First National Study of Jewish Education sponsored by the American Association for Jewish Education clearly shows that among the main reasons for the substantial increase in Jewish school enrolment is the fact that there is a growing interest by previously uninterested Jews in Jewish education for their children. Of the total enrolment of 553,600 in 1958, 47.1 per cent attended Week-Day Afternoon schools (i.e. two or three days per week), 45.1 per cent one-day-a-week schools and 7.8 per cent all-day Jewish schools. According to the 1958 report, Jewish education increased 131 per cent in the last ten years. Of the parents who have sent their children to Week-Day Afternoon schools, 65 per cent are Americans by birth; of those who have sent their children to one-day-a-week schools (i.e. Sunday Schools) 80 per cent are Americans by birth. In 1962 more than 600,000 children joined Jewish schools. This record enrolment represents a 12 per cent increase since 1958 and a 77 per cent increase in the decade since 1952. Over 11,000 children in 27 communities disclosed a very favourable attitude towards Jewish education. While most of these schools appear to be ineffective over a considerable area of endeavour, the basic values of Zionism—with the distinct exclusion of the idea of *Aliyah*—are an integral part of their educational orientation.

ZIONISM AND ALIYAH IN THE U.S.A.

Jewish behaviour patterns and a set of group activities, emotionally and aesthetically meaningful, are at present emerging. Broadly speaking, these seem to be bound up with the historical traditions and values of Jewish life at large. It is, however, difficult to describe their potential value and still more difficult to foresee the new corresponding type of thought which will follow it. They will, to a very large extent, determine the future strength and the future orientation of Zionism in this country and obviously that of *Aliyah* and *Halutziyut*.

The following attitudes and reactions to Jewish matters are characteristic of the overwhelming majority of the present-day American Jewish youth at all levels: great increase of self-confidence as Jews and the affirmation of their Jewishness without embarrassment or self-consciousness; considerable decrease of fear of antisemitism; remarkably less inclination to reject Jewish religion and Jewish group-identification than a generation ago; a greater degree of positive attitudes towards activities with Jewish content and association with Jews; search for adequate means of finding fulfilment as Americans and as Jews; serious concern with and various degrees of positive emotional involvement in the accomplishments and the destiny of the State of Israel; and consistent desires to visit Israel with *no* intention of settling there permanently. On the other hand, they all share the general contemporary American concern with material things, accepting the premise that prestige is related to wealth; the lack of interest in ideas for their own sake; the great pressures to conform; and the tendency to run away from intellectuality.²⁰ While they face with many minority group members the fear of coping with the vicious circle of future employment—despite the fair progress made in recent years—they do enjoy a considerable variety of opportunities for social, educational, and economic life. They are fully aware that they have much greater potentialities for personal fulfilment and better lives than their parents had.

It is estimated that at present the Jewish teen-age population in the U.S. is 439,000; approximately 93 per cent of the 15–16-year-olds and 80 per cent of the 16–17-year-olds attend school. A sizable number of them is engaged in part-time employment. The available findings show that the bulk of them consists of wholesome and socially conscious young people, with a high proportion of gifted individuals. Their moral standards are of a high level. The number of Jewish cases of juvenile delinquency, drunkenness, and illegitimate births is very negligible indeed. While intellectually alert, as a rule they, like their non-Jewish colleagues, are not interested in civic affairs. They are poorly informed about Jewish matters, about Zionism, and about Israel itself. This applies particularly to those who lack Jewish education.²¹ Although American life has a more pronounced formal religious atmosphere than many other liberal democracies, sentiments to Jewish religion vary in intensity, but some ties are demonstrable in all groups. Several studies

show that even in many instances young people desire more ritual 'than they found in their homes'.²²

The results of available censuses confirm that a sense of Jewish group identification is on a high level among them. The survey conducted under the auspices of the American Jewish Committee by Marshall Sklare and Mark Vosk²³ and that by Max F. Baer and Irving Canter²⁴ are, in matters concerning attitudes of Jewish teen-agers, in full agreement on the following points: serious desire to continue distinct Jewish identity; recognition of strong ties towards the Jewish peoplehood and religion; and overwhelmingly pro-Israel mindedness. According to Sklare and Vosk's study, 7 per cent of parents and 10 per cent of teen-agers declare their willingness to settle permanently in Israel and, according to the second survey, less than 1 per cent of teen-agers felt that way.

Young American Jews are joining the general great rush to colleges and universities. It is estimated that in 1961 there were about 250,000 Jewish students enrolled in all institutions of higher learning throughout the U.S.A. While distinct Jewish characteristics are disappearing and in general the Jewish students follow the same lines as the non-Jewish student, the following features and attitudes are prominent among Jewish students: great initiative, considerable percentage of high ability, philosophic inclinations, respect for education, progressiveness, and mixed attitudes towards intermarriage. Jewish students rate themselves much more frequently to be of a positive rather than of a negative or neutral attitude towards their Jewishness. They are today

far less tense and self-conscious about their Jewish identity than previous generations were. . . . If their Jewishness is no longer an embarrassment to the Jewish students to-day, it certainly is not a cause of exultation either. Whatever their reasons or rationalizations, they accept the implications of their identity. Their identity may be no problem; but it certainly is no challenge either. It is simply a condition of their lives. Often it is merely a complex of consumption habits rather than a reasoned system of values. For many students, though certainly not for all, Judaism is primarily the context of their social location. It is not, or not yet—and may never be—the context of their religious, cultural or spiritual location. Hence our greatest Jewish problem to-day may well be the fact that many young Jews at the university have no Jewish problem at all.²⁵

According to the study made by Leon Feldman²⁶ based on many surveys involving about 12,000 individual respondents, the Jewish student

wants to live as a Jew and believes in the desirability of the survival of the Jewish group, insists that Judaism still has something to contribute to mankind. . . . Just what Judaism could or should contribute to to-day's world he does not know, and he conceives of Jewish personality traits in a manner that suggests he is sensitive about his Jewishness, feels insecure

because of it, and in the main, dislikes it. . . . We might call the Jewish student's attitude to his own Jewishness 'quasi positive'.

The ideological strife within Jewish life in general and in the Zionist movement in particular is irritating to them; dissociation from Jewishness by a small minority is looked upon by the overwhelming majority of the students as cowardice. There is no doubt that Samuel Teitelbaum is right when he asserts 'that Jewish students who are marginal Jews make marginal adjustments on the university campus; and those who are affirmative in their identification without reservation are not only more completely integrated with their own group but also more soundly adjusted to the university *milieu*'.²⁷ Feldman maintains ²⁸ that the Jewish student

on the national level, approves the Zionist idea without being an active member of a Zionist organization. He favours the idea of a Jewish national state, is proud of Jewish achievements in Israel, is strongly interested in Israeli affairs and does considerable reading about them, but feels no direct connection between Israel and his own Jewishness, and settling there is a possibility farthest from his thoughts.

While beliefs and attitudes change significantly in both male and female students during their freshman and senior years, investigations show that the bulk of them exhibit a need for believing; yet they display frequently a sceptical and cynical attitude to the observance of Jewish religion, particularly to ritual. 'Numerous students have intellectual difficulties with Judaism as a religion. They know that there is a religious heritage in Judaism, but they don't know what to do with it intellectually. What they know of Judaism is not relevant to their thinking and needs.' This includes also those who attended week-day, afternoon, or even all-day Hebrew schools.²⁹ Yet the synagogue is held in high esteem and Jewish religion is the usual basis of their definition of Jewishness. They seem to be ignorant of Jewish secular culture, which is to them unrelated to modern life. This is partly a reflection of the impact of the shallow Jewish education received at home and at the Hebrew school. Large numbers of them passed through elementary Hebrew schools which in the words of a Report of the Commission for the study of Jewish Education 'is like a shallow river "a mile wide and an inch deep"'. In brief, the general tendencies among the present-day American Jewish youth can be summed up in the following: high level of Jewish group-identification, strong emotional involvement with Israel, and good potentialities for the development of a pioneering fervour covering a wide area of influence. As mentioned before, the Zionist movement has never developed a programme which would draw the imagination of our teen-agers and college or university students to the creative qualities of past and present Jewish life, not merely on the extroverted

basis provided by social engagement, but by the structure of an active and meaningful Jewish community itself.

Historically speaking, Zionist sentiments on the American Jewish scene did not begin as a reaction to local discrimination; nor were they a product of an indigenous richly Jewish intellectual life.³⁰ Both were almost totally absent. The impact of Zionist values was not pursued within the framework of an organized Jewish community. This too was and largely remained absent. In fact, such a community is evolving very slowly and is at present taking root; we still find aggregations of Jewish persons rather than real Jewish communities. The roots of American Zionist emotional motivations are found in the awareness of Jewish peoplehood and in the sense of solidarity with the Jewish group. This feeling is deeply felt and has a great tendency to persist. Group and ethnic solidarity is, of course, not a specifically Jewish phenomenon; it is common to all immigrant groups in the U.S.³¹ Oscar Handlin rightly observes that 'American Zionism of the last fifty years, falls into a well-established American pattern. It is not the eccentric behaviour of a single group, but rather the normal outcome of the freedom of group life in a democracy'.

Since the days of Theodor Herzl, a positive attitude to the fundamentals of Zionist ideals and values was discernible among the great majority of American Jews. These values imply: (a) common bonds of identity of Jewish peoplehood as a religious and ethnic entity regardless of geographical dispersion and national loyalties; (b) the concept of Jewish statehood as an inherent factor in Jewish history and in its future, and (c) at present, spiritual attachment to Israel. These values were and remained a powerful factor in shaping the American Jewish character, in raising Jewish morale and self-respect, and in intensifying the internal cohesion of positive Jewish group consciousness. To many they spelled a return to Judaism making them conscious of their responsibility towards their own destiny, opening new horizons for the future, and giving meaning and justification to their Jewish existence. It would be a grave mistake to base an appreciation of the impact of the values of Zionism on the collection of funds for Israel, or on the membership of the various Zionist bodies and affiliated institutions. The fact remains that the *values* of Zionism became an organic part of all American Jewish institutions, from the Synagogues and Temples, throughout schools, social welfare, and cultural bodies, to extreme secularized institutions. At present, as in the past, this attitude cuts across religious, partisan, and intellectual lines. These are known and well-established facts. It was correctly stated that 'if the realization of the State of Israel has been one of the most powerful educative forces affecting Jewish life in America to-day, the hope that the commonwealth might emerge was for decades—as we can now see—one of the prime motives in the saga of modern American Jewish history.'³²

As a result of this powerful impact of Zionist values, in very many instances American Jews appear often to be ready, and sometimes eager, to meet the general Jewish and Zionist demands without pressure. It seems that the masses in themselves instil their wishes and determine the range of their activities although their level of interest does not correspond with the objective needs and opportunities. The integration and the incorporation of Zionist values in the current pattern of life of American Jews, the general trend in American Jewish life which endeavours to develop tools for its own group survival, and the nature of the response towards the problems and the needs of Israel offer sound opportunities for the expansion of a constructive Zionist approach to American Jewish life with *Aliyah* as its distinct point of gravity.

In spite of the feeble Jewish cultural foundation of American Jews, they resent assimilation in the sense of ceasing to remain Jews. They display a conscious striving to remain a living part of the Jewish people. According to a survey conducted by Marshall Sklare and Mark Vosk, of a medium-sized Jewish community on the Eastern seaboard, 94 per cent of parents and 87 per cent of children wish to establish a distinct Jewish identity. Notwithstanding the fact that 'a typical pattern of discrimination against Jews is seen in all the American communities where Jews exist in very considerable number', genuine love and real devotion to their country is deeply rooted among American Jews. In fact their Jewishness is organically interwoven with their inherent American patriotic feelings. This corresponds with the present-day tendency of strong attachments to ethnic and religious origin among all groups on the American scene. Thus, self-assertion is becoming more dominant than assimilation. This is particularly noticeable in the new phenomenon of suburban life. The sense of Jewish group identification appears to satisfy the impulses of the Jewish population to a degree far greater than many would expect.³³ The endeavour of the first generation of immigrants to retain a sense of self-identification remains a powerful factor in the present American-born Jewish population. Obviously, this socio-emotional situation is in a state of flux and pregnant with inner conflicts.

Paradoxically enough, the destructive and constructive forces work side by side. Thus simultaneously the American Jewish population, together with other immigrant groups, is undergoing a process of conscious and unconscious assimilation; the Jews are obviously an organic part of all the American groups and ethnic components which are evolving towards an American consolidated nationhood. Cultural pluralism seems to be a phase only; the aim seems to be unilateral nationhood and national fusion. The evolving socio-cultural relations do not seem to appear to be conducive—in the long run—to permanent co-existence of ethnic minority groups except of a purely religious nature. Max Lerner³⁴ might be right in maintaining that 'one might

predict that in the latter half of the twentieth century these three religious groupings [Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish] will harden rather than dissolve. They are becoming increasingly self-contained . . . ' But American Jews, while they are looked upon and look upon themselves as a religious group, are generally oriented toward secularization. Their activities, it is true, are largely centred around Synagogues and Temples, but these become increasingly secularized. In line with this, the general Jewish attitude towards intermarriage is becoming greatly liberalized.

Under the guise of religion a kind of Jewish ethnic-cultural life is developing. Morris Ginsberg ³⁵ evaluates the position as follows:

It seems that American Jews join Jewish religious institutions because they want to be Jews and to be recognized as such, or perhaps negatively because they do not wish to become non-Jews. The institutions certainly cover areas of life other than those of religion in the narrower sense and, indeed, they do not seem to evoke any deep religious impulses. In this, the synagogues resemble the Christian churches. But unlike the latter, they are the basis of a distinctive group life in a manner which has no parallel in the Christian communities of the various denominations. The question arises whether a community can survive which claims to be based on religion, but in which the content of religious belief and practice is increasingly attenuated. It looks as if what is emerging is a Jewish version of the American way of life. But whether there is enough vitality in this version to enable the Jewish communities to maintain their identity, in face of the forces making for conformity or uniformity, only the future can tell.

PIONEERS FROM AMERICA

A small number of pioneers from the U.S.A. has kept on trickling into Israel since the early days of Zionist work. It was always, and still is, a process moving at a very slow speed and embracing only small numbers. A general survey of various stages of the American *Aliyah* and of its impact upon Israel is given by E. P. Lapide in his recent publication *A Century of U.S. Aliyah*.³⁶

At present there are four distinct *Halutz* organizations in the U.S.: *Hashomer Hatzair* (*Mapam*), *Habonim* (*Mapai*), *B'nei Akiva* (*Hapoel Hamizrachi*), and *Hechalutz Hatzair* (*Achduth Avodah*). With the exception of *Habonim*, they are all *Kibbutz* oriented movements. In addition to these four, all existing Zionist youth movements emphasize, in one form or another, the significance of *Aliyah*.

The following statistical tables show the *Aliyah* from the United States from 1948 to 1960 inclusive. They are divided into youth *Olim* according to their ideological affiliation, and into *Olim* in general according to their socio-economic status. The *Halutz Aliyah* and that of various Zionist youth organizations consists of persons whose average age varies

ZIONISM AND ALIYAH IN THE U.S.A.

as a rule from 18 to 25 years. Their economic background is predominantly of an urban lower and upper middle-income class. Their educational background differs substantially from that of small, even highly developed, agricultural communities. As far as their religious environment is concerned, only a small percentage of them come from orthodox Jewish homes. The *Middle Class* category includes white-collar workers and business proprietors with middle-class financial means. Figures concerning *professionals and technicians* refer to *Olim* with educationally and technically skilled qualifications in their particular type of work. Their average age ranges from 28 up and their arrangements for *Aliyah* are usually handled through the Professional and Technical Worker's Aliyah Organization, known as PATWA. *Retired Olim* covers the settlement of persons withdrawn from regular employment in their principle occupation. As a rule their age is above 65 years and they dispose of moderate means. *Settled Tourist* refers to persons who left as tourists and subsequently changed their status into permanent settlers.

The figures concerning *Halutz* organizations and those regarded as non-*Halutz* youth *Olim* were received directly from the respective organizations by the author. The rest of the figures were obtained partly from the *Aliyah* Office of the Jewish Agency in New York, partly from the Central Bureau of Statistics in Jerusalem, and to a considerable extent from several official publications.

United States Aliyah from Halutz Organizations: 1948-60

| Period | Total | B'nei Akiva (Bachad) | Habonim (incl. Hashavim) | Hashomer- Hatzair | Hechalutz- Hatzair |
|--------|-------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1948 | 315 | n.a. | 160 | 155 | 0 |
| 1949 | 302 | n.a. | 140 | 160 | 2 |
| 1950 | 334 | 17 | 110 | 190 | 17 |
| 1951 | 323 | 25 | 112 | 155 | 31 |
| 1952 | 234 | 18 | 89 | 105 | 22 |
| 1953 | 95 | 11 | 26 | 45 | 13 |
| 1954 | 88 | 3 | 26 | 50 | 9 |
| 1955 | 92 | 17 | 40 | 24 | 11 |
| 1956 | 93 | 28 | 26 | 32 | 7 |
| 1957 | 93 | 53 | 7 | 27 | 6 |
| 1958 | 85 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 6 |
| 1959 | 92 | 17 | 37 | 31 | 7 |
| 1960 | 103 | 27 | 51 | 19 | 6 |
| | 2249 | 241 | 850 | 1021 | 137 |

n.a.—not available

EDWARD NEUFELD

United States Aliyah from Non-Halutz Zionist Youth Movements: 1948-60

| Period | Total | Brit- Trumpeldor | Hansor- Hatzioni | Haoleh- Hassah | Mizrachi- Hatzair |
|--------|-------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1948 | 30 | 15 | 15 | 0 | * |
| 1949 | 33 | 22 | 11 | 0 | * |
| 1950 | 37 | 11 | 8 | 18 | * |
| 1951 | 33 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| 1952 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| 1953 | 15 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 1954 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 1955 | 18 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 4 |
| 1956 | 20 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 1957 | 24 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 3 |
| 1958 | 14 | 5 | n.a. | 7 | 2 |
| 1959 | 16 | 6 | † | 8 | 2 |
| 1960 | 17 | 6 | † | 7 | 4 |
| | 287 | 127 | 83 | 56 | 21 |

n.a.—not available.

*—established 1951.

†—merged with Young Judea 1959.

United States Olim in General: 1948-60

| Period | Total | Middle Class (incl. dependants) | Professionals and Tech- nicians (incl. dependants) | Settled Tourists | Retired | Misc. |
|--------|-------|--|---|---------------------|---------|-------|
| 1948 | 51 | 10 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 6 |
| 1949 | 148 | 8 | 25 | 96 | 11 | 8 |
| 1950 | 190 | 12 | 14 | 126 | 8 | 30 |
| 1951 | 268 | 12 | 20 | 189 | 20 | 27 |
| 1952 | 316 | 60 | 30 | 136 | 32 | 58 |
| 1953 | 263 | 49 | 76 | 82 | 26 | 30 |
| 1954 | 319 | 29 | 100 | 143 | 18 | 29 |
| 1955 | 302 | 19 | 120 | 130 | 14 | 19 |
| 1956 | 275 | 15 | 137 | 88 | 27 | 8 |
| 1957 | 501 | 52 | 146 | 92 | 68 | 143 |
| 1958 | 470 | 16 | 106 | 147 | 114 | 87 |
| 1959 | 463 | 65 | 90 | 98 | 118 | 92 |
| 1960 | 432 | 54 | 123 | n.a. | 169 | 86 |
| | 3998 | 401 | 1005 | 1336 | 633 | 623 |

n.a.—not available

GRAND TOTAL OF OLIM: 6,534

The above figures show that the total *Aliyah* from the U.S. amounted to 6,534 for the years 1948-60. These figures do not include some young *Olim* from Junior Hadassah, Young Judea, and similar organizations, nor do they include unaffiliated young *Olim*. Unfortunately this latter information is not available. The figures concerning American Jewish investor-immigrants and those consisting of the Hassidic *Olim*³⁷ are

ZIONISM AND ALIYAH IN THE U.S.A.

also not available. P. B. Lapide,³⁸ employing a different method of statistical procedure, maintains that 'the overall total of U.S. settlers since 1948 stands in mid-1960 at 7,595'. He concludes his data by stating that 'during the first twelve years of Statehood 3,712 American *Olim* and 1,483 tourists have settled in the country. At least another 2,400 pseudo-*Olim* were also integrated into Israel's economy'.

The most striking feature of the figures is the sharp decrease in the *Aliyah* of *Halutzim* and general youth *Olim*, and at the same time the constant increase of *Olim* classified as *Middle Class*, *Professionals*, and *Retired* persons. This is not a coincidence. The most probable reasons are the following: the spirit of adventure, enthusiasm, and challenge which prevailed during the first few years after 1948 has worn off—hence the decrease of young *Olim*. On the other hand, the general expansion of economic life in Israel which created more comfort and more advanced opportunities attracted to a much larger extent certain individuals of the Middle Class, Professional, and Retired groups. It should be added here that little is known about the occupational composition of American *Olim* who during the period 1948–60 emigrated from Israel. Judging from the overall situation, the probability is that the figures are of some significance.³⁹

The following may be added. None of these *Olim* immigrated to Israel because they were compelled to seek refuge from persecution or because they found life in America unattractive or incompatible. It was mainly the sense of idealism which led them to cast their lot with Israel. Most of them fulfil a very constructive function in the process of building and developing Israel and in shaping its socio-cultural character. In spite of the high human qualities which most of these *Olim* represent, their small numbers obviously limit greatly their potential impact upon Israeli life and upon that of American Jewry in the U.S.A. The total number of *Aliyah* from the U.S. for the period 1948–60 is most certainly out of proportion to the objective needs and possibilities of *Aliyah* from the country.

PROSPECTS

Present socio-political developments on the American national scene as well as in the Jewish arena in the U.S.A. create conditions very conducive to an expansion of constructive Zionist activities with *Aliyah* as its distinct centre of gravity. At present, various American groups of different ethnic and religious backgrounds are developing great vitality towards the goal of unity in diversity; it is a powerful force permeating all aspects of American life. This process remains not unrelated to the fact that America holds the leading position in the free world and to the growing awareness that the cornerstone of international relationships is interdependence, from which no country and no nation however

powerful can escape. The perspective of social thought has shifted in a direction different from the horizon set for past decades. If the large aims we have in view are not dissimilar from the old ones, the scale upon which we live is, for good and for ill, vaster than at any previous time. All this has a profound impact upon the people. Among others, it has radically changed previously held conceptions, prejudices, and obsessions. It broadens the general approach and creates maturity in many fields of activity of our society. In many instances the new attitudes are in sharp contrast with those previously held.

Never before was the need for American political and cultural impact, on any part of the globe, as vital for the preservation of American status as it is now. The overall position of America on the global scale depends to a considerable extent on the direct interrelationship with other peoples, not only on a Governmental level but on the level of personal interaction. Pioneering in other countries is one of the most powerful tools for the achievement of this goal. Former President Harry S. Truman, when referring to his Point Four Programme said:

. . . our missionary groups, our philanthropic and charitable agencies, must continue to make efforts . . . for the improvement of conditions in foreign lands. . . . Our young people can find careers in the pioneering work of bringing technical assistance to these countries. Our unions and our business organizations should enlarge their foreign contacts and bring the benefits of their experience to less developed countries.

This statement, made in June 1950, becomes with the passage of time of still greater importance. According to the 1960 Report of the Operations Co-ordinating Board of the National Security Council of the United States, there are 1,684,383 American citizens *permanently* residing abroad, of whom only 547,000 (less than $\frac{1}{3}$) are military service personnel. Consciously and unconsciously, these people can make a positive impact. In the present growing nature of international relationships, the permanent residence abroad of those American citizens can fulfil a highly patriotic function. In fact, this figure is too small by far to produce the needed impact. Oscar Handlin ⁴⁰ presents this problem in application to *Aliyah* in the following words:

. . . if there are among American Jews young men who find a challenge to their social imagination in the new life of the Israeli communal settlements or a challenge to their constructive energies in the backward economy of the Near East, they will, in going, be following an American tradition of long standing. In their departure, so long as they think of *Halutziyut* as a pioneering movement dedicated to the furtherance of humanitarian ethics and democratic nationalism, they will only be spreading to another part of the world the ideals of American democracy.

Thus within the context of this new relationship, the old underlying and unjustified fear—half-heartedly shared by the American Zionist

movement—that *Aliyah* might conflict with American patriotism⁴¹ or that emigration consists of an act of low prestige, has no validity even for those whose reasoning has remained of a narrow nature or whose thinking is insecure. In fact, never before did the concepts of *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* correspond so closely with the overall pattern of American national needs and tendencies as they do in our present state of affairs.

ALIYAH AND ZIONIST ORIENTATION

Notwithstanding the above, as matters stand it does not appear that in the foreseeable future there will be a large-scale emigration from the U.S.A. The maximum number envisaged is five to ten thousand *Olim* annually. This figure is most certainly not beyond the capacities of American Jewry. This number, and still more its probable quality, are bound to make a powerful impact upon Israel's development and equally so upon the vitality of American Jewish life. However, it has to be emphasized that nobody welcomes a disturbance in his social life even though supported by the best of arguments, if the need is not apparent in terms of personal experience. Pioneering, *Aliyah*, transplantation and readjustment under the best conditions, imply a disturbance in the accustomed frame of life. In order to overcome this problem, Zionist traditional feelings must be directed towards reasoned judgment and brought to the level of personal need within the framework of personal experience. Ideas are only strong and capable of becoming living factors if they are woven into the social fabric and social setting of their environment. In addition, the road to success of any concept lies not merely in the affirmation of its historical precedents, but in the effective enlargement of the ends for which these are used. It is in its power to organize the enlargement of those ends that American Zionism will provide the true measure of its determination to fulfil its function.

It is, therefore, imperative for the Zionist movement to develop appropriately orientated Jewish cultural and social conditions which in turn will become conducive to such a function. These must be defined within the context of the American Jewish environment, closely related to its temperament, culture, and consciousness. They must be based on their own resources and self-nourishment and not on the values and standards of Israel. Well tried out educational principles and techniques are available for the development of new attitudes. There are no valid reasons why they could not be achieved among the youth of American Jewry to whom neither the issues of *Aliyah* and *Halutzit* nor the awareness that they can play a worthy part in something of great significance were ever presented.

The practical applications of such a programme require that the existing stock of values of American Zionist orientation be radically

altered. The original and fundamental principles of pre-State Zionism are still valid today. They have changed only in form but not in substance. Obviously, a number of basic factors vary, but the framework of the system of co-ordination into which they must fit together remains almost the same. Thus, what was theoretically a fundamental part of Zionism, but was neglected because of a preoccupation with political and economic issues, must be recaptured. A radical readjustment in this direction is imperative, and the very future of Zionism in the U.S.A. depends on it. This is conditioned upon the ability to turn the American Zionist movement into a massive, cultural, and educational force for the purpose of: (a) ensuring the preservation and the continuity of Jewish life everywhere, and (b) strengthening and cultivating the attachment to the State of Israel. The central point of these endeavours must be *Aliyah* and *Halutziyut* which have a powerful bearing upon the vitality of both the Diaspora and Israel.

Such an orientation is wholesome and embraces the basic requirements of the current Israeli and Diaspora situation. The practical acknowledgment of Israel and the Diaspora as *equal partners in the common endeavour for the furtherance of Jewish peoplehood will automatically exclude—even in Israel—the narrow approach that Zionism is synonymous with Aliyah*. The emerging response to the new situation—which will supersede the traditional pattern of American Zionism—will be conducive to a spontaneous growth of *Aliyah* and *Halutziyut*. It will bring with it a new spirit, its own sense of values, its affirmation of a balanced situation antithetical to the old. *Aliyah* will then become an organic product of the new Jewish social and cultural conditions, apparent in terms of personal requirements and needs of our young generation. The newly emerging pattern will also obviously sweep away the meaningless tendency of 'Zionism without Israel'.

Broadly speaking, the existing Zionist organizational forms, representing a valuable type of communal asset, could be effectively utilized to achieve such purposes. However, their immediate task would be a serious concentration on Jewish public opinion and mass action of an adult-educational character. It would also imply establishing a large number of appropriate Jewish schools of the old Tarbut nature, building teen-age clubs and youth community centres and, in general, the transformation of Zionism into a movement of Jewish cultural and spiritual elevation with regard to the contemporary world. Here are available resources and great potentialities that have not been exploited. Obviously, such a new effort can utilize the existing values with the available quantum of forces by modifying them consciously to these explicit goals. To this limited extent, such a process of reorientation might only take the guise of a new concept. Only through such an approach can the present danger of further deterioration of the American Zionist movement—which danger is not remote but real—be averted. There is

no doubt that even such a mass effort will not solve all the problems involved in the present situation. We may not be able 'to turn the river', but we can certainly succeed in 'shaping its flow'.

NOTES

¹ *State and Diaspora* (Modern Israel Library I), Jerusalem, 1953.

² 'The Problem of the American Chalmutz' (*Forum I*), Jerusalem, December 1953, 46-8.

³ 'American Zionism and the State of Israel' (*Forum I*), December 1953, 150-1; cf. also Ben Gurion's article in *Davar*, 15 Jan. 1954.

⁴ *Jewish Frontier*, April 1951 (reprinted in *Chalutz and Youth*, published by the Chalmutz and Youth Commission of the Labor Zionist Movement), New York, 1952.

⁵ *Psychological and Sociological Foundations of Chalmutz in U.S.A.* (Chalmutz and Youth), New York, 1952, 39.

⁶ *The Day Jewish Journal (Der Tog)*, New York, 6 March 1961.

⁷ Issued prior to the World Zionist Congress in 1956 by the New York Office of the World Confederation of the General Zionists.

⁸ *The Day Jewish Journal (Der Tog)*, New York, 7 March 1961.

⁹ See on this question Judd L. Teller's 'America's Two Zionist Traditions' (*Commentary*), October 1955, 349.

¹⁰ *State and Diaspora* (Modern Israel Library I), Jerusalem, 1953, 19.

¹¹ Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society*, London, 1946, 75.

¹² Eli Ginzberg, *Agenda for American Jews*, New York, 1950, 2.

¹³ Martin Buber, 'Character Change and Social Experiment in Israel' (*Israel: Its Role in Civilization*, ed. Moshe Davis), New York, 1956, 208.

¹⁴ Mordecai Kaplan, 'The Meaning of The Tercentenary for Diaspora Judaism' (*American Jewry, The Tercentenary and After*), New York, 1955, 14.

¹⁵ Note the following words of Zalman Shazar ('The Zionist in the Time of the State', *Forum*, Jerusalem II, April 1956, 120): 'The State of Israel was brought into being in order to assure the continued existence and development of the Jewish people. As long as the bulk of the Jewish people remains outside the confines of the State, the State has the task,

not only of promoting its own development and welfare, with the assistance of the Jewish people, but of strengthening the Jewish people in its desire to survive and helping it erect effective barriers against the forces of assimilation and disintegration which are inevitable in the conditions of Diaspora existence today . . .' Similar opinions are repeatedly expressed by Zionist leaders in the Diaspora.

¹⁶ For excellent examples see Eliezer Livneh, *State and Diaspora* (Modern Israel Library I), Jerusalem, 1953, 50-2.

¹⁷ In passing it may be mentioned that 50 per cent of the immigrants from Asia and Africa have likewise been under nineteen. One-third of the families from North Africa have more than four children each and 10 per cent of the North African families have more than six children each. The average male age in Israel is 27.9 and the average female age is 28.1. One-third of all the inhabitants are under 15. The high birthrate and the high percentage of young people in the populace assure a steadily rising population curve in the years ahead.

¹⁸ 'Economic and Social Developments of American Jewry' (*The Jewish People, Past and Present*, IV), New York, 1955, 36.

¹⁹ According to the reliable 1958-9 *Study of the Jewish Population of San Francisco, Marin County and the Peninsula* (published Nov. 1959 by the Jewish Welfare Federation of San Francisco) intermarriage rates in excess of 27 per cent are found in the South San Francisco and Palo Alto-Menlo Park areas.

²⁰ Eli Ginzberg reports ('The Armed Services—Mirror of American Youth, published in *The Dilemmas of Youth: America Today*, ed. by R. M. MacIver, New York, 1961, 97) that 'In World War II over 700,000 young men were rejected for service because of illiteracy; about 500,000 illiterates were accepted, most of whom were given special literacy training after induction; and another 600,000 were so poorly educated that they were able to make only a small contribution

to the Army. About 18,000,000 men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-seven were screened and about 1,800,000 were found to be severely deficient educationally. Thus, roughly 'one out of every ten young men was a total or borderline illiterate.'

²¹ See *Teen-Agers in the Jewish Community Center, Report of a Consultation*, published by the Jewish Center Division, National Jewish Welfare Board (New York, 1955) 24.

²² Miriam R. Ephraim, *Meeting the Needs of To-day's Jewish Teen-Agers* (National Conference of Jewish Communal Services, May 1959), 6. See also on this point, Bernard C. Rosen, 'Minority Group in Transition; A Study of Adolescent Religious Conviction and Conduct' (Marshall Sklare, *The Jews, Social Patterns of an American Group*, Glencoe, Ill., 1958) 336-46.

²³ Marshall Sklare and Mark Vosk, *The Riverton Study: How Jews Look at Themselves and at Their Neighbors*, published by the American Jewish Committee, New York, 1957.

²⁴ Max F. Baer and Irving Canter, 'Jewish Teen-Agers Look at Israel'. This survey covers responses of a selected cross-section of 900 teen-agers in the sixteen largest Jewish Communities in this country. It was conducted by the Youth Department of the American Zionist Council in co-operation with the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization. So far, this survey has not appeared in print.

²⁵ Alfred Jospe, *The Jewish Student and his Sense of Jewish Identity* (Jewish Identity and the Jewish College Student; National Conference of Hillel Directors, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations 1959), 20-1.

²⁶ Leon A. Feldman, *The Personality of the Jewish College Student: A Portrait* (New York Department of Adult Education, Jewish Education Committee of New York, 1956), mimeo, 17.

²⁷ Samuel Teitelbaum, 'The Jewish College Student' (*The Chicago Jewish Forum*, Vol. 11, No. 3, Spring 1953).

²⁸ Leon Feldman *loc. cit.* See also Henry Loebowitz Lennard, 'Jewish Youth Appraising Jews and Jewishness' (*TIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science*, II-III, 1947-8), 262-81.

²⁹ The observations made by Zvi Gitelman in his article 'Religious Attitudes of Today's Collegians' (*Jewish Life*,

XXVII, 6 August 1960) seem to be an expression of wishful thinking.

³⁰ So far there is no authoritative study of the history of Zionism in this country. For various information see M. S. Raisin, *Dappim mi-pinkaso shel rabbi*, New York 1941, 360 ff.; Louis Lipsky, *Thirty Years of American Zionism*, 1927, I, 9 ff.; Israel Klausner, 'Adam Rosenberg, One of the Earliest American Zionists', *Herzl Year Book*, I, 1958, 233 ff.; Selig Adler 'Backgrounds of American Policy Toward Zion', *Israel, Its Role in Civilization*, ed. Moshe Davis, 1956, 251 ff. An excellent evaluation is given by David Ben Gurion in *Davar*, Jan. 15, 1954. For a detailed bibliographical index of papers published in form of booklets, in periodicals, etc. see Isidore S. Meyer, *Early History of Zionism in America*, 1958, and now Samuel Halperin, *The Political World of American Zionism*, 1962.

³¹ See Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life*, 1957, 245 ff., and 'America Recognizes Diverse Loyalties', *Commentary*, March 1950; Lloyd Warner and Leo Srole, *The System of American Ethnic Groups*, 1945; Lloyd Warner, *Democracy in Jonesville*, 1949. See also Myra S. Minnis, 'Cleavage in Women's Organizations: A Reflection of the Social Structure of a City' (*American Sociological Review*, XVIII), 1953, 47-53; Arnold and Caroline Rose, *America Divided*, 1948; H. R. Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, 1929; Robert M. MacIver and Charles H. Page, *Society*, 1949.

³² Louis Finkelstein, 'The State of Israel as a Spiritual Force' (*Israel: Its Role in Civilization*, ed. Moshe Davis), New York, 1956, 6.

³³ The following are some of the results of a recent study made by Marshall Sklare and Mark Vosk (*The Riverton Study: How Jews Look at Themselves and at Their Neighbors*, 1957): in a medium-sized Jewish community of the Eastern seaboard nearly all parents and nearly all children wished to establish a distinct Jewish identity (among the parents 94 per cent and among the children 87 per cent); both generations were very sympathetic to Israel: 7 per cent of parents and 10 per cent teen-agers declared their willingness to settle in Israel. See also Marshall Sklare and Benjamin B. Ringer, 'A Study of Jewish Attitudes Towards the State of Israel' *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group*, ed.

Marshall Sklare), 1958, 437-50; and David G. Mandelbaum, 'Change and Continuity in Jewish Life' (*The Jews*, 509-14). As among other ethnic groups, among Jews as well, religion is regarded as the channel of survivalism. Abraham G. Duker, *Outline of Comprehensive Introductory Course for Adult Jewish Studies*, 1951, 25; H. B. Grinstein 'Communal and Social Aspects of American Jewish History', *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, XXXIX, 1949-50, 267-282.

³⁴ Max Lerner, *America as a Civilization*, 1957, 714.

³⁵ Morris Ginsberg, *The Jewish People To-day*, Noah Barou Memorial Lecture, 1956, The World Jewish Congress, British Section, London, 1956, 22.

³⁶ Published by The Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel, Jerusalem, 1961.

³⁷ It is the movement of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, followed by Rabbi Y. Halberstamm, the founder of the Kiryat Zanz near Natanya.

³⁸ See Lapide cited above in note 36, p. 129.

³⁹ Herbert Freedman ('They Go Down from Zion', *Congress Bi-Weekly*, 19 Jan. 1959), discussing the question of re-emigration from Israel, makes the following interesting observations: 'No doubt, in addition to specific "Israeli" reasons, other factors come into play. There seems to be a definite atmosphere of unrest all over the world, in international instability which has given rise to large-scale migrations everywhere. The latest demographic yearbook of the

United Nations states that in 1956 alone, 383,000 people emigrated from Italy, 141,000 from Britain, 71,000 from Japan and 64,000 from West Germany. Some of these countries report a similar population influx. The International Committee for European Migration (ICEM), which aids financially and otherwise in the transportation and resettlement of migrants, extended help to 651,000 continental emigrants in the period 1952-7. During 1958 it undertook the transport of 157,000 emigrants. Viewed against this background, emigration from Israel is only part of a larger world picture. But there are, of course, specific Israeli features to account for the phenomenon'. See also on this question Ernest Stock, 'Americans in Israel', *Midstream*, III, 3, Summer 1957, 47 ff.

⁴⁰ Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality* (Boston, 1957), 251.

⁴¹ See on this question Oscar I. Janowsky, 'Question of Loyalty', *Jewish Frontier*, June 1949; J. J. Smertenko, 'Have Jews a Divided Loyalty?', *Harper's Magazine*, Oct. 1949; Hayim Greenberg, 'Patriotism and Plural Loyalties', published in his *The Inner Eye*, 1953, 172 ff.; J. H. Homes, 'Zion and American Jews', *Reconstructionist*, 16 June 1950; Irving Lipowitz, 'Alleged Problem of Dual Loyalties', *Reconstructionist*, 27 May 1949; Oscar Handlin, 'America Recognizes Diverse Loyalties', *Commentary*, March 1950; Robert Ernst, 'Concept of Americanism as Reflected in Minority Groups', *Publication of the American Jewish Historical Society*, XLVI, March 1957, 275 ff.

BOOK REVIEWS

JEWISH IMMIGRATION TO ENGLAND

J. Maitlis

(*Review Article*)

SOME eighty years ago the great mass emigration from Eastern Europe to the West started. In its wake it brought about a complete demographic change in the Jewish people. From a predominantly European nation, of whom by the middle of the nineteenth century over 75 per cent lived in Eastern Europe, it became in the course of the last eighty years a non-European, almost an American, nation. A brief comparison of figures offers a first indication of the changed situation:

| | 1840 | 1900 | 1960 |
|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| Europe | 87.8% | 80.9% | 30.80% |
| America | 1.1% | 10.9% | 48.4% |

While the European share in the nation's total population has fallen by some 60 per cent, the American share has increased from a bare 1 per cent in 1840 to over 48 per cent by the middle of this century, thus forming half of the Jewish people.

This process of change, although only clearly visible in the latter part of the nineteenth century, had already begun towards the middle of the century with the first migrations to the West, but assumed unparalleled proportions in the 1880s when millions of Jews shifted from Eastern Europe to the West and overseas and thus caused a turning point in the modern history of the Jewish people. It was not only the destitution and poverty of the Jewish masses which drove them away from their old homes, but above all the political restrictions and economic discrimination to which they were subjected by the various Czarist governments.

The pogroms and the May laws of the 1880s in Russia shook the Jewish spirit to its very foundation and violently disturbed the Jewish community at large. The former belief held by the Jewish intelligentsia in Russia in the salvation of the Jewish problem by enlightenment, emancipation, and cosmopolitanism was completely shattered under the heavy blows of the pogroms. Now sorrow and indignation filled the hearts of

the young, who felt betrayed by the very ideas of liberty and progress. The first reaction to the pogroms was the desire to escape, to seek refuge abroad. A mass movement of unprecedented dimensions had now started and in the wake of it some 120,000 Jews came from Eastern Europe to England and laid the foundation of the Anglo-Jewish community in its present form.

For some time I have been looking forward to a history of East European Jewry, its rise and growth and the impact it has had upon contemporary world Jewry. After all, the Eastern European immigrants were not wholly composed of an element of 'uncivilized' people, beggars as they were sometimes contemptuously called by their more fortunate co-religionists in the West; the immigrants also brought with them a homogeneous Jewish culture, learning, and tradition, and above all a living language, Yiddish, which broadly speaking stimulated and enriched their cultural life in the new countries of immigration. It seems, however, that such a comprehensive study is not yet at hand (at least it has escaped the notice of the present reviewer), but a monograph like the one by Dr. Gartner* is undoubtedly an important contribution to the story of that mass movement of Jews from Eastern Europe which has become a commanding theme in modern Jewish history and which has in the past hundred years completely transformed the social structure and geographical distribution of the Jewish people.

To study the immigrant community in England, and for that matter in any immigrant country, is to understand the social conditions and cultural background from which it came. In point of fact the Jews from Eastern Europe transplanted the 'Shtetel', a social and cultural heritage, trades and a way of life, into the new environment. The Jewish immigrant, poor and culturally backward as he was, had his roots in the past. On the new soil of England there was a continuity in personal and cultural life as well as in economic activity.

It should be observed that nineteenth-century England was to all intents and purposes not a land of immigration. On the contrary, many thousands left the British Isles for Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere; but to the Jews from Eastern Europe, England was a shining vista of great hope and promise. The immigrants fleeing from unspeakable poverty or from persecution in Russia were not received with open arms either by the English working class or by the Jews themselves, the reluctant hosts to impoverished migrants. There were many warning voices from all quarters to stay away. In the country of origin orthodox Jews were on the whole hostile to emigration and probably discouraged pious Jews from leaving. In the West the official leaders felt contempt towards the East European Jews and tried to prevent their settling down. But all this had in fact little effect on the prospective emigrant.

* Lloyd P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England (1870-1914)*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1960.

Oppression and poverty made Russia, or for that matter Austrian Galicia, infinitely worse than England, which in the image of the Jewish immigrant was a haven of freedom and refuge from persecution. Regardless of the untold difficulties and risks, the Jews arrived in their thousands to the friendly shores of Great Britain, some of them to continue the cheaper trans-Atlantic voyage from Liverpool and many of them to remain here. They came, as Dr. Gartner describes it in a moving chapter, exhausted, destitute, prey to scamps and cheats, victims of chicanery and fraud. There is heightened drama in this unique odyssey, the deep tragedy of Jewish wanderings. Even the charity doled out was mostly degrading. It was meant not to help in a constructive way but rather to get rid of the unwelcome immigrant.

To be sure, the Eastern European immigration was a poor one. The earlier German Jewish immigrants, coming from the Polish parts of Germany, formed a more prosperous group of tradesmen and skilled workmen. Many of the new immigrants, however, possessed hardly any vocational skill, and much of their training and experience was quite useless in English conditions. The most important immigrant trade was the making of garments, an old Jewish craft since it was connected with phases of the Jewish ritual. For a time boot and shoe making was nearly as important, but it soon lost ground. Jews were also engaged in some minor trades like furriery, the making of walking sticks and canes, cabinet-making and tobacco. Dr. Gartner notes that tobacco was one of the oldest of immigrant trades. While Dutch Jews were engaged in cigar-making, Eastern European Jews were among the first to make cigarettes in England. The manufacture of cigarettes became an important trade in Glasgow, being introduced there by Jacob Kramrisch, an Austrian Jew who arrived in Britain in 1873.

In examining the many facets of the immigrant community, Dr. Gartner rightly underlines the adaptability and skill of the Jewish worker. He was diligent and willing 'to toil interminable hours, as long as he could find work' (p. 64). His final object was to amass enough experience and some capital to get independence. The Jew worked hard and often under very difficult and exhausting conditions and at a place of work which was popularly decried as the 'sweat-shop'. It was a cramped, dirty workshop where both master and employees worked long hours in extremely insanitary conditions. The open-air hiring system of Jewish labour which took place on Saturdays in Whitechapel Road was also most degrading; masters hired hands for a work week which began Saturday evening or Sunday morning. This open-air market was called with a feeling of hatred and ridicule the 'pig market' (*hazer mark*).

Dealing with the question of work and wages, Dr. Gartner underlines the seasonal nature of Jewish immigrant trade. While there were several full weeks 'of lucrative but exhausting toil in season, two days of work

JEWISH IMMIGRATION TO ENGLAND

per week was the most to be hoped for during the slack period' (p. 95). Dr. Gartner states that a moderately good tailor could expect in theory to earn anything between £2 2s. and £2 8s. a week. In fact, however, there was a wide gap between the wage and the earnings which the worker took home in a week. The great majority of semi-skilled and unskilled workers worked only an annual average of two days or less a week; thus the tailor's weekly average 'take home pay' was only between 14s. and 21s.

But the picture presented by Dr. Gartner and supported by figures and tables seems not to be universal, at least not for some provincial centres. I should like to draw attention to a report from Leeds and published in the *Pojlisher Yidel* (No. 1, 25 July 1884). Describing the working and social conditions of the immigrant Jew in Leeds, a correspondent maintained that they were better by far than in any other industrial town. Most important of all, he states, is the fact that the master paid his workers on time, which apparently was not everywhere the case. Also working conditions were incomparably better than for instance in London or Manchester. There were set times for the worker to start and finish work. As a rule, the report goes on, in Leeds one started work at 8 in the morning and finished at 8 in the evening, with an hour for lunch and half an hour for tea. In summer one finished work on Fridays at 6 in the afternoon and in wintertime at 2. Nothing like it was known, the report underlines, in London, or for that matter in Manchester, where work began at 6 in the morning and went on until it might please the master to call a halt.

It goes without saying that in these difficult working and living conditions there was little time left for any intellectual pursuits. Culturally therefore England was hardly touched by the early Eastern European immigrants. The Jew who arrived in England had generally some Jewish education but, as Dr. Gartner rightly suggests, he was far from being a rabbinic scholar, nor was he much influenced by the ideals of Haskalah, which played an important role in Central and Eastern Europe. The immigrants came mostly from small towns and villages, 'places where the traditional way of life was slowest to weaken'. Their language was Yiddish and their intellectual environment, 'circumscribed by traditional Jewish life and thought', was narrow and parochial.

Hebrew writers like Joseph Hayim Brenner, Uri Nissan Gnessin, and, foremost among them, Achad Haam, who arrived in London in 1907, could hardly find any common language with this mass of people who had no sense for any creative effort. Brenner's pain and indignation, his sarcasm and ridicule, provide clear evidence of the spiritual conditions which he found on the London scene at the beginning of the century. Evidence of a low cultural standard among the working population comes also from other sources. People, complained the already mentioned report from Leeds in the *Pojlisher Yidel*, were ignorant. They were

not interested in any cultural pursuits, only in races. They did not *know* English, and Yiddish they did not *want* to know. On the other hand he recalled that the synagogues and private assemblies were crowded with worshippers—a sign of some active religious life.

A special section of Dr. Gartner's scholarly work deals with the important part England has played in the development and furtherance of Jewish socialist thinking, trade unionism, and the establishment of a flourishing press in Yiddish. The editor of the first Hebrew socialist journal *HaEmet* which appeared in London in 1877, was Aaron Lieberman, a writer of the Hebrew Enlightenment, who was deeply concerned with the social problems and working conditions of the Jewish masses. Another socialist leader, Morris Winchevsky, came to London in 1879 and together with E. W. Rabinowitz published the first Yiddish socialist newspaper *Der Pojlisher Yidel* in 1884. Others like Philip Krantz, B. Feigenbaum, and Kalman Marmer, as well as the poet Morris Rosenfeld, were active in London and later moved on to America. It is well worth underlining the fact that the initiative in the field of socialist activity and trade unionism came from England but the socialist tradition was later continued on a much larger scale in America.

By his painstaking research Dr. Gartner has presented us with a thorough study of high scholarly attainment into the intricate and complex problems of the early period of Eastern European immigration to England. In the years between 1870 and 1914 over 120,000 Jews came from Eastern Europe to the British Isles and helped to create the new social and cultural pattern of the Anglo-Jewry of today. But the history of Jewish immigration to England is far from being complete. An important chapter on the following period between the two World Wars, with no less drama than the former one, is still awaiting its master-writer. Let us hope that we shall soon be presented with a similar work of high scholarship and lucid writing which will cover this significant and momentous epoch.

JEW S UNDER ITALIAN FASCISM

Daniel Carpi

(Review Article)

IN SURVEYS of the history of the holocaust in Europe, and of the years preceding it, the place of Italian Jewry has not so far been evaluated.¹ Although this was one of the smallest of the European Jewish communities, its life became involved in the contemporary period just through its relations with the Fascist regime and, subsequently, during the German occupation, with events of a more general nature which overstepped their narrow local boundaries and which merit the attention of the historian.

R. De Felice's work* has now come to fill the gap; in his compass of the general scene and the mass of literary and historical material which he employs, and in the scope of his survey of the period under review (the first half of the present century), the author has eminently succeeded in filling the vacuum. It is no coincidence that the book has already been widely acclaimed in academic circles, the press, and among the public. Only a few months after its publication the first edition was sold out and a second has made its appearance.

The author is a young Italian historian, known until now principally for his work on Italian Jacobitism. On Jewish history De Felice, as far as we know, has published only three articles. Two of them deal with the history of the Jews of Rome at the time of the French Revolution and during the rule of Napoleon,² and only in the third, on Catholic-Jewish relations during the years 1880-1945,³ does De Felice touch on contemporary events.

Unlike most historians of the holocaust, Dr. De Felice had no connexion with these events, nor could he have been affected by their horrors: he is a Catholic; he comes from a town where there is no Jewish community and, if one may judge from his age, it is hardly likely that he was able to play an active role in one or the other of the opposing camps during the war. These considerations and the fact that the author is not familiar with the special problems of Jewish history, are evident in this survey, both in his method of research and in the conclusions drawn. On the one hand, there is a desirable detachment

* Renzo De Felice, *Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo*, ed. Einaudi, Torino, 1961, pp. xxxix + 697, L. 6,000.

on the part of the author from his subject, his study being based on an analysis of the source material without the obtrusion of personal recollections. But on the other hand, the central theme of the book, Italian Jewry, remains disconnected from the framework of general Jewish history, and as a result—placed as it is in the context of social change and national politics—emphasis is laid on the part played by these events which had a direct influence in shaping Italian politics and society, whereas the 'history of the Jews in Italy' is confined in the main to a discussion on the general attitude towards them.

The book follows a chronological order. It is divided into two parts totalling eight chapters, extending over 700 pages. It includes a foreword by the historian D. Cantimori, and there are 136 pages of documentary material, some of which is brought to light for the first time. The two parts are divided more or less equally and the author has divided the period into two parts: the first covers the period from 1922 to 1937, and the second, from 1938 to 1945. The alliance with Germany and the beginning of the 'racial measures' in Italy in 1938 are the dividing line.

In the first part of the book, therefore, De Felice considers the period in which no outstanding events occurred to mark the attitude of the Fascist regime towards the Jews. The author begins with an analysis of the ideological and pragmatistical positions of the Italian national movements—and that of the Fascist movement in its beginnings—in regard to the growth of modern antisemitism before the influence of political considerations had yet been felt by these movements, and for which they as yet held no responsibility.

In this survey De Felice demonstrates his expert and deep knowledge of the documents of the period. The reader is treated to a comprehensive and penetrating analysis which, for the first time, lays bare the sociological and ideological roots of subsequent Fascist antisemitism.

In the second and third chapters De Felice shows how, with the Fascists' rise to power and their assumption of the burden of responsibility for the conduct of home and foreign affairs, antisemitic pressure was considerably lessened; this was also true with regard to the other national movements which joined them. The Government needed the Jews in certain spheres (or at least found it convenient to make use of them) and refrained from openly making difficulties for them. This is expressed, among other things, in the promotion of a law to regularize the organization of the Jewish communities, and could be seen even more clearly after the Nazis had come to power in Germany. Then in 1933-4, when relations between the two totalitarian regimes were deteriorating, Mussolini appeared quite cordial towards the aspirations of some of the Jewish and Zionist leaders and afforded them practical support.

The official attitude towards the Zionist movement and the social and

political leanings of Italian Jews in their various organizations and institutions are examined in the fourth and fifth chapters of the book. Here the author evaluates the place and social significance of the various Jewish organizations. In this survey it would seem that the role of the Zionist movement has been underestimated, while that of the 'Union of the Italian Jewish communities' and of the Jewish Fascist group of Turin has been given too much weight. Of course the right of the historian to weigh up the various factors and to give prominence to one rather than to the other is not in question. However, we think that the learned author is mistaken in his judgment, and that he underestimates the importance and stature of the Zionist movement and its various trends as compared with the other organizations and movements which, perhaps, appeared to carry greater weight or to be more authoritative, but lacked social significance and made no real impact. In the same chapter 5 which concludes the first part of the book the author takes up his survey of the general political scene and discusses the various factors which led in 1937-8 to a turning point in Fascist policy towards the Jews. In a convincing analysis of the situation De Felice stresses the decisive influence of the pact with Germany and to the implementation of racial measures in Italy, even though in fact there was no overt evidence of German diplomatic interference in this matter (pp. 222 et seq.).

At the end of this first period therefore there is in effect a return to the beginning: the evidence which the author adduced at the opening of the book in his analysis of the antisemitic roots that were inherent in the national movements and at the birth of the Fascist movement; and the tactical reasons that for a number of years had restrained the Fascist Government from pursuing an anti-Jewish policy fitted in perfectly with the description of the 1938 outbreak of racial antisemitism at a time when the exigencies of foreign policy had changed and enabled the Fascist leadership to act in accordance with its principles and inclinations.

In the second part of the book De Felice considers the period between 1938-45. The first two chapters, comprising over 200 pages, deal with the 'preparatory' antisemitic policy, the promulgation of the Fascist racial measures and the position taken up by the various social groups: writers, artists, journalists, politicians, Fascist party leaders, and the Catholic clergy with regard to the implementation of this policy. The eighth chapter of the book, less than 30 pages, deals with the holocaust in 1943-5.

In this section also both the merits and the shortcomings of the first half of the book make themselves felt. While the author is considering the events of national, social, and political significance, he illustrates them with a wealth of documentary and literary material and

gives a penetrating analysis. But the discussion of Jewish subjects is incomplete, and at times even his choice of source materials is not entirely convincing.

Even if we dismiss the comparatively minor shortcomings, it is difficult not to feel surprised at the very limited space accorded to the period of the holocaust, both quantitatively—less than thirty pages in a book of several hundred—and, in particular, with regard to the author's evaluation of its importance in the contemporary history of Italian Jewry.

It would appear that in this final part of the book there are also strong reasons for dissenting from the author's views and conclusions.

Right at the beginning of the book De Felice quite casually states his general historical premise: 'The history of the Jewish people in the Diaspora is a true reflection of the history of the people among whom they were living' (p. 101). On the basis of this assumption, an assumption which pervades the arguments in the book, the holocaust loses its overall significance; the fact that at that time more than 8,000 Italian Jews lost their lives is diminished in importance by comparison with the hundreds of thousands of Italians who lost their lives in the Second World War.

This is not the place in which to challenge the author's assumption concerning the relation of Jewish history to general history; he himself does not reveal by which criterion he makes this categorical statement. But we may ask: would twenty years in the life of a tiny Jewish community, in itself socially and politically insignificant, merit so much close scrutiny were it not for the twenty fateful months (September 1943–April 1945) in which the Jews of Italy were torn away from this narrow local environment, from its laws and special ways of life and thrown violently into the whirlpool of the events and forces that were at work among the Jewish Communities throughout Europe? Did not, indeed, the holocaust mark not only the tragic end of 8,000 people, but an event of the greatest historical significance obliging us to reconsider the whole of contemporary history in a completely new light?

De Felice the historian does not touch on these problems or, perhaps, he ignores their existence. In either case, the tide of events in the period of the holocaust deserves further study and evaluation.

In addition to general written documentary sources—handwritten documents, memoirs, legal documents, etc.—the author has employed to good effect the most varied archival material. De Felice used at least four archives: The Central State Archives (which included the files of the Prime Minister's office), the files of the Foreign Office, the archives of the Union of Jewish Communities and those of the Jewish Community in Rome. From among the records of these institutions the author draws on an abundance of material which amplifies our knowledge of the period and enables us to make a fresh assessment of a

number of problems. His care in supplying documentary evidence as far as possible is shown in the appendix to the book in which 37 complete original documents are published. While there is not much point in dwelling on the choice (although one might express regret that the author has included too many legal documents or parts of books or other material which have already been published and are therefore known) it is nevertheless astonishing that all the documents are published in the appendix without an indication of the source from which they were taken, or of the archives in which they are kept. The diligent reader may discover the source from which the quotations were taken in the main body of the book, and may be able to identify most of them by comparing them with the documents in the appendix. But what about the others?

In so comprehensive a book it is not surprising that there are a number of slight errors in the spelling of names, transcription of Hebrew words, etc. Likewise we may point to the absence of names or events that should have been mentioned. Such flaws, or others, could be remedied in subsequent editions of the book and do not detract from the author's achievement. There is no doubt whatsoever that we have here an important and comprehensive work of research. The many scholars who will have recourse to it, among them those who may not entirely agree with the author's conclusions, will find much material for the understanding of important, but hitherto obscure problems which have here been elucidated for the first time.

NOTES

¹ Although E. Momigliano, *Storia tragica e grottesca del razzismo fascista*, Milan, ed. Mondadori, 142 pp., had already been published in 1946, the author's intention had been to give a general survey only of the period; he did not study it in detail.

² 'Gli ebrei nelle Repubblica romana del 1798-99', *Rassegna Storica del Risorgi-*

mento, Roma, XL (1953), n. 3;—'Per una storia del problema ebraico in Italia alla fine del XVIII secolo e all'inizio del XIX', *Movimento Operaio*, Milano, VII (1955), n. 5.

³ 'Chiesa cattolica clericali ed ebrei...', *La Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, XXII (1956), n. 11; XXIII (1957), n. 1.

SHORTER NOTICES

JULIUS CARLEBACH, *The Jews of Nairobi 1903-1962*, 90 pp., published by the Nairobi Hebrew Congregation, 1962, 15s.

In June 1962 Nairobi Jewry celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the foundation stone for the first synagogue to be built in that city—indeed, the first in East Africa. This book, by the Minister of the Nairobi Hebrew Congregation, was written in honour of that occasion. It provides a fascinating glimpse of the relations of East African Jews with each other, and between them and their non-Jewish neighbours.

The news in 1903 that H.M. Government was prepared favourably to entertain proposals for the establishment of a Jewish colony in East Africa—provided no portion of the administrative expenses would fall on H.M. Government—produced a storm of protest among Europeans in Nairobi. For example, Lord Delamere, the leader of the British settlers, cabled *The Times*, 'Feelings here very strong against introduction of alien Jews. . . . Flood of people of that class sure to lead to trouble with half-tamed natives jealous of their rights. . . .' Again, at 'the largest meeting of white men that has been held in Nairobi', the chairman declared that he knew it had been proved that Jews rendered themselves obnoxious to the people of every country they went to and he was sure that they would only turn out a hindrance instead of a help in British East Africa. Another speaker, who claimed expert knowledge of the Jew, warned that the natives would soon recognize that Jews 'were not white men according to their own ideas and would be influenced by them and their low code of morals'. Finally, it was resolved unanimously 'that this meeting, representing existing settlers, protests strongly against proposals locating alien Jews in their midst and are prepared to resist the same by all means in their power' (pp. 17, 18).

Nevertheless, to some Jews East Africa sounded attractive. A few arrived in 1903. A congregation was formed in 1904. By 1961 membership of the Nairobi Hebrew Congregation stood at 163. From 1955-57 the office of Mayor of Nairobi was held by a Jew.

Somewhat surprisingly, considering the protests against the proposed Jewish settlement, early Jewish arrivals encountered but little antisemitism. This appears to have been due to the incongruity between the mental image of the obnoxious Jew and reality. As the author explains, absence of antisemitism 'was undoubtedly due to the fact that all the early Jews came not as pedlars or traders but as artisans who were essential to the general community' (p. 24). True, there has been 'closing (*de facto* if not *de jure*) of social clubs to Jews, no matter how high on the social scale they may have been', but this has been 'studiously ignored' by the community (p. 11).

Nairobi Jews did much to help their persecuted co-religionists in Europe. Nowadays Israel is the focus of charitable endeavour—though solidarity with Israel, the author implies, might lead to Jews being regarded as Asians rather than as Europeans. 'Israel is in Asia', he reminds us; and he relates, somewhat resentfully, that 'A hostile official in an East African Education Department is reported to have ruled that Israeli-born children of European parents should attend an Asian school' (p. 15).

Some of the Jews of Nairobi 'have remained strongly attached to the community, others grew up indifferent but retaining their ethnic identification, whilst yet a third group has moved away positively from the community, becoming either openly hostile or simply refusing to maintain contact'. And yet, it seems that the problems arising from intermarriage are more easily coped with by practising Jews than by 'families totally unobservant and hostile or indifferent to religious practice' (pp. 12-13). It is an intriguing situation (by no means confined to Kenya) which ought to be investigated.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Though this book is not primarily written for the sociologist, the latter will find reading it a stimulating experience. Some specialized sociological thinking about small, isolated Jewish communities is urgently required, and this book provides an admirable point from which to begin.

SCHIFRA STRIZOWER

HEINZ MAUS, *A Short History of Sociology*, 226 pp., Philosophical Library, New York, 1962, \$6.

A collection of names is not in itself a bad thing; but the value of such a catalogue depends partly on how much detail it contains and partly on the classification it uses. As a catalogue of names this book is deficient enough, both in coverage and content. What will the reader make of the bare statement 'Knud A. Wieth-Knudsen is regarded as a demographer' (p. 192)? Other entries are often little more informative; for example, John Millar's book is cited, but we are not told why it was 'remarkable': we are informed that Vico thought that all human civilizations pass through three main stages, but we are not told what these are. Not all the entries are so defective; there are fuller discussions of Marx and Durkheim, but this kind of treatment is rare.

As a classification the value of the book is even more dubious. The book is divided into three parts: the development of Social Theory up to the First World War; Sociology in Modern Times; and World-wide Sociology. Why the last two parts should be separated is not clear, except that the second part includes North American and the third part South American sociology. The treatment is chronological rather than analytical, and though historical influences are occasionally indicated they are demonstrated too slightly.

It seems to me that the purpose of this book is uncertain: the non-specialist will find it too inclusive without gaining a picture of how traditions have developed and schools of thought emerged; the specialist will find the treatment too superficial. Some of the references will be helpful to the beginner, especially in placing some lesser known figures. But as a whole the book lacks structure; it is an unsatisfactory catalogue, not a history.

I. C. CANNON

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Books listed here may be reviewed later*)

- Beilner, Wolfgang: *Christus und die Pharisäer*, Exegetische Unterwuchung über Grund und Verant der Auseinandersetzungen, Verlag Herder & Co., Wien, 1959, xi + 271 pp., n.p.
- Ben-Horin, Meir, Weinryb Bernard D., Zeitlin, Solomon (edited by): *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, for the Dropsie College, Philadelphia, 1962, 649 pp., n.p.
- Braham, Randolph L.: *The Hungarian Jewish Catastrophe*, A Selected and Annotated Bibliography, Yad Washem Martyrs' and Heroes' Memorial Authority, Jerusalem & YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York Joint Documentary Bibliographical Series No. 4, New York, 1962, 86 pp., n.p.
- Catane, Moché: *Les Juifs dans Le Monde*, Editions Albin Michel, Paris, 1962, 316 pp., 12 N.F.
- Filler, Louis: *A Dictionary of American Social Reform*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1963, 854 pp., \$15.00.
- Hausner, Richard & Hephzibah: *The Fraternal Society*, The Bodley Head, London, 1962, 221 pp., 21s.
- Hay, Malcolm: *The Prejudices of Pascal Concerning in Particular The Jesuit Order and The Jewish People*, Neville Spearman, London, 1962, viii + 136 pp., 21s.
- Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion: *Nelson Glueck—A Bibliography*, 1962, n.p.

PAUL GLIKSON

- Hessing, Siegfried (ed.): *Spinoza-Dreihundert Jahre Ewigkeit*, Spinoza-Festschrift 1632-1932, 2. Vermehrte Auflage, Martinus Nijhoff, Den Haag, 1962, xxxiv + 205 pp., 24 guilders.
- Infield, Henrik F. (ed.): *Essays in Jewish Sociology, Labour and Co-operation in Memory of Dr. Noah Barou 1889-1955*, Thomas Yoseloff, London, New York, 1962, xiii + 167 pp., 30s.
- Kohn, Jacob: *Evolution as Revelation*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1963, 171 pp., \$3.75.
- Marshall, T. H.: *Sociology at the Crossroads and other essays*, Heinemann, London, 1963, ix + 348 pp., 30s.
- Patterson, Sheila: *Dark Strangers A Sociological Study of the Absorption of a Recent West Indian Migrant Group in Brixton, South London*, Tavistock Publications, London, 1963, xvi + 449.
- Perry, Thomas W.: *Public Opinion, Propaganda and Politics in Eighteenth Century England—A Study of the Jew Bill of 1753*, Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1962, 46s.
- Popper, Karl R.: *Conjectures and Refutations, The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1963, 412 pp., 55s.
- Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme Français*, Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris, 1962, 18 N.F.
- Roland, Charlotte: *Du Ghetto A L'Occident*, Deux Générations Yiddishes en France, Préface de Louis Chevalier, Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris, 1962, 19.50 N.F.
- Spinoza, Baruch: *Hebrew Grammar* (Compendium Grammaticae Linguae Hebraeae), Philosophical Library, 1962, 152 pp., \$4.75.
- Strizower, S.: *Exotic Jewish Communities*, Thos. Yoseloff—Popular Jewish Library, London, 1962, 157 pp., 7s. 6d.
- Umen, Samuel, *Jewish Concepts and Reflections*, Philosophical Library, 1962, 190 pp., \$3.75.
- Umen, Samuel: *Pharisaism and Jesus*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1963, 145 pp., \$3.75.

CHRONICLE

Prepared by

Paul Glikson

According to the latest official figures published in Moscow, there are only 14,000 Jews in Biro-Bidjan. The number has declined considerably since before the war, when it was reported that there were more than 30,000 Jews living in the 'Jewish autonomous region'.

The Jews form today only 8.8 per cent of the total population of Biro-Bidjan. No reason was given for the decline, but it may be presumed that a number of the younger generation moved out to settle in larger towns and cities.

★

Yiddish is the mother-tongue of less than one in three Canadian Jews according to the findings of the 1961 Canadian census of population.

This represents a decline compared with the figures for 1951 when it was established that half of the total Jewish population in Canada claimed Yiddish as their mother-tongue. The percentage of those who reported Yiddish as their mother-tongue was 95 per cent in 1931, and 76 per cent in 1941.

According to these statistics, 82,448 out of 254,368 Jews claimed Yiddish as their mother-tongue compared with 103,953 in 1951. The greatest proportion of Yiddish-speaking Jews is in Winnipeg (44 per cent).

★

Between the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948 and the end of 1961 about 500 people a year left Argentina for Israel, most of them pioneers who established themselves in *kibbutzim*. In 1962 the character of Argentina's emigrants began to change. Instead of young pioneers going individually or in non-family groups, whole families began to move out. The uncertain conditions, political and economic, and

CHRONICLE

the ensuing rise in antisemitism led to an increase in emigration, totalling about 1,000 in 1962. The trend continues sharply upwards. Many families, mostly middle-class, began to sell out and prepare to go to Israel. Some 2,000 persons left in the first months of this year.

*

A report on the problems of prejudice in Protestant religious education in the United States made by Yale University Divinity School showed that 43 per cent of the school lessons of one Protestant denomination contained variations on the theme that the Jews were responsible for Christ's crucifixion.

These findings were contained in a study by Dr. Bernard D. Olson, *Faith and Prejudice*, a part of a seven-year study carried out by the Divinity School to determine how Catholics, Jews, and Negroes are portrayed in Protestant educational literature.

Protestant educational material displays a wide range of treatment of those subjects which are most telling in their effect on Jews. One denomination cautioned its students that feelings of hate and acts of violence against Jews 'have a long history; their roots are deep and widespread'. Citing the crucifixion story, the denomination asserted that the Jews have been accused of 'having killed the Son of God. Such an accusing attitude towards the Jewish people is surely not a fitting part of the Christian gospel.' While many denominations carry variations of the same attitude, 'refutation of the charge is also found in all curricula but one'. Some text books, according to the study, refer to Jews and Judaism without distinguishing between Biblical times and the present day; and statements made about Jews in the first century tend to be carried into the present, applying to all Jews.

*

Allocations of \$10,059,644 for 1963 programmes aiding 170,000 Nazi victims in thirty-two countries, were granted by the Board of Directors of the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany. These allocations will raise to \$100,000,000 in all the sums granted by the Conference since 1954.

The major components of the budget are as follows: \$7,757,637 for relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement, of which \$7,000,000 is earmarked for programmes in Europe and Australia; \$1,917,757 for cultural and educational reconstruction, and \$384,250 for other expenditures. The allocation of \$7,000,000 for Europe and Australia is to be administered by the American Joint Distribution Committee which will supplement this sum by \$2,290,000 received from other sources and bring to \$9,290,000 the funds expended for these programmes. Allocations of \$1,917,757 will aid five major programmes in Jewish cultural and educational reconstruction. They include education, research and publication, scholarships and fellowships, Yeshivot and rabbinical seminaries, and the commemoration and documentation of the Jewish catastrophe in Europe.

*

Jerusalem has absorbed 100,000 immigrants since the establishment of the State of Israel, and its population now is 180,000 as compared with the 60,000 who remained in the capital after the lifting of the siege in 1948.

46 per cent of Jerusalem's labour force is employed in secretarial and clerical situations in Government, and national institutions, 17 per cent in industry, 22 per cent in various services; the remainder in transport and other works. The Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Mordecai Ish-Shalom, called for governmental aid to bring the city's population to 250,000 in the course of the next few years.

Over 6,000 persons from Western countries settled in Israel in 1962: 1,433 from North America, 1,262 from Latin America, 1,401 from Western Europe, 68 miscellaneous, and 1,863 tourists who decided to settle.

The Executive of the Jewish Agency decided that all immigration activities abroad will be combined in to one unit, as the first step towards the establishment of a central authority to deal with newcomers from the lands of free emigration.

A 'chief emissary for immigration' will direct the activities of emissaries of the various Jewish Agency departments and only one central file will be opened for each potential immigrant.

PAUL GLIKSON

The Jewish Agency Absorption Department allocated 14,830 dwelling units to new immigrants in 1962. These included more than 1,700 units built especially for large families.

Of last year's immigrants, 53.2 per cent were sent to development areas; 34.7 per cent to the coastal plain; 2.9 per cent to collective or co-operative farm settlements, and 0.6 per cent to Youth Aliya institutions. The balance were taken care of by their relatives.

*

According to official census figures for 1954 and 1961, the movement of the Jewish population in Australia was as follows:

| | 1954 | 1961 |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Victoria | 29,924 | 33,335 |
| New South Wales | 24,026 | 26,673 |
| Queensland | 1,334 | 1,494 |
| South Australia | 985 | 1,095 |
| West Australia | 2,782 | 3,090 |
| Tasmania | 150 | 116 |
| Northern Territory | 23 | 26 |
| Capital Territory (Canberra) | 111 | 122 |
| Total | 59,335 | 65,951 |

*

The Jewish community in Ethiopia consists of four separate entities living quite distinct lives with little or no contact between them; the Falashas or Black Jews, who are indistinguishable from the ruling Amhara race; their centre is near Gondar the ancient capital of the country where they live a simple rural life. Another section consists of immigrants from Aden and Yemen, numerically small but playing an important role in Ethiopia's commercial life. Then there are some 450 Israelis, many of them sent on special missions of technical assistance by the Israel Government. Finally, a group of European victims of Nazi persecution, mostly professionals, who found refuge in Ethiopia.

*

A Survey of Jewish Day and Supplementary Schools in Western Continental Europe prepared by the Department of Education of the American Joint Distribution Committee shows that despite intensive efforts by Jewish communities throughout Western Europe only one quarter of the estimated Jewish children of school age is receiving a Jewish education. While there has been an increase of 10 per cent in the number of those children since the last survey in 1959, only 6,000 are attending Jewish day schools. In recent years school premises have been purchased or built in Athens, Rome, Milan, Strasbourg, Paris, Amsterdam, and Stockholm; plans for new schools are under consideration in Paris and Brussels.

*

Professor Leon Roth who died suddenly in Wellington, New Zealand, on 1 April, was one of the most distinguished contemporary Jewish philosophers. His name is closely connected with the development of the Hebrew University where he held the Ahad Ha-am chair of philosophy from 1928 until 1953, and was a rector in the years 1940 to 1943.

Born in London on 31 March 1896, he was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, where he was marked out as an outstanding philosophy student. Before leaving for Palestine, he was for five years (1923-1928) a Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of Manchester.

During his tenure of the Ahad Ha-am chair, the Philosophy Department of the Hebrew University came to be recognized as one of considerable distinction. Professor Roth was the leading spirit in developing the department along the lines of the British tradition, and did much to foster the spirit of liberalism not only at the university, but also among the Jewish community in Palestine.

CHRONICLE

In 1953 he settled permanently in England but travelled extensively abroad. In 1957-1958 he was visiting professor in the United States, and he also lectured in India, South Africa and in many other countries. During the last years, he concentrated his philosophical reflection on the interpretation of Judaism, lectured frequently on this subject and published a number of outstanding studies, e.g., *Jewish Thought as a Factor in Civilisation* (1954), *God and Man in the Old Testament* (1955), and lastly *Judaism, a Portrait* (1960).

Professor Roth was well known as an historian of philosophy. Among his many publications in this field, the most influential have been, *Spinoza* (1929), *Descartes' Discourse on Method* (1937), *The Guide for the Perplexed: Moses Maimonides* (1948). He was also responsible for a series of translations of philosophical classics into Hebrew. He contributed frequently to many learned journals in England, France and Israel. We were proud to count him among our contributors. The Editors of this *Journal* wish to express their deep regret at the passing of a distinguished scholar.

*

Professor Alfred Métraux, who died in tragic circumstances last April, was one of the most eminent ethnologists of our time. Born on 5 November, 1902 in Lausanne, he was educated at the University of Paris, and was one of the first students at the Institut d'ethnologie. From 1928 to 1934 he directed the newly established Institute of Ethnology at the University of Tucumán, and later held various academic appointments in the United States, Mexico and France. In recent years he lectured at the Collège de France, and held the chair of South American anthropology at the Ecole pratique des hautes études in Paris where until the end of 1962 he was director of studies.

In 1934/1935 he headed the Franco-Belgian expedition to Easter Island; he also did field work among many Indian tribes in various Latin American countries. From 1948 until 1950 he was the acting director of UNESCO's Pilot Project in Haiti.

His numerous publications include, *La civilisation matérielle des tribus tupi-guarani* (1928), *La religion des Tupinamba et ses rapports avec celles des autres tribus Tupi-Guarani* (1928), *Introduction à la connaissance de l'Île de Pâques* (1935), *Myths and Tales of the Matak Indians from the Chaco, Argentina* (1939), *The Ethnology of Easter Island* (1940), *The Native Tribes in Eastern Bolivia and Western Matto Grosso* (1942), *Myths and Tales of the Toga-Pilaga Indians* (1948), *L'Origine des Indiens de l'Amérique* (1951), *L'Île de Pâques* (1951), *Voodoo* (1959), etc.

From 1950, Professor Métraux was a distinguished member of UNESCO's Secretariat, active as a programme specialist in charge of racial questions in the Department of Social Sciences. Under his direction UNESCO published two valuable series of pamphlets, 'The Race Question in Modern Science', and 'The Race Question and Modern Thought' aiming at a better understanding between races and creeds. In this connexion he worked closely with the World Jewish Congress which presented UNESCO with two studies included in these series, *Jewish Thought as a Factor in Civilisation* by Leon Roth, and *The Jewish People* by Harry L. Shapiro.

The Editors of this *Journal* wish to express their deep regret at the untimely passing of an eminent scholar and international civil servant.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

ATTAL, Robert, see 'Notes on Contributors', Vol. II, No. 1.

BOAS, Henriette, Ph.D.; teacher of Greek and Latin at Het Nieuwe Lyceum (Hilversum) and Maimonides Lyceum (Amsterdam). Correspondent of *The Jewish Chronicle* (London), *The Jerusalem Post*, *Ha'aretz* (Tel Aviv). Publications: *Aeneas' Arrival in Latium* (Ph.D. thesis) 1938; *Het Midden Oosten in Overgang* 1947; compiler of *International Bibliography on the History of Religions* for the years 1952-6.

CARPI, Daniel, B.A., M.A. (The Hebrew University, Jerusalem); Secretary, The Historical Society of Israel. Publications: 'The Catholic Church and Italian Jewry under the Fascism' in *Tad Washem Studies* (Vol. IV, 1960), 'Il Problema

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

ebraico nella politica Italiana fra le due guerre mondiali' in *Rivista di Studi Politici Internazionali* (vol. XXVIII, 1961), 'Le Premeise Giuridiche e l'ordinamento amministrativo della Comunione Israelitica di Padova nel sec. XIX' in *Scritti in Memoria di F. Luzzatto*, Rome, 1962.

DAVIS, Moshe, B.S., B.J.P., Rabbinical Ordination 1942, M.H.L., Ph.D.; Head, Institute of Contemporary Jewry; Visiting Professor, Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Co-Director, American Jewish History Centre (Jewish Theological Seminary of America); Provost and Assoc. Professor in American Jewish History, Jewish Theological Seminary of America (on leave since 1959); Vice-President, American Jewish Historical Society; Executive Member, Israel Historical Society. Formerly Dean, Teachers Institute and College of Jewish Studies, Jewish Theological Seminary (1945-51); Louis LaMed Award in Hebrew Literature (1953), Guggenheim Fellow (1956). Publications: *Yahadut Amerika Be-hitpatchutah*, New York, 1951; 'Religious Life and Institutions in America' in *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion* (ed. by Louis Finkelstein), New York, 1960; Editor *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Vols.*, Vol. I—Hebrew, Vol. II—English, New York, 1953; ed. *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*, New York, 1956; ed. (with Isidore S. Meyer) *The Writing of American Jewish History*, New York, 1957; *The Emergence of Conservative Judaism*, Philadelphia, 1963; co-editor (with Salo Baron and Allan Nevins) of Regional History Series of the American Jewish History Centre. Current research: Problems in the study of Contemporary Jewry; the Jewish tradition in America; America and the Holy Land.

MAITLIS, Yaakov J., see 'Notes on Contributors', Vol II, No. 1.

NEUFELD, Edward, M.A., LL.M., Ph.D., D.Litt.; Rabbi, Ahavas Israel Congregation, Grand Rapids, Mich.; member of National Executive Council, Zionist Organization of America; member of National Executive Council, American Joint Distribution Committee; governor of the Herzliyah Hebrew Teachers Institute in New York. Author of: *Ancient Hebrew Marriage Laws*, London, 1944, 'The Status of the Male Minor in Talmud' in *Revue Internationale du Droit de l'Antiquité*, VI, 1951; *The Hittite Laws*, London, 1951; 'The Rate of Interest and the Test of Nehemiah 5: 11' in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1954; 'The Prohibitions against Laws at Interest in Ancient Hebrew Law' in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 1955; 'Socio-Economic Background of Yobel and Semitta' in *Rivista Degli Studi Orientali—Scuola Orientale nella Università di Roma*, 1958, etc.

PERES, Jochanan, B.A., M.A. (Economics and Sociology); research assistant, Dept. of Sociology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; formerly instructor at the Berl Katzenelson Institute for Study and Research, Zoffit, Israel. Publications: 'Reaction to the Eichmann Trial in Israel' (with Dr. S. Herman and Mr. E. Jachtman) in *Scripta Hierosolymytana*, 1963; 'The General Assembly in the Kibbutz' (in Hebrew) in *Ovnaim*, 1962. At present engaged on a research programme on communicative roles in Israel (teachers and journalists) directed by Professor S. N. Eisenstadt and sponsored by the Ford Foundation; and is taking part in a study on Jewish identity among Israeli youth conducted by Dr. S. Herman of the Centre for Group Dynamics in Jerusalem.

SARON, Gustav, B.A. Hons. (Rand), B.A. (Oxon.), LL.B. (South Africa); General Secretary, South African Jewish Board of Deputies; member of the Editorial Board of *Jewish Affairs*. Formerly lecturer in Classics (1929) and Law (1931) at the University of Witwatersrand; executive member, Society of Christians and Jews in South Africa; joint secretary, International Conference of Christians and Jews held at Oxford, 1946. Publications: joint editor and contributor to *The Jews of South Africa, a History*, Oxford University Press, 1955.

SHERMAN, C. Bezalel; author of *Jewish Communal Organizations in the U.S.*, New York, 1949; *Jews and Other Ethnic Groups in the U.S.*, New York, 1950; *Israel and the American Jewish Community*, New York, 1951. Co-editor (since 1953) of *Yiddisher Kemfer*; managing editor (since 1953), *History of Jewish Labour Movement in the U.S.*