THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME VI NO. 2 DECEMBER 1964

CONTENTS

Chain Migration and Immigrant Groups, with Special Reference to Australian Jewry	*Charles Price*	157
Notes on the Jews of Turkey	*Naphtali Nathan*	172
Patterns of Identification with the Jewish Community in the U.S.A.	*Victor D. Sanua*	190
The Defacement of a Ghetto Exhibition	*H. Lever*	213
Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren	*Paul Vincent*	220
Kurt Blumenfeld on the Modern Jew and Zionism	*Shaul Esh*	232
The Jewish Population of Jerusalem	*O. Schmelz*	243
Book Reviews		
Mr. Memmi on Jewishness and the Jews	*Elie Kedourie*	264
The Jews of Britain under Study	*Max Beloff*	270
Shorter Notices		275
Books Received		285
Notes on Contributors		286
Chronicle		287

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY

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

Annual Subscription (from 1965) £1.8.0 or $4.00 (post free)—Single Copies 15s or $2.25 net

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

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

CHAIN MIGRATION AND IMMIGRANT GROUPS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AUSTRALIAN JEWRY

Charles Price

FOR THE sociologist one of the main interests of migration is the appearance of immigrant groups and communities, oases of old world life in a new environment with manifold and intricate problems of adjustment and assimilation. This intricacy and complexity make sensible generalization difficult, more so if one is dealing with the problem at three levels: adjustment of members of the group to one another; adjustment of members of the group to individuals outside; adjustment of the group itself to outside institutions and organizations. In this complexity one useful method of attack is to examine various ways in which such groups come into being. The three ways discussed here are organized group settlement, gravitation group settlement, and chain migration.

Organized group settlements come into existence when public or private organizations collect venturesome families, arrange their transport, and place them all together in a rural settlement carved out of the forest, prairie, desert, or bush, or in some new industrial enterprise such as a mine, foundry, or textile factory. The character and homogeneity of the group depends on the original selection policy, while its history and problems derive very largely from the administrative programme and capital resources bequeathed it by its sponsors. Many European colonies abroad owed their beginnings to such settlements, but in the modern world, with certain exceptions such as Israel, they are less important.

Gravitation groups appear when persons who are dissatisfied with their organized settlement, or who have come to the new country quite independently, move somewhere where they can find persons speaking the same language or dialect, following the same customs, holding the same political views, or practising the same religion. Such groups are very common amongst refugee peoples, and many of the large Jewish concentrations of America, Britain, and Australia owe their existence to this attraction of like for like.

These two forms of immigrant settlement are well known and well

described. Less attention, perhaps, has been given to the third form, chain settlement, that is, migrant communities that come into being when persons from a particular township or district in one country settle in a particular locality abroad, establish links with their friends and relatives at home, and encourage them through letters, visits, and offers of assistance to join them. In the words of R. A. Lochore, these links then form a 'migration chain', that is, an 'established route along which migrants continue to move over a period of many years'.[1] Lochore gives as illustration a fisherman from Stromboli island who came to New Zealand about 1890, returned home for a visit, and persuaded his brother and later a cousin to join him; these then persuaded other Strombolesi to emigrate and so 'year after year people continued to move along the migration chain, until they built up what was virtually an Italian village in New Zealand'.

It is important to note that these three kinds of group settlement do not necessarily imply that members of the group occupy all or most of a restricted geographical area, as it often did with the rural group settlements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the ethnic group 'bloc' settlements of late nineteenth century American cities. In some cases, especially in these days of telephones and motor cars, rural and urban families need have few dealings with their immediate neighbours but can spend most of their social and leisure time with families who, though in the same general area, are not near neighbours. Immigrants of the same ethnic, political or religious background may be dispersed over a considerable area yet maintain societies, clubs, churches, informal social relationships, and all the other things that go to make a group settlement work as a closely-knit social entity.

In its original sense the term 'chain migration' is slightly different from that of Lochore's usage. It goes back at least to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when thousands of migrants were entering the U.S.A. each year. Officials watching this great movement speedily became aware that one of the major factors involved was the letter to the home-folks written by an enthusiastic settler and containing glowing descriptions of wages and conditions in the New World.

> That letter [said the Commissioner-General for Immigration in 1907] is read by or to every inhabitant of the village, or perhaps even passed on to neighbouring hamlets. Others are thus induced to migrate—selling their belongings, mortgaging their property, almost enslaving themselves to procure the amount of the passage. They come, find employment at what seems to them to be fabulous wages, then write letters home; and so the process goes on and on. . . . These letters constitute the most extensive method of advertising that can be imagined; almost innumerable 'endless chains' are thus daily being forged link by link. [The Commissioner-General also mentioned the influence of the occasional visit home, sometimes even stronger than that of a letter.][2]

This American usage is clearly wider than that of Lochore. First, it covers persons who came out to join a friend or relative but who did not sponsor anyone themselves, in which case the immigrant group might grow no larger than the original pioneer and one or two others. The three Jews from Talsi, Latvia, who followed each other to Broken Hill (New South Wales), in the first decade of this century and there set up as drapers are a case in point; they formed a small Talsi chain, but by no stretch of the imagination could be held to make up the substantial community Lochore has in mind.[3]

Second, the American usage covers persons who were encouraged to emigrate by letters, visits, or assistance from abroad but who did not stay long with those sponsoring them. Soon after arrival they might move away to some new rural, mining, or industrial area, perhaps to wander for many years before firmly planting their roots, and then not necessarily near migrants from the same township or district. This happened with many southern European migrants to Australia and also with a number of those British and German Jews who came to Australia during the gold-rushes of the 1850s and wandered from digging to digging as prospectors or itinerant storekeepers.

These two forms of chain migration cannot be ignored. Recent investigations in Australia suggest that they were responsible for some 23 per cent of southern European immigration in the period 1890–1940. Nor can the other 70 per cent (the residual 7 per cent represents migration outside the chain process) be adequately covered by the Lochore usage. In the Lochore sense, chain migration involves direct movement from the particular township of origin to the particular place of settlement, the migrant establishing himself there in what is virtually an old-world village in a new land. In fact, many immigrant groups have built themselves up in a much less regular way. For example, the first pioneer from the microscopic Greek island of Kastellorizo just off the Turkish coast came to Perth, Western Australia, in the mid 1880s and, after a short visit home, attracted several others to join him. By 1912 there were a hundred and fifty or so Kastellorizans in Australia but not all in the Perth group: some were moving about the gold-fields to the east or the timber-camps in the south-west; others, in small batches of three or four, were fishermen, labourers, or small retailers in various townships up and down the Western Australian coast; yet others had drifted far away to the eastern state capitals of Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney. Then, just before the First World War, development projects at Darwin in the Northern Territory attracted a few Kastellorizans from Western Australia, these being quickly joined by families leaving the home island because of Turkish trade restrictions and bombardments. At the end of the war, work in Darwin ceased and the large Kastellorizan group there split into several sub-groups, some spending a few years as cane-cutters in parts of North Queensland

before drifting south to establish retail stores and restaurants in Brisbane and Sydney, others moving from place to place down the Western Australian coast until they either joined one of the groups nearer Perth —some of these still being itinerant prospectors and labourers in the mining and timber country—or else travelled east to join their former comrades in North Queensland. It was not until the thirties that the Kastellorizan groups of Australia achieved general stability, then as sizable groups in Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane, and smaller groups in a few other places.

During these forty years of flux and change the chain process was continuously at work. Not only were newcomers constantly arriving to join one or other of the existing groups—sometimes just before it moved off somewhere else—but the records show that during these moves one or two persons would go ahead to sound out the new place and then inform their friends whether it was worth their while coming to join them. In this sense internal migration about Australia was just as much part of the chain process as the original migration from Kastellorizo. So also with migrants from the islands and coast of central Dalmatia; these too moved extensively about the Australian continent but some also travelled backwards and forwards between Australia, New Zealand, Chile, and California. In this article subsequent migration of this kind—whether internal or international—is called secondary chain migration.

Secondary chain migration has sometimes been important in Jewish settlement in Australia, particularly between 1850 and 1900 when from 50 to 20 per cent of the Jewish population were outside the metropolitan areas. During these years many British, German, and a few East European Jews opened up stores and hotels in remote country townships, bringing their brothers and friends to join them, with their help moving on to found another business when some new area was opened up. In this way one branch of the Solomons family developed stores and hotels at Cooma, Eden, and Bombala in southern New South Wales, eventually joining forces with a Norwegian whaler at Twofold Bay. Later these extra-metropolitan enterprises dwindled in importance, partly because some families became assimilated into the Gentile world and partly because the growth of metropolitan Jewries drew many small-town and rural families into the capital cities. Nevertheless, even in the 1920s it is possible to trace the movement of small groups of Jews from the one place of origin in and out of mining towns such as Broken Hill or market towns such as Toowoomba.

To keep these various complexities clear, this article uses the term 'chain migration' in the wider usage of the U.S. Commissioner-General —but to include internal as well as international migration—and, within this more general process, uses the term 'chain settlement' to denote those substantial immigrant groups that sometimes result, whether they be from primary or secondary migration.[4]

Chain migration has been one of the most powerful forces in migration history. It completely dominated non-British migration to Australia before 1945—both Jewish and non-Jewish—primarily because passage costs to Australia were high compared with those to the Americas, and intending migrants, unable to obtain a government assistance that was almost exclusively confined to British families, were usually dependent upon help from friends and relatives established in Australia. Even in America, however, chain migration was important. Though migrants might raise fares themselves, or borrow them from benevolent organizations, many were dependent on friends for their first accommodation and jobs. In 1910, for instance, a year that included considerable Jewish immigration from eastern Europe, over 90 per cent of alien arrivals into the U.S.A. declared they had come to join friends and relatives.[5] With these East European Jews chain migration allied itself to the expulsive pressure of persecution to produce one of the great population movements of modern times.

Even without the pressure of persecution chain migration has sometimes produced remarkable results, especially when letters and visits engendered the kind of emigration fever described by the Commissioner-General, eventually catching up wives, children, and aged parents, all ready to join their bread-winning relatives abroad when they realized that in the chain settlements there were sufficient persons from their own family, township or district to enable them to recreate much of their old life and friendships in the new world. The Macedonian village of Antartikon (Zheleva), for instance, in the hills near Florina, has lost so many by emigration to Toronto that the inhabitants now total only a few hundred and many houses are standing empty; there are about two thousand persons of Antartikon origin in Toronto and many of those left in Macedonia have been making efforts to join them.

It is at this point that chain migration is every bit as strong as those schemes of family migration organized by governments. Occasionally, indeed, it has depopulated whole areas. Large-scale emigration to the Americas between 1871 and 1911 reduced the population of numerous places, including many districts of Basilicata and Abruzzi in southern Italy, several islands and districts of Croatia and Serbia, parts of Epirus and the Peloponnesus in Greece; in some cases the population declined to such an extent that cultivated land was either converted to pasture or abandoned altogether, intensive cultivation such as viticulture was given up or converted to something requiring less labour, and villages were left empty or half filled. Chain migration to Australia, though not as spectacular, has contributed to population decline in certain Alpine valleys and in some of the smaller Mediterranean islands.

Frequently, however, the system worked less violently, draining off only a few persons at a time and not affecting the bulk of the local population except insofar as they were the beneficiaries of remittances

from abroad. Whereas in the case of large-scale emigration remittances were often a temporary payment home until arrangements could be made to bring the rest of the family overseas, in the case of slow chain migration remittances sometimes became an established part of the home economy. Some of the townships of the Dalmatian coast established chain links with California and Australia in the 1850s and maintained them until restrictive legislation interrupted immigration to the U.S.A. in the 1920s and emigration to Australia in the 1940s. In some such cases remittance money was regularly invested in improved farm buildings, consolidation of scattered strips, clearing of debts, and various other ways useful to peasant farmers struggling towards the ideal of a debt-free consolidated holding.

In the country of settlement one clear sign of chain migration is the uneven distribution of migrants with respect to their places of origin; that is, they do not come as a broad scatter from each country of origin but as heavy concentrations from those often quite restricted areas where chains have been operating strongly. Moreover, the distribution as between different countries of settlement often varies greatly since some chains set strongly to one country and others to another. For example, in the period 1890–1940 Australia obtained well over 75 per cent of its Greek immigrants from the Greek islands (40 per cent from the three small but prolific islands of Ithaca, Kythera, and Kastellorizo) here contrasting with the U.S.A. and Canada which drew relatively far more from mainland areas such as the Peloponnesus. In the same period Australia obtained almost 80 per cent of its Italian settlers from the Valtellina in the Lombard Alps, certain plateaux and foothills of the Venetian Alps, the Monferrato hills of Piedmont, the Aspromonte district of Reggio Calabria, the Mt. Etna region of North Catania, and the coastal villages of Messina, including the Lipari islands; here contrasting with Canada and the U.S.A. which attracted far more settlers from southern areas such as Basilicata and the Abruzzi. The same holds for smaller areas of origin. Both northern California (San Francisco–Santa Cruz) and Australia attracted migrants from the central and southern Dalmatian coast and islands, but California drew relatively more from Brač island and the Dubrovnik–Konovali district and Australia relatively more from Korčula island and the Makarska district.

The same phenomenon is visible in Jewish migration. South Africa drew far more settlers from Lithuania than did Australia, though a number of Lithuanian Jews did come to Australia, mainly from the towns of Kovno and Vilna. The main East European sources of Australian Jewry in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were: Galatz and Jassi in Rumania; Kalisz, Warsaw, Lodz, and Bialystok in Poland; Riga and Minsk in Latvia and White Russia; Lvow, Kiev, and Odessa in the Ukraine. In the 1930s the flow swung somewhat to

central and western Europe, mainly large towns such as Budapest, Vienna, Berlin, and Hamburg.

Though the source material cannot be pressed too far, it appears that at least half, if not more, of East European Jews settling in Australia came from capital cities such as Warsaw, or from substantial towns such as Lodz, Lublin, or Kovno. In this respect the rural-urban make-up of East European migration to Australia seems somewhat different from that attributed to migration to the United Kingdom.[6]

Another sign of chain migration is the concentration of persons of the one origin in a relatively small number of occupations. This is not a conclusive sign as it may arise from the fact that immigrants who come quite independently may all be driven by economic conditions into the same narrow range of occupations. But when migrants of different origins, but similar skills and training, sort themselves into different occupations according to origin, then it is a sign of chain processes; that is, of the greater ease with which pioneers can place those they sponsor in occupations in which they are themselves established, perhaps in their own farm or business. Thus Kytheran Greeks tended to follow the example of the first Kytheran settler in Australia and concentrate in the fish shop business: conversely, Ithacan Greeks followed their pioneers not only into fish shops but into confectionery and fruit shops. Again, mainland Sicilians from Messina province divided their attention between farming, catering, fishing, mining, and timber cutting whereas their northern neighbours from the Lipari islands concentrated almost exclusively in the fruit shop business and their southern neighbours from Catania almost exclusively in agriculture.

A similar sorting out process is visible amongst first generation Jewish settlers in Australia. Though, by the end of the nineteenth century, there was a general Jewish concentration in finance, general dealing, textiles, and certain skilled trades such as watch-making and cabinet-making, there was a distinct difference between certain birthplaces. Compared with the total Jewish population there were more German Jews in the jewellery and general merchant business, more Rumanian Jews in the fruiterer's trade, more Polish Jews in the textile trade, more Austrian Jews as general labourers. Some of this doubtless arose from previous training—many from Lodz, for instance, had apparently had textile experience in this growing 'Manchester of Eastern Europe'. But the records suggest that the activities of chain sponsors in finding jobs for their protégés also played an important part. In any case previous training and chain migration often go together: an established settler frequently has many friends in the occupation he followed at home, and it is he who can most sensibly write encouraging letters to them about opportunities available for their particular skill in the new country.

The documentary evidence, then, points clearly to the existence of widespread chain migration amongst Jewish settlers in Australia. To

what extent did this migration result in chain settlements, in substantial groups of people from the same town or small district of origin? Clearly Jewish migration to America and Britain often produced groups of immigrants from the same country or region ('region' here referring to an area smaller than the main ethnic-political divisions but considerably larger than a district—for example Lombardy, Friesland, Poznan, Galicia). In London there was a Polish synagogue in Cutler Street as early as 1790, a Dutch synagogue in Sandys Row (1860) and a German synagogue in Spitalfields (1870).[7] In Chicago, even before the great immigration of the eighties and nineties, there had developed one synagogue for the old-established Bavarian Jews, another for the more orthodox Jews from German Poland, another for German Jews from Bohemia, and another for Jews from Latvia.[8]

In Australia, too, there was a sorting out by countries and regions of origin. Between 1881 and 1920 some 45 per cent of German Jews settled in Melbourne and only 21 per cent in Sydney whereas about 45 per cent of Polish Jews went to Sydney and only 25 per cent to Melbourne; likewise Estonian Jews showed a strong preference for Sydney. During the twenties and thirties the trend swung the other way, Polish Jews concentrating heavily in Melbourne while German and Austrian Jews settled in Sydney much more strongly than before. Indeed, in this later immigration Polish Jews carried far more weight in Melbourne than in Sydney, which may go some way to explain the very considerable differences that now exist between the Jewries of the two cities, and also the greater survival of Yiddish culture in Melbourne.

Another interesting concentration is that of Palestinian-born Jews in Perth, they making up nearly 40 per cent of Jewish arrivals in that city during the 1920s; this may partly explain the lively and somewhat unusual character of Perth Jewry. In contrast, Adelaide has always had a preponderance of German and Austrian Jews, which may have had something to do with the relatively high rate of Jewish intermarriage and assimilation into the Adelaide Gentile world.

Concentration by country and region of origin, however, does not necessarily, though it frequently does, denote the workings of chain migration: it may denote the effects of gravitation settlement, the coming together of persons of the same general background, speaking the same language or dialect, practising the same religious customs, not because they knew of each other beforehand but because they heard that an appropriate group existed in a certain place and they wanted to be with people of their own kind. It is often difficult to separate chain and gravitation forces and one has to delve deeply to discover evidence of a family or district sponsorship system or, at least, evidence that numerous families from the one town or district were living in the same general locality in the new country.

Some writers have not so delved and have attributed the results of

chain settlement to gravitation forces.[9] (Likewise chain effects have sometimes been credited to organized group settlement.)[10] With Australian Jewry the evidence for chain settlement is fairly clear. Naturalization and similar records show persons of the same name and birthplace living in the same house or else a few doors away; they also show town and district concentrations in the Jewish areas of both Sydney and Melbourne. Between 1880 and 1920 Latvian Jews from Latgale tended to concentrate in Melbourne whereas other Latvian Jews usually preferred Sydney; Polish Jews from the towns of Lomza and Lodz tended to concentrate in Melbourne, whereas those from Lublin preferred Sydney; and so on.

But the records also show that these concentrations were not solid 'bloc' settlements but were distributed through the Jewish areas. Two or three families from A lived alongside a few families from B who were next to a family from C; then come two or three houses containing settlers from D, the whole being interspersed with a number of Gentile Australian families and a sprinkling of Greek restaurants, Italian cabinet making shops, Slav boarding houses, and the like. It might be several blocks, or even streets, before one found more families from A.

In these conditions, where various chain groups are all intermingled in the one locality of settlement, there arise some problems of great interest to the study of immigrant groups. On the one hand are the forces of home-town friendship and loyalty, drawing together families from the one place of origin. Sometimes they produce no more than informal visiting and family co-operation: at other times they bring forth formal clubs and societies. In part these societies represent the desire of families from the same township or district to formalize their larger meetings and provide supervised occasions when young people may meet the children of families known to their parents. Or they may arise from the anxiety of families adrift in a strange world to form mutual benefit or charitable organizations. And how better to create these than by working with relatives and friends accustomed to helping each other in the chain processes with sponsorship, accommodation, and jobs? Sometimes they go further and take over the task of organizing chain migration itself, raising money which may be lent to a settler anxious to bring out relatives and friends from the home district.

Such local societies abound amongst European immigrants in America and Australia and have been common in certain Jewish settlements in America. The *Landsmannschaften*, or local organizations developed in the 'ghettos' of East Europe, sometimes virtually rebuilt themselves by chain process in the New World, devoting themselves to the interests of families from the original town or village.[11] Similarly a number of the small *minyanim* (prayer meetings) held in private rooms in the slums of East London at the end of the nineteenth century appear

to have been small groups of migrants from the one place in eastern Europe, recreating in London not only the ritual but the congregation to which they were accustomed.

Over against these local separatist forces, however, there exist in areas of mixed chain settlement strong forces working the other way. When chain groups derive from the same country or Folk,[12] speak the same language or dialect, and have many customs in common, there is the strong possibility that Folk interests will eventually create such powerful institutions—social clubs, charitable organizations, political societies, churches, or schools—that local district interests will be overwhelmed, that district organizations may never appear or, if having appeared, will either die altogether or be left as unimportant societies for the preservation of family trees or the arrangement of an annual jollification and clan back-slapping. To some extent this is what happened with the various Bulgarian chain-groups of Adelaide, South Australia, with the Slovene chain-groups of San Francisco, and the Polish chain-groups of Chicago.

But this has not always been so: sometimes, indeed, the reverse. Sometimes a number of pioneers from widely separate districts and regions were thrown together in the early years of settlement and formed small but lively Folk groups. Then the pioneers brought out friends and relatives, chain migration got well under way, and before long the one area contained large numbers of families from diverse districts and villages of origin. This rapid growth of numbers, particularly of wives and children who were often quite uninterested in Folk, political, or cultural affairs, greatly strengthened village and district interests and brought to the surface local differences in social customs and family values which unattached pioneers had tended to overlook in the turmoil of finding a living but were more disposed to notice when their womenfolk joined them.

Occasionally this rapid growth of local interests completely shattered the original Folk group and replaced it by a number of lesser groups linked only by odd ties of pioneer friendship and the occasional Folk newspaper or society. The Slavonic group settlement of San Francisco, quite strong from the 1850s to the 1880s, gradually broke up in this way during later decades. So also in some of the Italian settlements of Australia: here chain migration at times increased so rapidly that Folk loyalties had no sooner raised their head than they were overwhelmed by a mass of district and regional loyalties and interests.

At other times the growth of local chain interests, though not strong enough to shatter the original Folk group, did prove strong enough to convert it into a kind of federation of lesser groups. In central Sydney, before the First World War, a few pioneers from the islands of Kythera, Ithaca, Samos, and the Cyclades, and from the mainland areas of Athens, Volos, and the Peloponnesus, banded together to found a Greek

Orthodox Community with Community premises, church, charitable organizations, and social facilities. From the 1920s onwards, when chain migration was bringing out increasing numbers of women and children, there appeared some active district and regional communities, each expressing itself through an incorporated or unincorporated club or association. There are now thirty or so such organizations, compared with half a dozen pan-Hellenic societies.

In some cases these associations are little more than mutual benefit societies working as subdivisions of the Community and using Community premises. In other cases they are large and wealthy organizations with club premises sufficiently attractive to monopolize the social life of member families and to focus the activities of numerous informal groups and cliques. Since many of these organizations confine full membership to persons who were born in the district or region concerned, or to their descendants, they have been an understandably important agency in keeping settlers from one part of Greece closely tied to each other, in preserving local customs and phrases, and in slowing up intermarriage with other groups.

Much the same has occurred in the Greek communities of Melbourne and Toronto. In all three places some of the district societies have grown so strong that leaders of the Greek Community and other pan-Hellenic organizations have criticized them for encouraging settlers to confine their interests to district concerns, to abstain from participating in pan-Hellenic activities or mixing with other Greeks, and to undermine (in fact, if not by intention) the Folk life of the Greek community; instead of recognizing that they are branches of the Folk tree, the district and regional groups have 'wrongly' taken the view that they are independent seedlings or suckers. So far, because of the strong traditional veneration for the Greek church, the desire of many parents to have their children taught Greek in the evening language schools organized by the Community, the love of educated Greeks for pan-Hellenic culture and history, and the activities of royalist, radical, and other organizations that cut across district interests, Greek Folk loyalties have preserved sufficient unity to enable one to speak of a Greek community that is a federation of district and regional groups. But, as in all federations, there are strains and stresses.

Where, along this line running from town or district dominated settlements to Folk dominated settlements, lie the Australian Jewish chain groups? Before the Second World War Folk interests were clearly in the ascendant. Families and friends undoubtedly saw a good deal of one another, and certainly helped newcomers from the home town. But there were few signs of organized *Landsmannschaften* and little evidence that migrants from the same town or district held small *minyanim* on their own. Admittedly there were prayer-meetings outside the organized synagogues, as for instance those held in the early twentieth century in

Carlton and North Carlton, later to become organized congregations within Melbourne Jewry. Likewise in Sydney there were regular *minyanim* at Newtown from 1883 until a synagogue was opened in 1919, and at Surry Hills for at least ten years before the founding of the Eastern Suburbs Central Synagogue in 1921. The founders of these *minyanim*, however, came from various parts of Germany and eastern Europe and were, it seems, moved by a desire to found congregations nearer their own homes and a desire to have more orthodox services. So far as Jewish institutional life was concerned Folk organizations were the only ones in existence.

This situation derived in part from the residential mixing of chain groups, but also from the relative slowness of Jewish chain migration. In 1861 the Jewish population of Australia, according to the colonial censuses, numbered some 5,500, a little over half being in Sydney and Melbourne. By 1921 it had increased to only 21,600, some 8,700 being in Sydney and 7,000 in Melbourne. Compared with Jewish migration to the U.K. and U.S.A., this was small indeed. In the early twentieth century the two 'ghettos' of Chicago alone contained 35,000 Jews, with many others elsewhere in the city. Large numbers settling in close proximity, many from the same town of origin, made it easier to convert informal family and friendship meeting into the more formal structure of *Landsmannschaften.*

In Australian Jewry this conversion did not take place until much later, after further immigration of East European Jews during the 1930s and 1940s, and then on a small scale only. Though there were signs of *Landsmannschaften* before the war they did not become important until after the mid-forties when persons from half a dozen places in eastern Europe developed formal organizations for bringing to Australia those of their townsfolk who had survived the concentration camps. In Melbourne, which by 1947 contained the largest Jewry (14,000 to Sydney's 12,000), one or two *Landsmannschaften* became quite powerful; that of Bialystok, for instance, bought a large house in Melbourne, converted it into a hostel for new arrivals, and raised funds for the passages and accommodation of refugees whom they nominated through the main Australian Jewish relief organizations. In Sydney, however, with the possible exception of one Hungarian group, *Landsmannschaften* did not operate in the same formal way. Partly as a consequence of this local sponsorship policy, and partly because Melbourne Jewry generally seemed more active in fostering refugee migration, Melbourne gained more than Sydney, in 1961 numbering at least 29,500 compared with Sydney's 23,000.

It is too early to say whether these recent *Landsmannschaften* of Melbourne will develop still further, to such a point that they will survive against the forces drawing their members into the main stream of Jewish life. Probably they will not. First, unlike the Greek district groups,

Jewish chain migration has virtually ceased since the arrival of the refugees in the late forties and early fifties, except for a trickle coming from Israel and a variable stream from the United Kingdom, and the last does not seem particularly interested in local organizations. Second, the Jewish Folk community of Melbourne has numerous Folk institutions that between them engage the attention of divers families, including many involved in the *Landsmannschaften*: newspapers (including Yiddish sections), welfare organizations, Zionist organizations, Men's and Women's societies, etc. Moreover the post-war revival of Jewish schools in Melbourne means that numerous young Jews—in sharp contrast to young Australian-Greeks who have no Greek Orthodox schools apart from evening classes—may attend schools that encourage friendships and loyalties cutting across the diverse places of origin.

It could be argued that there is one deep and possibly enduring division in Australian Jewry that is based on particular place of origin: the religious. For instance, some speak of the Hungarian Jews of Sydney and Melbourne as a separate people, primarily because those Hungarians who are orthodox hold to a stricter form of orthodoxy than many other central and eastern European Jews. It is true that when religious differences are allied to differences of origin the latter may receive such reinforcement that they persist for many generations: German Lutherans may take many generations to become assimilated, as in South Australia, not so much because they are German as because they may be the only Lutherans in a predominantly non-Lutheran country; likewise Greeks may take many generations to become assimilated, not only because they are Greeks but also because they may be virtually the only representatives of Christian Orthodoxy in a country that is predominantly non-Orthodox.

It is too early sensibly to comment on the development of the Jewish Hungarian group; except to say that it is at present unclear whether chain or gravitation forces have been paramount in bringing it into existence. Furthermore, its activities are apparently attracting a number of strictly orthodox Jewish families of other origins; if this continues the group may eventually cease to have much connexion with place of origin and become simply an ultra-orthodox section in the Jewish Folk community.

One thing, however, is clear: the existence of chain groups within a larger Folk group presents immigrant families with complex problems of adjustment and assimilation. They not only have to adjust to the Australian Gentile world but change from the familiar ways of their particular place of origin, as enshrined in their local organization, to the ways of the Australian Jewish Folk community about them. These problems of dual assimilation have sometimes proved difficult for other immigrants; for example, Calabrians and Venetians in the same horticultural areas of Australia, both much more familiar with the dialect

and customs of their own region than with standard Italian and traditional Italian culture, have at times intermarried more with, and generally assimilated more quickly to, British–Australians about them than to one another. With such strong religious and cultural forces embodied in Folk organizations, and with so many Australian Jews agreeing that assimilation into the Gentile world is to be resisted, it seems unlikely that this will happen with Australian Jewish chain groups. The fact that the problem exists, even in a minor degree, nevertheless shows the strength of chain forces even in long-term matters of settlement. Chain forces have, of course, been paramount in the course of migration itself.

NOTES

[1] R. A. Lochore, *From Europe to New Zealand*, Wellington, 1951, p. 24.

[2] Report of the Commissioner-General for Immigration, U.S.A., 1907, p. 60; see also H. P. Fairchild, *Greek Immigration to the United States*, New Haven, 1911, pp. 88, 119.

[3] This Talsi chain, together with much of the other Australian–Jewish historical detail in this article, is mentioned in a recent monograph by Charles Price, *Jewish Settlers in Australia (1788–1961)*, Australian National University, Social Science Monograph No. 23, 1964. The statistics and records referred to in this article are more fully set out, described, and assessed in the monograph. Briefly they are:

(1) Secondary sources, particularly the biographical, statistical, and general articles published in the five volumes of the *Journal of the Australian Jewish Historical Society*.

(2) Colonial and Commonwealth Censuses (Australia) 1861–1961, most of which show religion, usually cross-classified by local government area (county, shire, municipality, etc.) and occasionally by occupation and country of birth. Some Censuses also give religion by age (which indicates size of family) and cross-classify religion of husband and wife (which gives a clue to intermarriage).

(3) Street gazetteers giving name and occupation.

(4) Colonial and Commonwealth Naturalization Records (1850–1947). In the colonial period these usually give village and country of birth, age, date of arrival in Australia, occupation, exact place of residence. In the Commonwealth period there are added details of: names, ages, and birthplaces of wife and children; capacity to read and speak English; length of stay in other countries; other places of residence in Australia with time spent in each (it is this last item that enables one to trace the family, village, or district chain around Australia). These naturalization records were sampled, at a rate varying with the period and nationality but averaging $\frac{1}{2}$, and Jews were identified by name (following the normal pattern of Jewish name-changes) if the records lacked positive evidence such as passport or police statements that the subject was a Jew. The naturalization records provide the bulk of information concerning chain migration—by enabling one to relate name and exact place of birth to exact place of residence and occupation—and the author has found them equally fruitful in North America when working on Greeks in Toronto and Yugoslavs in California.

[4] For a more detailed discussion of these terms and of their importance in migration history and analysis, see Charles Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*, Melbourne 1963. (Some of the material in this article relating to southern Europeans in Australia, Canada, and the U.S.A. is set out more fully in this book.)

[5] *Reports of the Immigration Commission*,

1907–10 (U.S.A.) Washington, 1911, Vol. IV, p. 59.

[6] Lloyd P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870–1914*, London, 1960, p. 241.

[7] Ibid., p. 199.

[8] L. Wirth, *The Ghetto*, Chicago, 1928, pp. 142, 160–9.

[9] E.g. T. C. Blegen, *Norwegian Migration to America*, Vol. 2, Minnesota, 1940, pp. 74 ff., though he does not define his terms precisely, is in effect doing this.

[10] H. Hack, *Dutch Group Settlement in Brazil*, R.E.M.P. Bulletin, Vol. 7, Supp. 4, The Hague, 1959, starts off to discuss organized settlements but his description of particular places, e.g. Carambey colony, makes it clear that he is involved in chain movements.

[11] Wirth, loc. cit.

[12] 'Folk' is the term here used for certain major ethnic groupings. It is preferred to 'race' as that term has so many physical associations. It is preferred to 'nation' or 'nationality' as it avoids difficulties caused by changing international boundaries; by the existence within one state of several distinct and often antagonistic ethnic groupings such as the Serbs and Croats or Czechs and Slovaks; by members of an ethnic grouping living beyond the state wherein are settled the bulk of their ethnic fellows (Egyptian or Cypriot Greeks, for instance). One can also apply the term to peoples that have or had no home state: the Gypsies, Vlachs, Jews, and so on. In a sense it is taking the English word 'folk', already used in a similar sense by some sociologists, capitalizing it, and using it as German does when distinguishing Volksdeutche from Reichsdeutsche. In this article, Australian Jews—almost all Ashkenazi in origin—are treated as a single Folk. For further discussion of the term in immigration analysis and of the complexities of Folk group settlements, see Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*.

NOTES ON THE JEWS OF TURKEY

Naphtali Nathan

THERE are about 40,000 Jews in Turkey at the present time, divided into two distinct groups. The Sephardim account for some 97 per cent of the total Jewish population; they are the descendants of the Jews who went into exile from Spain and Portugal in the last years of the fifteenth century. The remaining 3 per cent are made up of Ashkenazim.

Mention should also be made of Karaite Jews, of whom there are about two hundred families in Istanbul: they are an independent group, have no dealings with the Chief Rabbinate of Turkey, and are not normally considered part of Turkish-Jewish society. They are the descendants of the followers of Anan ben David who, in the year 761, seceded from the Jewish fold, disowning the Talmud and recognizing only one authoritative source: the five books of the Torah (*Mikra*); hence the label *Bene Mikra* (Sons of the Scripture), from which is derived the word 'Karaim'. They have their synagogue in Istanbul in the suburb of Hasköy, and their own cemetery. They use a calendar peculiar to themselves, and their Holy Days do not correspond to the dates on which the Holy Days are kept by world Jewry. They marry only among themselves. There is, however, one source of religious contact between them and the Jewish community of Istanbul: for circumcision they employ the services of a *mohel* from the rabbinical community; this has been their practice for a long time. The Turkish authorities refer to them in official documents as 'Karaite Jews'.

The Jews of Turkey no longer enjoy a world reputation for scholarship, but in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries they produced a great literature.[1] There was a general decline in Jewish life after the First World War, the lowest ebb being reached in 1931, the year in which the then Chief Rabbi of Turkey, Hayim Bejarano Effendi, died.[2] Haim Nahoum Effendi had been Chief Rabbi from 1908, when he succeeded Moshe Lévi, until 1919.

The leaders of the Jewish community did not appear to take to heart the task of appointing a successor, and there was no Chief Rabbi of Turkey until 1953, i.e. for twenty-two years. This absence of a spiritual leader and guide led to apathy and religious indifference: time-honoured customs and traditions crumbled in many Jewish homes, and when

Raphael Saban was appointed Chief Rabbi on 25 January 1953 he faced a community in process of social disintegration.

At the first census of the Turkish Republic in 1927, 81,392 Jews were returned in a total population of more than thirteen and a half million. Over half of the total number of Jews were enumerated in Istanbul. By 1935 the total Jewish population had declined to 78,730; by 1945 to 76,965; and by 1955 to 40,345.

The decade up to 1955 saw, of course, the establishment of the State of Israel; it is believed that 35,000 Jews left Turkey for Israel between 1948 and 1955.[3] In 1962 the distribution of the Jewish population continued to exhibit a great concentration in Istanbul, where there are about twenty synagogues and houses of prayer. The present Chief Rabbi of Turkey is David Asseo. He is helped in his administrative duties by a religious council and by a lay council. The President of the former (the *Beth Din*) is Rabbi Baruh Ha-Kohen, who bears the titles of *Rosh Beth Din* and *Mare De-Atra*; Rabbi Baruh Hakohen has four rabbis to assist him. The lay council of the Chief Rabbinate is concerned with general matters affecting the Jewish community, including welfare services; it also acts as a channel for receiving and giving effect to government directives; there are nineteen members (Sephardim and Ashkenazim).

The Jewish press of Turkey did not remain silent during the many years when the community was bereft of religious leadership. Eventually Jewish leaders decided to seek permission from the Government to elect a Chief Rabbi by means of a poll: thus it was that Rabbi Raphael Saban was appointed; this was but an official confirmation of his role, for, as head of the Rabbinical College, he had been the chief religious authority in the country. The Chief Rabbi was installed on 25 January 1953, an historical day for Turkish Jewry. Abraham Benaroya commented in *L'Etoile du Levant*: 'Turkish Jewry has a shepherd again. After an interval of two decades the Jewish community of Turkey has found a pastor for its community numbering nearly sixty thousand souls.'

The first major step taken by the Chief Rabbi was to establish a rabbinical seminary: the once famous seminary of Istanbul (at Kusgundjuk) had ceased to exist for some years; this meant that no rabbis were being trained in the country, which, added to the non-existence of a Chief Rabbi, led to a rapid disintegration of religious values. Indeed, it is not too much to state that the very existence of the Jewish religion in Turkey was at stake. On 6 February 1955 the new seminary in the Hasköy district of Istanbul opened its doors; its function is to train rabbis and religious teachers. At the end of the academic session of 1962 the seminary had forty-five students, three of whom were awarded the rabbinical diploma (*Semiha*).

Kashrut has become a matter of major concern, for it is alleged that there is no Jewish restaurant in Istanbul where one can be certain of a strictly *kasher* meal; the Beth-Din is constantly in dispute with butchers.

Tourists and commercial travellers are faced with a painful situation; some of them may even have to go hungry, and Istanbul's Jews are constantly exhorting the Chief Rabbinate to take stricter measures for *Kashrut*. There are, of course, many other matters exercising the leaders of Jewry, such as problems of social welfare and religious education of the young.

The Chief Rabbi died in 1960. The leaders of Turkish Jewry did not repeat the error of the past: within months a successor was appointed. He is Chief Rabbi David Asseo.

JEWISH COMMUNAL SCHOOLS

The Turkish language is the compulsory medium of instruction in the schools. Turkish state schools, both primary and secondary, are non-fee-paying, and are open to all children irrespective of race or religion; the children of minority groups—Greeks, Armenians, and Jews—attend these schools. There are many Jewish students in the universities, particularly in the Faculty of Medicine and in commercial schools and technical colleges; there is no tension whatever between Muslim and non-Muslim students; on the contrary, there is a spirit of good fellowship which Jews in the universities of many other countries might well envy.

There are a few foreign schools in Istanbul—French, English, and German—which are allowed to teach in the medium of their national language, but only at secondary school level; many well-to-do Jews send their children to these institutions.

Istanbul has four Jewish communal schools and one High School (formerly a B'nai B'rith institution); the curriculum is identical to that in Turkish schools, and is approved by the Minister of Education. Jewish schools, however, are allowed to give, in addition, one course in elementary Hebrew, but they do not give tuition in Jewish history or literature. In 1961 there were 1,483 pupils (792 boys and 691 girls) in these five schools. In the same year there were 44 pupils in the Rabbinical Seminary. In 1962 the six institutions had increased their intake so that the total enrolment was 2,000.

There is also in Istanbul an organization known as *Mahazike Torah*, which gives religious instruction to boys and girls and also trains *hazanim*, *mohelim*, and *shohetim*. Pupils may enrol from the age of eight years; boys may stay until the age of twenty, when they must leave for military service. Classes are held in the evenings and on Sunday mornings; the older and more advanced students in turn become tutors of the younger pupils.[4]

SOCIAL SERVICES AND SOCIAL WELFARE

These are supervised by the Central Welfare Board of the Chief Rabbinate. They include (1) Schools, (2) Holiday Homes for needy children, (3) *Mahazike Torah*, (4) *Mishne Torah* (to feed and clothe poor children, and be of general material assistance to them), (5) *Sedaka Umarpe*, which pays school fees, (6) *La Goutte de Lait*, founded in 1907 and run by a group of women who now every evening give a cup of hot milk and bread to needy and undernourished pupils of Jewish communal schools.

(7) The Orphanage was founded after the First World War. There were then 1,250 orphans, 300 among them being war orphans. In 1924 there were 277 residents (250 boys and 27 girls), while another 1,000 were placed (at the expense of the Orphanage) in various homes.[5] In 1926 the total number of resident orphans was 142; in 1941 there were about 100; and in 1960, 48 (23 boys and 25 girls). After completing their primary education, the children are apprenticed to various trades.

(8) The *Or-Ahaim Hospital* has been in existence for 75 years. (9) *Aid to Tubercular Patients* is known by its Turkish name of VEREM. Some 1,500 Jews in Istanbul alone are believed to suffer from the disease. VEREM pays for extra nourishment and for recuperation centres in the countryside. Seriously ill patients are sent to hospitals at the expense of the organization. (10) *The Old People's Home* shelters, feeds, and nurses the indigent. Costs are constantly rising, and the Central Welfare Board has frequently to make urgent appeals for funds.

Apart from these ten organizations (all members of the Co-ordinated Association of Jewish Welfare Bodies), there are several other independent welfare societies, such as:

(*a*) *Matan Basseter*, for financial help to the needy;

(*b*) *Bikour Holim*, for help to the sick (such as extra food and the cost of medical prescriptions);

(*c*) *Society for Assistance to the Poor*, formerly a B'nai B'rith association; it is now concerned exclusively with welfare activities.[6]

Special mention must also be made of the Small Loans Agency in Istanbul. The B'nai B'rith in 1923 had helped to establish this agency; its purpose is to assist small business men and professional men (such as doctors or chemists) with loans at a very low rate of interest; it has enabled many recipients to establish a secure and honourable livelihood.

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF ISTANBUL

The Ashkenazi Community

The Ashkenazim of Istanbul are said to number about 700 souls, according to the Office of the Ashkenazi Community; however, there are many who are not on its registers, and the correct figure is probably

nearer 1,000. *El Tiempo*, in an article in its issue of 8 April 1959, mentions a total of 1,500, but this is almost certainly a highly inflated figure.

Abraham Galanté, in his *Histoire des Juifs d'Istanbul* (Vol. 2, 1942), states that when Spanish Jews arrived in Turkey in 1492 they found a settled Jewish community which extended a warm welcome to them; the local Jews were Romanites, Italians, and Ashkenazim.

In 1854 and 1855, during the Crimean War, about four hundred Ashkenazi families arrived from Kertch in the Crimea, and in or about the year 1895 members of this community established a synagogue in Istanbul which they called the Kertch Synagogue. Some ten years later it had ceased to exist.

There was a steady immigration of Ashkenazim in the latter half of the nineteenth century. At the beginning of the twentieth century Istanbul's Ashkenazim were nationals of Austria, Germany, Russia, and Rumania. In 1915, Trietsch stated that Istanbul alone had an Ashkenazi population of 10,000 souls.[7]

About the year 1920, Heinrich Reisner became President of the Ashkenazi community in Istanbul. He was also at the same time Vice-President of the Sephardi community. These were the hard post-war years, and the years when large numbers of Jews—mainly Ashkenazim—were seeking refuge from revolutionary Russia. Reisner was engaged in relief work and in helping those families who wished to emigrate to the Americas; in this, he was greatly dependent upon assistance from the Joint organization of New York. In May 1911 the B'nai B'rith organizer, S. Bergel, came to Istanbul, and Reisner collaborated with Joseph Niego (a Sepharad) in the creation of a lodge in Istanbul; the aim was to unite in one association the whole of Middle Eastern Jewry. Until then the B'nai B'rith had a largely Ashkenazi membership. Joseph Niego became the first President of the Lodge, and devoted himself for over half a century to the welfare of Turkish Jewry. Isidore Schnitter succeeded Reisner as President of the Ashkenazi community. He died in 1953. In 1954 Mr. Marko Rabinovitch succeeded him; the following year Mr. Pinhas Kerstein became President, and remained in office until 1958, when he left Turkey to settle in Israel. In 1959 Mr. Sebastian Hübler succeeded him.

The Old People's Home, *Moshav Zekinim*, was founded by the Ashkenazi community more than fifty years ago. It is now managed by a joint Sephardi-Ashkenazi committee of ladies. In 1962 there were 27 residents:

	Men	*Women*
Ashkenazi	3	4
Sephardi	2	18

The Great Synagogue in Yüksek Kalderim Street used to be known as 'Oesterreichischer Tempel'. About sixty years ago it enjoyed the services

of the famed Hazan Bernard Wladowsky, who spent a brief period in Constantinople. Austrian leaders constituted, over a long period, the elite of the Ashkenazi community, and to this day German is the language used by the Office administering the affairs of the community; notices, letters, circulars, etc., are usually written in German. Yiddish is still used by many Ashkenazim, but knowledge of the language is steadily declining.

Rabbi Samuel Shapiro was a Hazan in two synagogues and was also very active in giving religious instruction to the young; he died in the same year (1944) as Dr. David Markus. The two men had been closely associated in a joint study of the Talmud over a number of years. A month after the death of Rabbi Schapiro, the Hazan and Shohet Mordohay Payuk also died. The loss of these three men of religion in rapid succession was a severe blow from which the Ashkenazi community has not yet recovered. To this day they lack the guidance of a rabbi.

The community has 344 registered paying members.[8] There is great harmony between Sephardim and Ashkenazim. Marriage between them now frequently occurs, in striking contrast to the situation prevailing fifty years ago.[9] Writing on this subject, Abraham Galanté[10] said that credit for this new harmony is largely due to the establishment of the B'nai B'rith Lodge in 1911. Perhaps the clearest indication of good relations is shown in the fact that the memorial service for the martyrs of the Warsaw Ghetto Rising is organized jointly by the two communities: the annual service is held alternately in a Sephardi and an Ashkenazi synagogue.

On 20 April 1963 it was the turn of the Sephardi community; the service was held in the Neve Shalom Synagogue, and Chief Rabbi David Asseo officiated; Cantor Shaposhnik recited *El Mole Rahamim* according to Ashkenazi ritual.

To summarize the position of Istanbul's Ashkenazim: they are a community in a state of rapid decline and beset by great financial difficulties; moreover, they lack the spiritual guidance of a rabbi, and there is consequently a serious danger of disintegration, at least as far as religious life is concerned.

Gurdji (Grusiny) Jews

They are a tiny minority in Istanbul, now amounting to about sixty souls. Natives of Tiflis and of the mountainous region of the Caucasus, some two hundred fled to Turkey in 1920 after the Bolshevik Revolution. They do not form a distinct community, but are generally considered Oriental Jews, and as such, members of the Sephardi community; indeed, their religious and communal affairs are administered by the Central Office of the Sephardi Community and by the Chief Rabbinate.

There are a few families in Istanbul who originate from the Baku

region and speak a Tartar-Persian dialect; there is also a small group of Kurdish Jews from Iraq whose language is a dialect of Aramaic. These two groups are (wrongly) labelled by long-established Istanbul Jewry as 'Gurdjis', perhaps because they worship at the same synagogue as the Gurdjis.

Gurdji Jews were lent the Or Hadash synagogue some thirty years ago. They are a pious group, faithful to their religion; their prayers and chants are intoned in a mixture of Ashkenazi and Sephardi styles. They are an industrious people, and specialize with great success in the manufacture of hosiery. Nowadays the Or Hadash synagogue has a heterogeneous congregation, which includes some long-established Istanbul Sephardim. The first Gabbay is a Gurdji, and the second Gabbay a Sepharad.

JEWISH COMMUNITIES OUTSIDE ISTANBUL

Ankara (Angora)

This city was raised to the status of capital by the Turkish Republic in October 1923. It already had a Jewish community, with its own schools and social services. When Abraham Galanté visited Ankara in 1926 he found one hundred and twenty families; when he returned in 1932, to attend a History Congress in the city (he was then Professor of History in the University of Istanbul), there were two hundred families.[11]

Izmir (Smyrna)

Izmir has the second largest Jewish community in Turkey. It was in Smyrna that Shabbetai Zevi (1626–76) was born; he was a Cabbalist, and declared himself to be the Messiah who would lead the Jews back to Jerusalem in the year 1666. Zevi created a great stir beyond Turkey, and attracted a delirious following; the Sultan was greatly perturbed, and summoned him to Constantinople. Fearing a sentence of death, and also fearful of retribution upon the whole of Turkish Jewry, Zevi appeared before the Sultan and declared his desire to become a Muslim. He was renamed Mehemet; several of his disciples promptly followed his example and became converts. They were labelled *Deunmeh* by the Turks; their descendants (now estimated at about 10,000) are an integral element of the Turkish people, but they have retained several peculiarities of their Jewish past. They occupy leading positions in the country, and many of them are business men and industrialists.

Smyrna in the nineteenth century was one of the major centres of rabbinical and Jewish cultural life. One of its sons, Rabbi Hayim Palacci, was the author of some sixty-eight works, among them *Tsedaka Hayim*, Smyrna, 1838; *Hayim ve Shalom*, Smyrna, 1862; *Birkath Mordehay Lehayim*, Smyrna, 1868; *Sefer Hayim*, Salonica, 1868; *Lev Hayim* (2 volumes), Smyrna, 1870; *Torah ve Hayim* and *Ketoub Lehayim*.[12]

The first Ladino paper in Turkey, *Sha'are Mizrahi* (*Puerta del Oriente*), was published in Smyrna; it was founded in 1846 by Raphael Uziel Pincherli. Several other Ladino papers followed: *La Buena Esperanza*; *El Nuvelista*, first appearing in French as *Le Nouvelliste* and a year later half in French and half in Ladino. (It ceased publication in 1922.) A weekly, *Messeret* (Turkish for 'Joy'), was published in 1897. In 1910 *La Boz de Izmir* appeared; and in 1919 *El Shalom*. The last Jewish paper to be published in Izmir, *El Mundo*, appeared in 1923; a year later it ceased publication, and Izmir Jewry has had no newspaper since.

In the 1930s the city had a Jewish population of about 16,000 souls, and boasted thirteen synagogues.[13] There has been a great exodus of Izmir Jews to Israel since the establishment of the State. The Chief Rabbinate of Turkey sent a circular letter in 1962 to all Jewish communities in the country, requesting statistical data. In its reply, Izmir stated that there were 1,960 Jews. On the other hand, the Istanbul Ladino paper, *Shalom*, in its issue of 24 April 1963, published an article on the role of Jewish women in Izmir; in the course of the article, written by the paper's editor, Avram Leyon, the city's total Jewish population was given as 4,500. This latter figure certainly appears more realistic.

Izmir Jews have two synagogues, three schools, a hospital, an Old People's Home, an orphanage, an association for assistance to the poor, a cultural society patronized by the young, and a *Mahazike Torah*. There is also an association, *La Sociedad de Kabarim* (also known as *Hevra Kedosha*) which was founded four centuries ago by Rabbi Joseph Escapa, who was the founder and leader of the Jewish community in Smyrna. This Society is a philanthropic institution, now managed by eminent Jews; among other good works, it maintains the Karatash Hospital.

In 1946 Izmir's three communal schools had a total of 1,204 pupils. The Talmud Torah School and Orphanage had 430 pupils in 1923, and 599 in 1929; in the school year 1961–2 the total had dwindled to 150. The Talmud Torah School was Smyrna's first educational establishment; it was founded in 1871, its pioneer organizer being Rabbi Arié Kohen Rappaport, a man of great virtue and learning, and a Talmudic scholar. It was he who first introduced the teaching of modern Hebrew in the school. The present headmaster is Mr. Isaac Nahoum.

Izmir's spiritual leader is Rabbi Sigura. One of the city's most active leaders, both in the philanthropic and the cultural fields, is Mrs. Esther Morguez Algrante; she is a poet and journalist, and has a profound knowledge of Jewish history and literature; her poems and articles frequently appear in *Shalom* and are greatly appreciated.

For many years the Izmir correspondent of *Shalom* was Ruben Katan who died in 1961. He was a man of learning and wide culture. His journalistic contributions were highly regarded; he also taught in communal schools, and played a very active role in numerous charitable organizations. His death was a serious blow to Izmir Jewry. His son,

Nissim Katan, has followed in his footsteps, and is the present Izmir correspondent of *Shalom*.

Adrianople

In 1912 Adrianople had 14,000 Jews, and theirs was perhaps the most tightly knit and organized Jewish community of the East. It was in Adrianople that Joseph Caro (1488–1575), an exile from Spain (who later became a Cabbalist), wrote his masterpiece *Shulchan Aruch*. Adrianople was also the birthplace, in 1857, of Rabbi Abraham Danon, whose family was famous for its learning and for its eminent rabbis.

Adrianople had a community deeply interested in Jewish studies and traditions. Its thirteen synagogues bore the names of illustrious families who had settled in the city; its famous Yeshivoth boasted numerous *Sifre Torah* and invaluable manuscripts. Adrianople had its communal schools and social services which included an orphanage and a hospital. A political and literary paper, *La Boz de la Verdad*, was published in the city. Wars, fires, and other crises took their toll, and the city's Jewish community, once the pride of Turkish Jewry, is now in a state of decline: in 1962 there were only 430 Jews; and one synagogue alone survives.

About thirty years ago a great number of Adrianople's Jews settled in Istanbul and formed their own association; they had also brought their *Sifre Torah* and sought to establish their own synagogue in Istanbul. The administration of the Tofre Begadim (Schneidertempel) put at their disposal a part of their large building, and it is there that Adrianople's Jews now worship; thus the same building houses a Sephardi and an Ashkenazi synagogue (the name of the former is *La Sinagoga de los Edirnelis*). The Adrianople association in Istanbul has its own communal services, a *Matan Baseter* and a *Bikour Holim*. The present Rosh Beth-Din of Istanbul, Rabbi Baruh Hakohen, is a native of Adrianople.

Brusa

Brusa, with its strategic geographical advantages, is a centre of commerce and handles a large entrepôt trade; an important part of its import and export business was managed by Jews, who, before the First World War, numbered about 3,500. The 1927 census revealed that in that year only 1,915 Jews resided in the city. The city's Jews have always lived in the same district, and the three synagogues are situated close to one another. The Brusa community had its own social services, which included a *Bikour Holim* and a *Hakenesseth Orhim*. Brusa had a literary association known as Cercle Israélite which in 1925 was renamed *Bursa Ouhouveet Klubu* (Turkish for 'Brusa Friendship Club'); its aim was to popularize a knowledge of the Turkish language among Jews and to give material assistance to needy students; a dozen years later the club had ceased to function.

Before the First World War the Alliance Israélite Universelle had a

total of 450 pupils in its two schools (one for girls and one for boys); the schools were eventually taken over by the Jewish community, and in 1931 the total number of pupils was 150. The community declined in numbers, and the schools ceased to exist in 1935; Jewish pupils went to State schools, which welcomed them.

Today Brusa's Jews number about 400 souls. In other provincial towns of Turkey some small Jewish communities continue to exist, but their numbers are rapidly declining as a result of wars and emigration. Some of these groups even lack a rabbi, and refer matters of religious and communal interest to the Chief Rabbinate in Istanbul. The Chief Rabbinate is sometimes able to send *Mahazike Torah* graduates to provincial outposts to act as *mohelim*, *hazanim*, and occasionally, as rabbis. These communities are almost always exclusively Sephardi—few Ashkenazim are found outside the major cities.[14]

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Istanbul continues to be the main centre of the country's foreign trade. Turkey's trade and industry are in large part managed by the three principal minority groups: the Jews, the Greeks, and the Armenians.

The Jews play a major role in every sphere of the country's economic life, a role out of all proportion to their number. The Turks have always admired them for their industry and energy, and greatly appreciate their skill as business men and entrepreneurs; many Turks welcome collaboration with Jews in various commercial undertakings and in the management of factories. G. Bie Ravndal, American Consul General in Constantinople, wrote:

> . . . Turkish Jews have carved out for themselves a place in every branch of the national life and are found as traders, bankers, professional men, office workers, and even laborers. In the former Ottoman Empire they occupied important government positions, but the tendency of the new nationalism, ushered in by the Republic, has been to put them in the same relative position as other non-Muslims, although they have never been persecuted in Turkey.[15]

THE JEWISH PRESS IN TURKEY

Istanbul has always been the centre of Jewish journalism in Turkey, although, as we saw earlier, Izmir was also the home of several publications. The first Ladino paper to appear in Constantinople (in 1853) was *Or Israel* (*La Luz de Israel*); its editor was Leon de Hayim Castro. In 1855 Protestant missionaries published a journal in Istanbul entitled *El Manadero* (The Source) in their effort to convert Turkish Jews to Christianity; some of the articles dealt with scientific and historical

subjects, as well as with matters of specifically Jewish interest. It ceased publication three years later.

Jornal Israelit was published in 1860; *Sefath Emeth* (*El Luzero*) in 1867. In 1871 *El Tiempo* appeared and had a long life, for it ceased publication on 27 March 1930. David Fresco, who was concerned with Jewish journalism for fifty-five years, was its last editor; *El Tiempo* was patronized by Jewish intellectuals, and Fresco waged a relentless fight against fanaticism and obscurantism. Fresco retired in 1930 to France, where he died three years later, aged eighty.

In 1871, *El Progresso* appeared; in 1872, *El Telegraf*, later renamed *El Telegrafo*; in 1879, *El Sol*; in 1885, *El Radio de Luz*; in 1886, *El Amigo do la Familla*, an illustrated weekly concerned with historical and geographical subjects, as well as with literary matters. In 1888, *El Instructor* appeared; in 1894, *La Edicion de Jueves del Telegrafo* (The Thursday Edition of *El Telegrafo*). In 1899, *Djeridei-i-Lissan* was published in both Turkish and Ladino: its aim was to familiarize its readers with the Turkish language.

1908 saw the birth of no fewer than five publications: *La Patria*; *La Boz*; *El Burlon*; *L'Aurore* (in French); and lastly, *El Jugueton*, a satirical weekly founded and edited by E. R. Carmona. When he died in 1931 the paper ceased publication. *El Jugueton* is a valuable repository of Ladino humour and folklore, and should be of interest to linguists; for it was written in a popular vein and exhibited, apart from archaic Spanish, neologisms taken from the Turkish, Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and French languages. Carmona delighted Turkish Jewry for twenty-two years with the humorous sketches he printed.

Three new publications appeared in 1909: *Hamevasser* (in Hebrew); *El Relampago*; and *El Judio*. These were followed in 1910 by *El Gracioso*, and in 1911 by *El Correo*, both edited by Victor Levi. After the First World War in 1919 came *La Nation* (in French). In 1923 *Hamenora* (a monthly appearing in three languages, Hebrew, Ladino, and French) was published by the B'nai B'rith organization; it later became a quarterly, and had a total life of fifteen years.

1928 was the year in which Turkish was printed in Roman characters. Jewish journalists were greatly influenced by the change, and many editors decided to print their papers in romanized Ladino; two weeklies appeared in 1931 in this new style, one in 1947, three in 1948, two in 1950, three in 1952, and one in 1958.

A fortnightly review appeared in 1939, published in Turkish, French, and Ladino; a weekly was published in Turkish in 1949 (it lasted only nine months); and another weekly, *L'Etoile du Levant*, was published in French in 1948. It was edited by Abraham Benaroya. Of all these publications, only two have survived: *Shalom*, edited by Avram Leyon, and *La Vera Luz* edited by Eliyezer Menda.

LANGUAGE

The vast majority of Turkish Jews, the Sephardim, continue to speak Ladino. However, a peculiarity of theirs, as well as of other Turkish Jews, is that they are multilingual; and this is true even of ordinary working men. Bie Ravndal,[16] wrote:

> The mother tongue of the Sephardic Jew is old Castilian, occasionally mixed with Turkish words and Hebraic expressions. The Ashkenazim speak German or Yiddish, and the Karaites speak Greek, having been Hellenized under the Byzantine Empire. All Levantine Jews, however, speak more than one modern language.

After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the New Turkey was faced with the problem of various ethnic minorities who had enjoyed many special privileges. It was resolved to unify the residents of the country by making the Turkish language their mother tongue; in 1927 a special Commission was formed to this end, and the slogan, 'Citizen, Speak Turkish!' was launched. The Press enthusiastically collaborated. Abraham Galanté, in 1928, published a work in Turkish under the slogan's title. In it he analyses the historical, political, and social reasons for the non-Muslim minorities' ignorance of the Turkish language.

In my documentary article published in *L'Etoile du Levant* (4 February 1954) on Sir Moses Montefiore, I noted that it was this eminent Jew who had first urged (on his visit to Constantinople in 1840) that Jews should teach Turkish in their communal schools:

> . . . Montefiore exprima le désir que dans chaque école juive de l'Empire Ottoman, l'on enseigne aux enfants à lire et à écrire la langue turque. Montefiore offrit même d'assumer les premiers frais et promit de parler à ce sujet au Ministre des Affaires Etrangères Mustafa Reshit Pasha. Le Haham Bashi Moshé Fresko adressa alors à toutes les Communautés une circulaire, imprimée en turc, en judéo-espagnol et en hébreu, ordonnant l'enseignement de la langue turque, circulaire qui fut lue dans toutes les Synagogues de la ville. . . .

In the last few decades the Turkish language has been generally adopted by younger Jews, who now speak and write it fluently. In 1961 Mark Glazer, while lecturing on social anthropology in Istanbul University, carried out a piece of field work to determine the degree of knowledge of the Turkish language among the city's Jews. He took a sample of 20 households, 17 Sephardi and 3 Ashkenazi, numbering a total of 80 individuals, and published the results of his inquiry in *Shalom* on 21 June 1961. He found a total of sixteen languages spoken: Turkish, French, English, Ladino, Russian, German, Hungarian, Hebrew, Yiddish, Czech, Serbian, Greek, Italian, Bulgarian, Swedish, and Arabic. Various individuals in the group spoke four or five languages: every single person spoke Turkish; 96 per cent spoke French, 77 per cent

Ladino, 48 per cent English, 33 per cent Greek, 31 per cent German, and 8 per cent Hebrew.

As could be expected, Glazer found some difference between the languages known by the older members of the group, on the one hand, and by school children and young adults, on the other hand. He found that Ladino is rarely used outside the household or the kinship group: 98 per cent of the younger people speak Turkish with their friends, as against 26 per cent of the older members of the sample. The latter with their friends speak French most frequently (59 per cent); while only 21 per cent use Ladino for the purpose. Glazer concludes that 84·5 per cent of the young Jews use Turkish as their chief language, while only 14 per cent of the old do so. As for the Ashkenazim in the sample, one third (33 per cent) of the old speak mainly Yiddish.

On the basis of this inquiry, as well as of general observation by informed students of the subject, it seems inevitable that Ladino will fade out in Turkey, and will certainly cease (within less than a quarter of a century) to be the mother tongue of the nation's Sephardim.

CULTURAL LIFE

There is no specifically Jewish cultural life in Turkey, or at least none worth speaking of: there has been a dramatic decline of interest in Judaism and in Jewish history and literature, and the young appear to be remarkably uninterested in these studies. True, Turkish nationalism discourages separatist movements, but nevertheless there is no ban on cultural activities connected with one's own ethnic or religious group. There is no longer a Ladino literature, and hardly any publications now appear in this language, and none in Hebrew.[17]

The last Hebrew press shut down in 1944, when its proprietor, Moise Babok, emigrated to Palestine. Turkey's Jewish writers have, since then, published their works in Turkish or in French; the young Jewish poet, Joseph Habib Gerez, writes in Turkish and sings the glories of his native city of Istanbul. He has recently published his sixth book of poems, and has abandoned classical verse for modern styles which have attracted a great deal of praise from Turkish critics. Gerez also contributes to Ladino papers on Jewish topics, but his articles are written in Turkish. He has attempted to encourage his young co-religionists to form cultural associations; there are, at the present time, four Jewish cultural societies in Istanbul, one of which is the Old Students' Association of the Lycée Juif.

The Library of the Chief Rabbinate is very little used, in sharp contrast to older days. On the other hand, Italian Jews are nowadays making a brave effort to promote interest in religion and culture, and every Friday night, after the prayers of Kabalath Shabbath, they organize lectures to which the ladies are invited; the speakers are rabbis and lay notables, and the languages used are Ladino and French.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

DAVID MARCUS

On 30 December 1900 Dr. David Marcus came to Istanbul as Rabbi to the Ashkenazi community. He was a native of Novgorod and studied in the Yeshivoth of Lomza and Marianpol, under the guidance of Rabbi Lobele Plotzker, who awarded him the diploma of Rabbi. Marcus then went to Bonn University, where he studied psychology, philosophy, and child education.

He became the Rabbi of one of Dusseldorf's synagogues, and was frequently mentioned in the Jewish press of Germany; this led the Austrian community of Istanbul to invite him to take up the post of headmaster of the Goldschmidt School, and he also became the religious leader of Turkey's Ashkenazim. In 1901 Dr. Marcus published in Halle (Germany) a psychological study entitled: *Die Associationstheorien im XVIII Jahrhundert.*

In 1908, after the new Constitution of Turkey had been proclaimed, he obtained Turkish nationality; he then established and directed an association for the study of the Turkish language among Turkish Jews. He was also granted further financial assistance from the Hilfsverein to establish two other schools.

The Balkan wars of 1912 resulted in the uprooting of 635 families (3,101 souls), mainly women and children, who sought refuge in Istanbul. Several Jewish organizations were concerned with the urgent task of relief; Dr. Marcus acted as the agent of the Hilfsverein, and on its behalf he gave these various bodies a weekly sum of ten thousand gold francs.[18] Dr. Marcus was also very active in co-ordinating the work of relief to the victims of the 1914–18 war, and was appointed working chairman of the *Commission Centrale de Secours* established jointly by the Hilfsverein and the Joint Distribution Committee of New York. Apart from his functions as Rabbi of the Ashkenazi community, Dr. Marcus was a member of the Istanbul Beth Din; from 1922 until 1940 he was Headmaster of the *Lycée Juif Béné Berith* and in 1932 he became proprietor and editor-in-chief of the periodical *Hamenora.* He was a prolific writer, and his journalistic and literary contributions were many: in 1936, his *Trois mille ans d'histoire juive* was published in Istanbul; he later worked on his *Histoire Juive sous le Croissant pendant la première moitié du vingtième siècle,* but this work was never finished.

ABRAHAM DANON

Abraham Danon was born in 1857 and educated exclusively at home by his father (an Adrianople rabbi); he became in turn a rabbi and an erudite Biblical and Talmudic scholar. Danon's tutor in Western culture was Rabbi Yossef Halévy, a dynamic personality who burst one day into Adrianople and very soon became the leader of the city's young intellectuals; Danon was greatly influenced by Halévy, and in turn he communicated his knowledge and enthusiasm to a group of young men, whose leader he became; they founded a cultural association known as *Doreche Hashkala.*

Danon's literary output was as erudite as it was varied. He contributed articles to Hebrew journals, and also collaborated with the *Revue des Etudes Juives* and the *Revue Asiatique.* He possessed a good knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic, Ethiopian, Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Greek, Latin, French, German, and English; his greatest interest, however, was in Jewish history: in 1887 he published his *Toledoth Bene Abraham,* a translation in Hebrew of Theodore Reinach's history of the Jews, to which he added numerous extracts from Graetz, Geiger, and Schulmann. He also wrote, in French, a complete history of Shabbetai Zevi's 'false Messiah' movement. In a funeral oration on Danon, published in Istanbul's *Hamenora* of May 1925, Joseph Niego said: 'Une grande partie de ce travail parut dans la Revue des Etudes Juives en brochures, mais j'ai entendu dire qu'une autre partie de ses recherches sur cette question n'a pas pu être publiée de son vivant et qu'elle est encore quelque part à l'état de manuscrit . . .'

Danon was also a poet, and in 1888 he published in Hebrew a collection of poems entitled *Maskil Li Aidan*; they consisted mainly of translations from Virgil, Saadi, and Victor Hugo, but also included some of Danon's own original Hebrew poems. In 1896 he published his very well received compilation 'Recueil de Romances Judéo-Espagnoles'; they were romances (in a Castilian dialect) sung by Sephardim of the Eastern Mediterranean. The work was very well received, especially in Spain; Rodolfo Gil, in the preface to his *Romancero Judeo-Espanol: El Idoma Castellano en Oriente* (Madrid, 1911), acknowledges his very great debt to Danon. In 1888 Danon published a periodical, *Yossef Da'ath* (or *El Progresso*), in three languages: Hebrew, Ladino, and Turkish; his aim was to make it a periodical specializing in the history of Oriental Jewry; a year later, the censorship of Sultan Abdul Hamid II suppressed it.

Danon was the founder (in 1897) of the Rabbinical Seminary of Adrianople, where he held several chairs simultaneously. At the request of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, he went on several missions to various cities of the Orient. For more than twenty years he was also President of the Adrianople ORP (Comité de l'Œuvre d'Apprentissage). During the First World War he was able, after endless difficulties, to leave Turkey in order to settle in Paris. His was a bitter leavetaking: he had been deeply disappointed at the decision of the Consistory not to elect him Chief Rabbi of Turkey. One of the last great men of Oriental Jewry, Danon died in Paris in 1925.

ABRAHAM GALANTÉ

Abraham Galanté started his career as a writer and journalist. He was the only historian of his age who devoted his life to the study of Jewish communities in Turkey. He was born in 1873 in Bodrum in Anatolia, and died in 1961 in Istanbul; he was descended from a long line of rabbis who had written numerous works on religious and philosophical topics. In 1947 Abraham Elmaleh published, in Istanbul, Galanté's biography: *Le Professeur Abraham Galanté—sa vie et ses œuvres*. Galanté adhered to Ernest Renan's theory that 'one can only understand an idea if one can read it in the language in which it was originally expressed'. He himself knew Turkish, Hebrew, Ladino, Arabic, Greek, Italian, Latin, French, English, and German.

From 1914 to 1933 Galanté was on the staff of the University of Istanbul where he taught Comparative Grammar of Semitic Languages, and Ancient History of Oriental Peoples; in 1943 he was elected to represent Nigde at the Great National Assembly. He wrote his many works in Turkish and in French, but he always reproduced documents and statements in their original language; when once asked whether his labours were appreciated by his fellow Jews in Turkey, he tersely replied: 'My books are printed in Istanbul and read abroad.'

Galanté was not, of course, the first historian of Turkish Jewry: he owed much to his predecessors, such as M. Franco, Salomon Rozanes, Abraham Danon, Baruh Mitrani, and Juda Nehama; Galanté, however, carried out intensive research in the archives of the Ottoman Empire, and in Greek and Armenian texts.

In January 1957 the young poet Joseph Habib Gerez organized celebrations to mark the occasion of the historian's eighty-fourth birthday. Many distinguished persons attended the ceremony, and messages were received from the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Paris, from Dr. Cecil Roth in Oxford, from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and from many other individuals and institutions.

Galanté published no fewer than fifty-seven works, starting in 1925 with *Hamourabi Kanounou* (the Hamurabi Code), in Turkish. Two years later, in 1927, he published (also in Turkish) *Three Semitic Legislators—Hamurabi, Moses, Mahomet*. It is a comparative study of the three legislators' views on commercial transactions, on the status of workman and slave in society, on family law and penal law, on the concept of legal responsibility, and on the law of evidence.

In 1948 his *Two Forgeries* appeared, again in Turkish. This was in answer to the publication in 1943 of Turkish translations of Roger Lambelin's *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, and of Henry Ford's *The International Jew*. Galanté exposed the calumnies contained in these two books, and with the help of a Wiener Library Bulletin (published in London in September 1947) he was able to quote the refutations of no fewer than thirty-six writers.

In 1931 Galanté published in French his *Documents officiels turcs concernant les Juifs de Turquie*: he translated into French 114 laws, edicts, and legal verdicts, with historical summaries and appendices; he also reproduced the speech Sir Moses Montefiore delivered before Sultan Abdul Mejid refuting the calumny of 'ritual murder' (the Damascus affair); and the Greek texts of the four encyclicals published by three ecumenical Patriarchs in defence of the Jews. In 1948 he published his *Fin tragique des communautés juives de Rhodes et de Cos, Œuvre du brigandage hitlérien.*

HAIM NAHOUM EFFENDI

Following the proclamation of the Turkish Constitution in 1908, Haim Nahoum Effendi was elected Chief Rabbi of the Ottoman Empire in succession to the retiring Chief Rabbi, Moshé Levi. The appointment of Nahoum, who was regarded as an intelligent and cultured man enjoying great esteem despite his youth, was warmly greeted by Turkish Jewry. He was born in Manissa (Asia Minor) in 1873, and attended the Jewish Seminary in Paris, where he obtained his rabbinical diploma. In 1906 he was sent by the Alliance Israélite Universelle to Abyssinia to study the situation of the Falashas. He was Chief Rabbi of Turkey from 1908 to 1919, and a member of the Turkish delegation to the Lausanne Peace Conference. Chief Rabbi Nahoum was responsible for the suppression of the 'red passport', a government measure imposing restrictions on Jews visiting Palestine.

In 1919 he resigned his position as Chief Rabbi, his political activity having been subjected to strong criticism. He then settled in Paris where he defended the Turkish cause in the European press. In 1925 he was elected Chief Rabbi of Egypt, and remained in office until his death in Cairo in November 1960. He was in his eighty-seventh year.

Chief Rabbi Nahoum was an outstanding linguist and scholar, as well as an able administrator. He was decorated by the Negus of Abyssinia, by the Sultan of Turkey, and by King Fuad of Egypt.

STATISTICAL NOTE

In the first census of the Turkish Republic, 1927, the number of Jews returned was 81,392 in a total population of 13,648,270.

The table below shows figures for the principal centres of Jewry in 1927 and in 1962. The 1962 figures are taken from the records of the Chief Rabbinate:

	1927	*1962*
Adana	159	218
Ankara	663	648
Brusa	1,915	373
Adrianople	6,098	430
Gazi Aintab	742	162
Gallipoli	736	222
Istanbul	47,035	30,000
Izmir	17,094	1,960
Kirklerili	978	88
Mersina	122	51
Milas	259	79
Dardanelles	1,109	461
Tekirdaghi (Rodosto)	889	169
Tire	1,063	146
Tchorlu	592	84

The total Jewish population has shown a steady decline since 1927:

1927	81,392
1935	78,730
1945	76,965
1955	40,345

The sharp decline from 1945 to 1955 was mainly due to large-scale emigration to the newly established State of Israel.

NOTES

[1] See M. Franco, *Essai sur l'histoire des Israélites de l'Empire Ottoman*, Paris, 1897; pp. 226–75 contain a full and detailed list of the output in Hebrew and Ladino of Jewish writers and rabbis in nineteenth-century Turkey.

[2] He was born in the small Bulgarian town of Eski Zagore (then under Turkish rule) about the year 1846. He was a man of great learning, a linguist and a poet as well as an eminent theologian. His numerous works added great lustre to Sephardi literature.

[3] They were, in the main, economically depressed members of the community, but perhaps went to Israel as much to fulfil the ancient dream of a Jewish National Home as to better their standard of living.

[4] The guiding spirit of this organization is Mr. Nissim Behar, and it is very largely due to him that the youth of today have been saved from the ignorance of, and indifference to, Judaism which had prevailed in their parents' days. He is also the author of some fifteen religious works in Hebrew and in Ladino; in 1948 he published (in Ladino) *La Agada de Pesah*. Eventually it went out of print, and he was asked to reprint it in Romanized Ladino. This he did in 1962, writing in the Preface: '. . . Munços Korolijionaiyos me rogaron de publiar de nuevo La Agada en karakteres latinos. Munço ensisti para no publiar siendo es kontra mi prensip, ma despues ke supe ke munças famiyas no izyeron el Seder de Pesah por no saver meldar el Ebreo, me ovlegi a emprimar solamente por una ves en karakteres latinos . . .' (Many co-religionists begged me to re-issue the Agada in romanized Ladino. I was very reluctant to do so, as this is against my principles; but when I learnt that many families held no Seder because they could not read Hebrew, I felt compelled to print it, only this once, in Roman characters . . .)

[5] The Orphanage was totally destroyed by fire on 21 July 1924, fortunately with no loss of life; in 1926 a new building was inaugurated. The Orphanage owed much to Nissim Toledo who established the Adrianople Orphanage before coming to Istanbul in 1937. He died in September 1956.

[6] The B'nai B'rith was founded in Istanbul in 1911. One of its main aims was to unify the Sephardim and the Ashkenazim. It was an intensely active organization, maintaining schools, instituting Hebrew religious classes in lay schools, and introducing tuition in the arts and crafts; in 1915 it founded the Lycée Juif (which still exists); it organized public lectures, subsidized the printing of works on Jewish subjects, and gave assistance to Jewish students at the University of Istanbul. In 1938 the Turkish Government enacted a law banning all organizations which had connexions with foreign agencies. As a result, the B'nai B'rith—as well as other bodies similarly placed—wound up its activities.

[7] D. Trietsch, *Die Juden der Türkei*, Leipzig, 1915, p. 7. The Ashkenazi community of Turkey still awaits its historian.

[8] In 1961, 10 men and 18 women died; in 1962, 8 men and 14 women. There were five births in 1961 (4 boys and 1 girl), and ten in 1962 (5 boys and 5 girls).

[9] Sephardim refer to Ashkenazim as *lehli*, which is the Turkish term for Poles; in the Ottoman Empire, all Ashkenazim —irrespective of their country of origin— were known as *lehli*.

[10] Abraham Galanté, *Histoire des Juifs d'Istanbul*, Vol. 2, Istanbul, 1942, pp. 210 f.

[11] Abraham Galanté, *Histoire des Juifs d'Anatolie*, Vol. 2, Istanbul, 1939, p. 276.

[12] The last two works give neither the date nor the place of publication.

[13] The first volume of Galanté's *Histoire des Juifs d'Anatolie*, published in 1937, is exclusively devoted to Smyrna Jewry. The second volume, published in 1939, deals with 107 Jewish communities of Anatolia.

[14] The Chief Rabbinate recently received information about some small towns. Tekirdaghi, Mersina, and Corlu each have one synagogue, but no rabbi. Milas also has no rabbi; it had two synagogues, but one of them is now used as a warehouse while one still survives as a synagogue. Iskenderun has a synagogue and a rabbi. Kirklerili has a rabbi. Gazi Aintab has a synagogue and a rabbi; it is worth noting that the community is Arabic speaking.

[15] G. Bie Ravndal, *Turkey: A Commercial and Industrial Handbook*, Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., 1926. See also Abraham Galanté's *Rôle economique des Juifs d'Istanbul*, Istanbul, 1942; and *Médecins juifs au service de la Turquie*, Istanbul, 1938.

[16] Op. cit., p. 24.

[17] It was the Sephardim who first introduced printing in Turkey in 1494: the brothers David and Shemouel, sons of Jacques Nahmias, founded the first press; the Turks, on the other hand, only began printing in their language in 1727.

[18] See A. Galanté, *Histoire des Juifs d'Istanbul*, 2 vols. (Vol. 1, Istanbul 1941; Vol. 2, Istanbul, 1942); Vol. 2, p. 212.

PATTERNS OF IDENTIFICATION WITH THE JEWISH COMMUNITY IN THE U.S.A.

Victor D. Sanua

INTRODUCTION

THE purpose of this paper is to review studies of attitudes and motivations of Jews which bear on patterns of identification with the Jewish community and participation in Jewish community services and activities.

While a great number of studies could be considered as relevant to the topic, the diversity in approach and methodology has made the task somewhat complex and difficult to achieve in a short paper. Many of the findings reported by these studies relate to particular groups, such as big city and small town Jews (some of the samples being random and others non-random) and groups known to have close involvement in Jewish affairs and those who do not. Methods used in collecting the data ranged from psychological tests, projective techniques, objective personality tests, scales of Jewish identification, and open-ended questionnaires, on the one hand, to simple general discussions and participant-observation on the other.

The groups studied were the membership of synagogues, Jewish community centres, total Jewish populations, or samples of the Jewish population living in a given city. Two recent sociological studies conducted by Lenski (1961) and Morgan (1962), for the purpose of studying general populations, have given us some information on the Jews only because they happened to be included in the sample. Some studies were conducted on a shoe-string budget while others were conducted by very well-known research organizations at a highly sophisticated level.

Most of the studies to be reviewed here implicitly or explicitly involve the concept of identification. This concept has been discussed by Freud (1946), Balint (1945), Seward (1954), Howe (1955), Foote (1951), and others. For purposes of this paper, the term will be taken to mean group identification.

Sherif (1956) used this term in referring to the general observation

that during the course of an individual's development, his self-identity becomes related to a group and that his experiences and actions are profoundly affected by his relationship with the group, by his conceiving himself as part of it and experiencing its triumphs and vicissitudes as joys and tribulations. Jewish identification is a very general term which has been difficult to define precisely. The fact that we are still struggling over the definition of 'what is a Jew' naturally makes it even more complex to define Jewish identification.

Chein (1955) has pointed out the difficulties involved in defining the term as it pertains to Jews. He indicates that the fractionalization of the Jewish community into innumerable factions and ideologies makes identification a somewhat complex phenomenon. He enumerates the different types of Jews: the 'out of pocket' Jew who feels that he has fulfilled his Jewishness by donating to charity, the 'cardiac' Jew who experiences his Jewishness in the heart, and the 'gastronomic' Jew who feels Jewish when he has had a Jewish meal. On the other hand, Chein states, there are many Jews who, while identifying themselves as Jews, do not care about anything which is Jewish.

From the studies reviewed, I have selected areas which would indicate a close relationship to Jewish life, such as religious education, charity contributions to Jewish and non-Jewish causes, observance of religious practices, attitude towards Israel and Gentiles, and association with Jewish and non-Jewish organizations.

Another concept which has often been used in discussing a minority group is marginality. The Jew has been considered to be the marginal man *par excellence*. This is how Stonequist (1942) defines the marginal man:

> The marginal man is the individual who lives in, or has ties of kinship with two or more interacting societies between which there exists sufficient incompatibility to render his own adjustment to them difficult or impossible. He does not quite 'belong' or feel at home in either group . . . For many it is a matter of incomplete cultural assimilation in one or both societies; for others it arises less because of lack of cultural assimilation than from failure to gain social acceptance, and in some cases it originates less because of obvious external barriers, than because of persistent inhibitions and loyalties (p. 297).

Lewin (1948) has provided us with a theoretical formulation of the problems faced by Jews. He indicates that an individual can have several types of identification, but conflict arises when there is no compatibility between the various roles he must fill and when there is a degree of uncertainty about just where he belongs. Lewin states that in the days when Jews lived in a ghetto, boundaries were clear-cut for them; they wore a badge which distinguished them from the dominant group. The in-group feeling led to extreme conservatism,

orthodoxy, and ethnic solidarity which, in turn, was responsible for the group's survival against difficult odds. During the period of the Emancipation, the ghetto walls practically disappeared in the western part of Europe and the Jew was able to move about freely. Thus, the Jewish group lost its compactness as boundaries became less well-defined. Since pressures from the outside group were eased, the trend for the Jew became to acquire the dress, habits, and language of the dominant group. While forging ahead, the Jew found himself between two worlds. The cause of the actual difficulty in the marginal individual is not inherent in the real or formal aspect of his belonging to many groups but in his feelings of insecurity with regard to belongingness. With regards to this uncertainty, Lewin adds:

> For the modern Jew there exists an additional factor to increase his uncertainty. He is frequently uncertain about the way he belongs to the Jewish group, and to what degree. Especially since religion has become a less important social matter, it is rather difficult to describe positively the character of the Jewish group as a whole. A religious group with many atheists? A Jewish race with a great diversity of racial qualities among its members? A nation without a state or a territory of its own containing the majority of its people? A group combined by one culture and tradition, but actually having in most respects the different values and ideals of the nations in which it lives? There are, I think, few chores more bewildering than that of determining positively the character of the Jewish group (p. 180).

The present survey has been conducted for the purpose of obtaining a general picture of the close ties of Jews to their community or their sense of identification with the Jewish ethos. The survey includes studies specifically conducted in the area of philanthropy whose primary purpose was to find out who are the donors and their motivations for giving. The second set of studies included in the survey covers community studies conducted for the purpose of establishing demographic characteristics of the Jewish population in a number of cities around the country and data about the nature of the respondents' 'Jewishness'.

PHILANTHROPY AS A SPECIAL ASPECT OF JEWISH IDENTIFICATION

According to Baron (1961), the historian, giving to charity in the United States may become the dominant expression of community allegiance. It is difficult to determine precise figures of Jewish benevolence. In March of 1963, information about financial drives in the United States and Canada was provided by the *Jewish Community Bulletin* of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. It is estimated that about $130,000,000 are raised by federations every year for maintenance needs alone. This excludes capital income and endowment income. If the latter two were added, the figure would probably

amount to $200,000,000. This does not include funds raised independently for synagogues and non-federated Jewish agencies. It is estimated that over one million Jews contribute each year. Klutznick (1961) has indicated that fund raising has become a catalyst, and the measure of conscience and esprit de corps of organized Jewish life. While the American community has given more to charity than any other Jewish community in the world, the fact remains that we are still somewhat doubtful whether American Jews give more than other groups on the basis of their per capita income. South African, Swiss, and English Jews claim their ratio of donations to be higher.

Jewish philanthropy was the subject of an interesting paper by Sklare (1962) who analysed some of the problems confronting the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies as well as other federations. According to Sklare, there has been a weakening of giving to Jewish organizations or causes connected with the belief that *tsedakah* is a God-given commandment. On the other hand, there is an increasing emphasis on the nonsectarian aspect of giving. A vivid example given by Sklare is Brandeis University which many thought would prove a failure and yet succeeded far beyond expectations. Sklare thinks that Brandeis University has provided donors with the possibility of supporting a nonsectarian cause within a Jewish setting. His pessimistic outlook is expressed in the following paragraph:

> The relatively modest proportion of Jewish households which give to federations and the modest level of most contributions, the reliance upon a small percentage of big-givers, the inability of the federations to increase their income in the face of rising needs, the ambiguities suggested by the success of nonsectarian oriented Jewish causes, the increasing acculturation of the giver and his resistance to conceiving of his philanthropy in traditional ways—these are only some of the problems which confront federations in particular and Jewish philanthropy in general.

The following is a series of studies which have been especially conducted under the auspices of federations for the sole purpose of defining attitudes of donors towards philanthropy. Such information as to the characteristics of the high, low, and non-donors, motivation for giving and non-giving, attitudes towards the Federation and its beneficiary agencies, participation in Jewish community and religious life, attitudes and opinions with respect to Jewish identification was usually included. Such studies were conducted in Essex County, St. Louis, Los Angeles, and New York City. Three of these studies were conducted by research agencies which used professional interviewers.

(*a*) *Essex County (1961)*

The most recent large-scale study of the characteristics of the contributor to philanthropy was conducted for the Jewish Community

Council of Essex County by the National Research Opinion Center. The 30,000 contributors to the Federation campaign in 1960 were separated into five different classes depending on the size of their contribution. A few selected characteristics of the donor groups are listed as follows:

	Giving more than $2,500	*Giving $500 to $999*	*Giving less than $100*
Median Income	$50,000	$26,700	$12,900
Self-employed	90%	75·8%	39%
Less than high school education	29·9%	14·2%	14·3%
Attended Hebrew School	73·0%	77·0%	66·0%
Not synagogue members	19·0%	7·6%	35·7%

The following represents some of the values selected by these donors as necessary to being a good Jew:

Essential Values	*Giving more than $2,500*	*Giving $500 to $999*	*Giving less than $100*
Contribute to charity	77%	65%	44%
Support Israel	59%	56%	41%
Belong to a temple	67%	68%	49%
Knowledge of the fundamentals of Judaism	67%	66%	58%
Gain respect of Christians	56%	74%	61%
Marry within faith	41%	50%	47%
Accept being a Jew	89%	88%	91%
Provide Jewish education for children	66%	69%	61%

The data indicate that the low donor was less oriented towards traditional Jewish values. Moreover, the study reported that the low donor gives relatively less to the Federation campaign and less to all kinds of Jewish causes as compared with the higher donor. The reasons for giving to a favourite charity similarly differentiated the low and high donor. 'Ethnic loyalty' was the primary factor underlying motivations of the high donor and ranked third with the low donor. A second important reason for giving, mentioned by most donors, was that the campaign helps Israel, for which great admiration and support were expressed. Loyalty to local civic needs was seventh in line, which fails to corroborate the conclusion of the St. Louis study (discussed below) which suggested that the Federation should emphasize local civic support in its campaign. It should be pointed out that 82 per cent of all persons interviewed in the Essex County study belonged to one or more Jewish organizations.

(*b*) *St. Louis Study* (*1960*)

This study was primarily concerned with donors' reactions to overseas giving versus local or national giving. The study was conducted in

three phases: (1) Intensive interviews with 25 men selected at random from a group of 71 men considered to be opinion leaders by the Federation. Ten of them were interviewed by the senior and associate director of the study and the rest by St. Louis interviewers. An interview guide was developed, on the basis of these interviews, to probe both conscious and less conscious aspects of giving, and the major reliance was on open-ended questionnaires. (2) Selection of a sample which included major donors who had given $250 or more and those deemed to be capable of contributing this amount or more. (3) The final phase of the research included the re-interviewing of a number of donors; the latter sample was deliberately loaded with a greater proportion of under-givers.

On the basis of their findings, the researchers presented the following suggestions:

(*a*) It would be desirable to have a token reduction in the proportion of money donated to United Jewish Appeal;
(*b*) the Federation should build its prestige in preparation for an ultimate—perhaps imminent—separation of the two drives;
(*c*) alternatives such as designated giving undermined the function, authority and role of the Federation and would lead to resentment;
(*d*) Federation would lose ground unless it moved and adjusted itself, and redefined its goals and activities;
(*e*) Federation should become directly involved with social, cultural, and educational activities.

The major conclusion reached by the investigators was as follows:

> Taken in conjunction with the other findings, we would conclude that there is probably room and direction for beginning to reduce the size of overseas contributions, but that this ought to be handled with great care and moderation.

Let us see whether this statement is justified by the actual empirical data. When the question was raised about discontinuing financial help to Israel, 93 per cent of the pro-Israel group voiced opposition as compared with 80 per cent of those positive to all causes, 65 per cent of the under-givers, and 45 per cent of the pro-local givers. (In the total sample, 78 per cent were opposed to this idea.) Respondents were further questioned about what they would do if there were two separate drives and who would receive the major share. Only 63 per cent of those who were pro-Israel indicated that they would give more money to United Jewish Appeal as compared with 4 per cent of the pro-local giving group who indicated similarly.

Respondents were questioned about their reactions to local and to

overseas giving by the use of the semantic differential.* While the study does not report in detail on these findings, it says that overseas giving was found to be more vigorous, masculine, turbulent, and exciting. Local giving was found to be comparatively maternal, middle-aged, and respectable, indicating that overseas needs are more dependent on and more tinged with emotion.

It is possible that the advice to reduce allocations for overseas needs has been suggested by the finding that more people would give to the Federation than to U.J.A. if the drives were separated. On the other hand, it has also been pointed out that overseas giving is closely related to the 'emotions' of the donor. The investigators do not present detailed data about the differences found among the various groups in the study based on the semantic differential technique.

It is somewhat difficult to reconcile these two findings—a reluctance to give more money to the U.J.A. when two drives are organized and a more positive reaction when attitude towards giving to Israel is measured indirectly. One factor, which is not seriously considered by most studies, is the religious background of the interviewers. Since this study was conducted by a non-Jewish organization, is it possible that the respondents felt impelled (except for the pro-Israel group) to favour local giving, since emphasizing overseas giving might have been interpreted as having a greater allegiance to Israel than to the United States? Studies have already reported the sensitivity of Jews on this point. If the same questions were asked by clearly identified Jewish and non-Jewish interviewers, it is possible that different types of responses would be recorded. However, the use of a psychological technique, specifically the semantic differential used here, constitutes a major methodological improvement on the other studies which primarily relied on interviewers.

(*c*) *Los Angeles Study* (*1955*)

In 1955 the Research Service Bureau of the Los Angeles Community Council studied the attitudes of givers and non-givers towards various aspects of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Funds. Interviews were conducted with 161 subjects. The major purpose of the study was to assess the image of the U.J.W.F. as held by different types of donors.

The study reports that among the small or medium givers, the theme of charity and Israel predominates, while among the large givers, Israel appears to be the 'keynote'. In this latter group, the ratio of giving to Israel and Los Angeles (local giving) is 4·51 : 1. Non-givers most often respond in terms of the Los Angeles (local) emphasis in their

* The Semantic Differential measures indirectly the connotations of words and objects. The stimulus words are rated on a seven-point scale ranging from positive to negative reactions, and the respondent is asked to record his first impression on the scale. For further information on the technique, see Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957).

definition of the U.J.W.F. (0·88 : 1). The study indicates that it is noteworthy that the extent to which mention of Israel predominates over mention of local Jewish communities increases with the size of the gift. This suggests that Israel plays a very important role in the mind of the large giver to the U.J.W.F.

In view of the finding and subsequent suggestion reported in the St. Louis study that the giving to Israel be de-emphasized, is it possible that the type of findings pertaining to Israel depends on the characteristics of the Jews living in a given city under study, or a function of the manner in which the question is posed? For example, in Los Angeles respondents were asked as to what kind of image they have about the U.J.W.F., while in St. Louis respondents were questioned whether, if the drives were split, would they give more to Federation or to U.J.A.

It should be noted that in order to obtain some consistency in findings, investigators should attempt to replicate studies across the United States, using similar tools and questions and similar samples to avoid results which may only reflect differences in the conditions and variables selected by the investigators. Independent findings, without an effort in obtaining comparable data, do not lead to an accumulation of significant data.

While the Los Angeles study was conducted in 1955 and the St. Louis study in 1960, it may be assumed that interest in Israel might diminish in time, particularly in view of its recent comparative strength. However, the Essex County study, conducted in 1961, still shows that interest in Israel remains strong. The largest givers in the Los Angeles study tend to favour Israel as compared to small givers; 60 per cent indicated that Israel is very beneficial to the status and security of American Jews, and 71 per cent were willing to indicate that the Jews should try to influence United States foreign policy in favour of Israel. Here, there was no fear of expressing dual allegiance. It should be pointed out, however, that all the interviewers in the Los Angeles study were Jewish.

(*d*) *New York City Study* (*1952*)

In 1952 the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies contracted with A. J. Wood and Co. to conduct a study which would provide a complete and comprehensive analysis of the knowledge, attitudes, and interests of the Jewish public with respect to the operations of the Federation.

While a 15 per cent loss of respondents is to be expected in normal surveys, the loss of respondents in this study amounted to 50 per cent —and that following six attempts to reach respondents. This is the highest loss of respondents reported in the studies I have surveyed, and would also tend to make the results more optimistic. The unwillingness

of respondents to co-operate was due to: (1) belief that interviews were just a fancy way of soliciting funds; (2) the fact that the question pertaining to income status was considered as an indirect way of obtaining information which could be used for further soliciting; (3) in some cases, to complete disinterest in the Federation and a consequent unwillingness to cooperate.

It is probable that Jews living in big cities are less willing to be interviewed than those in small cities or towns. Once the cases were interviewed they were grouped according to income, age, and religious affiliation. The major findings reported were: (1) Only 13 per cent of the sample considered that the Federation should lay greater stress on the Jewish character of the organization than had been done in the past, while 9 per cent wanted less emphasis on the Jewish aspect of the Federation, and the remainder felt that no change in emphasis was necessary. (2) Of the respondents, 36 per cent thought that it was more important to help Jews abroad, while 34 per cent expressed preference for helping Jews in the United States, and 22 per cent stated that help to both causes was of equal importance. Helping Jews abroad was mentioned more frequently by the lowest income group, younger people, and Orthodox and Conservative affiliated groups.

The objective measurement of the motivation for giving was done by relating each type of response with the amount of the contribution. With good control in the income of the respondent, it was found that the Jewish community theme is not only the strongest of motivations influencing contributions but it is also the strongest gratification felt after giving to charity. The conclusion drawn from the study was that 'An emotional appeal stressing the projection of the name of the Jewish community and the need for taking care of our own people would have the strongest motivating influence in persuading the public to contribute to Federation'.

STUDIES CONDUCTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

For a number of years, the national organization of the American Jewish Committee has been conducting or has been assisting in studies taking place in different parts of the United States for purposes of finding out how adult Jews feel about Judaism, their own Jewishness, their reactions to Jewish and non-Jewish neighbours, their experience of antisemitism, and so on. Only three of these studies will be discussed here; they were conducted in cities which were given the fictitious names of Riverton, Bayville, and Southville.

While the Riverton study (1957) was conducted by professionals, other surveys were conducted by volunteer interviewers, and except for the Riverton study, which was printed and published by the

American Jewish Committee, all other studies are available in mimeographed form only or are still unpublished.

The Riverton study, a most elaborate piece of research, was conducted in a sizable industrial town in the East named 'Riverton'. Out of a total population of 130,000 in this town, 7 per cent were Jewish. The sample included 200 families with both parents as well as one of their adolescent children between the ages of 13 and 20, and all were interviewed. This procedure enabled the investigators to study the differences between two generations of Jews.

Denominational affiliation of the parents was found to be: 16 per cent Orthodox, 43 per cent Conservative, 30 per cent Reform, 7 per cent 'other', while 4 per cent stated that they had no religious affiliation. The trend among the younger generation was reported to be towards greater affiliation with the Conservative and Reform denominational groups. Some, however, expected to abandon their Conservative affiliation for the Reform.

When questioned about their religious practices and observances, only 10 per cent of the families indicated that they observed all the major religious customs. The following figures indicate the customs observed by the families:

72 per cent observe High Holidays;
44 per cent observe the Seder;
47 per cent celebrate Bar Mitzvah;
31 per cent observe dietary laws (only 8 per cent have two sets of dishes); and
31 per cent light candles on Friday nights.

Children were asked to express their reactions to their parents' religious practices in order to determine whether any conflicts exist between the two generations in this area. In response to this question, 83 per cent of the younger generation expressed approval and only 14 per cent expressed indifference or negative attitudes. No differences were found between those coming from Orthodox homes and those from Reform homes, nor were there any differences between male and female respondents. Projecting to the future, the investigators found that children are not expected to deviate significantly from the religious practices of their parents; 72 per cent intend to observe the same traditions that their parents do, 11 per cent intend to be less observant, and 7 per cent plan on being more observant than their parents.

The majority of the sample in the Riverton study expressed a positive attitude towards the existence of Israel. Only 5 per cent of the parents and 9 per cent of the children expressed negative feelings. However, the desire to live in Israel was rather minimal and expressed by only 7 per cent of the parents and 10 per cent of the children.

Contributions to Jewish charities and causes were another aspect

investigated by this study. Respondents were asked to list charities they would prefer to contribute to; the following table shows the distribution of their choices:

	Parents	*Children*
	%	%
Jewish charities	75	46
Non-sectarian	11	21
No preference	14	22

Some differences were found between the three denominational groups: 94 per cent of the Orthodox group, 78 per cent of the Conservative, and 74 per cent of the Reform group indicated they would contribute to Jewish charity organizations.

The above figures indicate that only half of the children would contribute exclusively to Jewish charities. It may be suggested that the choice of one alternative might have caused some conflict among the adolescent group since limiting their contributions to Jewish charities could be interpreted as a sign of chauvinism. It would have been more effective to have asked the respondents how, given a certain amount of money, they would then have distributed it among various charity organizations including those assisting Israel.

By and large, the study suggests that most of the respondents expressed the desire to remain Jewish. There was little expression of inferiority feelings or self-hatred. However, such emotions can hardly be expected to be expressed to a Jewish interviewer conducting his interviews under the auspices of a Jewish agency.

It would have been of interest if a similar study had been conducted by a non-Jewish interviewer in a study sponsored by a non-Jewish agency. There is sufficient evidence in the literature pointing to the fact that respondents' attitudes are easily altered in response to the interviewer's characteristics.

The over-all findings of this major study are that adolescents would like to see Jews and Judaism survive and that they tend to identify themselves as Jews in different ways. The authors conclude on an optimistic note, stating that these adolescents have no plans for assimilation with the dominant group. On the other hand, they do not shy away from participating in the activities of the general community.

The Southville (1959) and Bayville (1961) studies were also conducted by the American Jewish Committee. While professional workers were used in the Riverton study, volunteers were used in the latter two studies. In Southville, volunteer interviewers were selected from the total Jewish population, while in Bayville, volunteers were recruited from members of the American Jewish Committee. In Southville, a sample of the total Jewish population of the city was involved in the study while in Bayville, respondents were selected from the membership of Jewish organizations.

In Southville, the name for a major metropolis with a population of 500,000 and a Jewish population of 8,000, 285 families were interviewed. They represented 10 per cent of the Jewish population. Of the total sample, 94 per cent stated they were affiliated with a temple or synagogue, 53 per cent were Reform, 41 per cent Orthodox, and only 4 per cent were affiliated with a Conservative synagogue. However, 40 per cent of the Orthodox-affiliated indicated that they considered themselves Conservative.

The following represent the practices which, according to subjects interviewed in Southville, are considered essential to being a good Jew:

%	
95	Believe in God
93	Lead an ethical and moral life
88	Accept being a Jew and not hide it
74	Gain respect of Christian neighbours
72	Support humanitarian causes
71	Belong to a synagogue or temple
66	Know the fundamentals of Judaism
59	Promote civic betterment and improvement
57	Attend services on High Holidays
53	Marry within the Jewish group
48	Work for equality for all minority groups
38	Contribute to Jewish philanthropies
28	Support Israel
19	Attend weekly services
13	Observe dietary laws

The following Jewish causes are listed here according to the importance attached by the respondents for philanthropic support: synagogues, community relation agencies, Jewish family services, Jewish community centres, national youth-serving agencies, local Jewish education, Israeli causes, Jewish hospitals, overseas relief, institutions of higher learning, research and publications on Jewish history and background. It is surprising to note that despite the rather high degree of education attained by the respondents, intellectual pursuits received the least support.

In spite of the low ranking of support for Israeli causes, when the question was specific to Israel 90 per cent reported that they would feel a sense of personal loss if Israel were destroyed and 60 per cent would consider it a 'very deep' sense of personal loss.

As to the distribution of their donations, 45 per cent of Southville respondents indicated that they gave more than one-half of their donations to Jewish causes; 17 per cent equally to sectarian and non-sectarian causes, and 13 per cent more to non-sectarian causes.

When respondents were asked how they would feel if their children

should marry out, 68 per cent said they would strongly disapprove and 19 per cent mildly disapprove, while 12 per cent indicated that it would make no difference, and 1 per cent would mildly approve.

In the Bayville study, 249 persons were selected for interviews. Again, beliefs and practices which according to respondents are essential to being a good Jew were similar to the findings of the above study with some slight differences. More Jews in the Bayville survey considered giving to charity and support for Israel as very essential; on their contribution to charity, 70 per cent indicated that they gave more to Jewish drives, 18 per cent more to non-sectarian drives, while 8 per cent gave about the same to sectarian and non-sectarian drives. Here we see a significant difference between the Jews of Bayville and those of Southville. Almost half of the respondents in Bayville are formerly from New York. The extent to which this origin has affected their motivations for giving more to Jewish charities cannot be determined unless the data are re-examined to see whether former residents of New York City are more likely to favour Jewish causes than those who were raised outside the New York area.

DEMOGRAPHIC STUDIES CONDUCTED BY JEWISH AGENCIES

A large number of studies have been conducted by federations and Jewish community centres for the primary purpose of establishing the demographic characteristics of their constituencies which would help them in formulating programmes and strategies to fulfil their functions. Surveys conducted in New Orleans, Washington, D.C., Long Beach, California, and Greater Lynn, Massachusetts, will be discussed in this paper.

(*a*) *New Orleans Study* (*1953*)

While the New Orleans study is a little more than ten years old, it could serve as a model for further studies, particularly since it is quite elaborate. The schedule used in this study was developed from schedules used in six other cities and a 'standard' form devised by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

Some of the findings which are related to the Jewish identity of the respondents in New Orleans are presented below.

Of the married Jews in New Orleans, 7 per cent had non-Jewish spouses; 50 per cent of the subjects were located in one section of town, thus indicating a high concentration of Jews in this city. In the age group 6 to 20, 79 per cent were attending Sunday School as compared with 20 per cent attending Hebrew School. Of the households with children not yet receiving religious education, 9 out of 10 indicated that they planned such education for them in the future. Consequently, it appears that to all intents and purposes, most parents expect their

children to receive some kind of Jewish education. Approximately three-quarters of the New Orleans Jewish population over the age of 12 reported membership in at least one congregation. It is possible that membership may reflect identification with particular congregations based upon other than formal membership and, therefore, the membership figures may be over-inflated. More than one-third of the population over the age of 13 indicated membership in a men's club or sisterhood chapter of a synagogue or temple. Contrary to other studies, the Reform group seems to be dominant among New Orleans Jews, since more than half of the subjects indicated such congregational preference. As for the rest, one-third indicated they were Orthodox and 5 per cent that they were Conservative. The answer 'none' or 'no answer' was given by only 9 per cent of the cases. The largest percentages of members were reported in organizations such as the Jewish Community Center (20 per cent), B'nai B'rith (17·8 per cent), and Council of Jewish Women and Hadassah (each with 15 per cent). The Zionist group had a membership of 6·1 per cent.

(*b*) *Washington, D.C., Study (1956)*

Another major study of the Jewish population was conducted by Bigman in Washington, D.C. Estimates for the Jewish population in that city ranged from 40,000 to 70,000. The study sought answers to numerous questions such as the geographic location of the Jews in the city, their religious, educational, cultural, and philanthropic activities, and their permanency of residence in that city. Such information was considered to be essential to a more effective conduct of communal affairs. Volunteer workers were used in the initial phase of the study. However, when it was learned that fewer than half of the assigned addresses were contacted by these workers, it was decided that the workers were burdened with more than they had been led to expect. Consequently, two-thirds of the interviews were conducted by 30 professional people, mostly statisticians and sociologists. To illustrate the difference between trained and untrained interviewers, it was noted that 17 per cent of the volunteer workers were unable to obtain information as to their subjects' income status as compared with 8 per cent of the professional interviewers. Approximately 1,600 interviews with Jewish families were completed. While all the volunteer interviewers were Jewish, the professional workers' group was mixed. Some of the findings are presented below.

Of the total sample, 61 per cent were not affiliated with any Jewish organizations or congregations, which contrasts sharply with the findings of the New Orleans study. As to the women, 40 per cent indicated non-affiliation. It was reported that among women membership rate increased correspondingly with the family income, while among males whose incomes ranged up to $10,000 the trend was reversed. Among

the teenagers (up to 15) more than one-half of the boys and about 40 per cent of the girls indicated membership in at least one Jewish organization, while the trend was reversed in the 16–19-year-old group. However, it was reported that men as compared to women have a higher percentage of membership in non-sectarian organizations. Thus, it appears that the women's interests, in this sample, were more Jewish community-oriented while the males tended to concentrate their interests in the community affairs at large.

With regard to philanthropy, 92·1 per cent of the families indicated they contributed to the Red Feather Campaign, while 79·3 per cent indicated that they contributed to the United Jewish Appeal of Washington. However, records are not available as to which of these two campaigns received more money.

When questioned on their synagogue or temple affiliation, 56 per cent indicated no such affiliation, 12 per cent indicated they belonged to an Orthodox synagogue, 25 per cent to a Conservative, and 6·3 per cent to a Reform temple. A similarity in demographic characteristics was found between the Orthodox group and those not affiliated with any congregation; both were in the lower income bracket, had lower occupations and educational background, were older, and had been born abroad. The majority of those who were not affiliated with a synagogue or temple indicated that this was due to the fact that they had no children of an age at which attendance at synagogue services would be meaningful to them.

The percentage of mixed marriages was found to be rather high compared with other studies—12·2 per cent. The author explains this in pointing out that the sample in this study was not primarily derived from 'master lists' of known Jews but also derived from all blocks in the area. A comparison of the two samples shows that the rate was 5·2 per cent in Jewish families identified through the 'master' list and 19·9 per cent identified in the block sample. Rosenthal (1963) recently wrote an extensive article surveying the literature on the subject of intermarriage. He found an increasing rate of intermarriage in the United States. His report had widespread repercussions among Jewish leaders and in Jewish newspapers.

(*c*) *Long Beach-Rossmoor, California, Study* (*1962*)

This study was conducted by Massarik in a city populated by approximately 15,000 Jews. Some of the major findings are as follows.

Of the total sample, 50 per cent were synagogue members and 11·2 per cent attended services very often or frequently; only 9 per cent had married out; Jewish history and culture (67 per cent), Jewish identification (35 per cent), and Jewish life in the United States (30 per cent), were considered as the major themes of Jewish education. Almost 98 per cent of the respondents indicated that the children must or

ought to receive Jewish education. Moreover, it was found that 55 per cent belonged to at least one Jewish organization; that 30 per cent had no preference with regard to the type of kitchen their community centre ought to have (kosher or non-kosher); preferences for local and overseas dollar allocations were quite evenly balanced; persons with higher income tended to express slightly more positive feelings towards the United Jewish Welfare Funds when compared with those in the lower income bracket, but religious identification was not related to attitudes towards U.J.W.F.; only 25 per cent indicated that antisemitism presented no problem.

(*d*) *Greater Lynn, Massachusetts, Study (1956)*

A very simple study was conducted by the Jewish Community Federation of Greater Lynn on the Jewish population in that town. The study was conducted because of the recent population changes in Boston caused by the Jews moving out of Boston and into suburban areas at a rapid rate. Such a study designed to understand the effect of the changes in Greater Lynn's demographic composition was considered important to effective planning of programmes by local congregations, Jewish schools, and social agencies. A questionnaire consisting of 18 simply worded questions was prepared, and 166 volunteers were used to telephone 3,163 households whose names had been collected from the various lists of Jewish agencies in the area.

It was found that six out of ten children between the ages of 5 and 12 were receiving some kind of Jewish education. Peak enrolment began at the age of 9 and dropped after the child reached the age of 12, although almost one-half of the 13-year-olds were still enrolled for Jewish education. The following table shows both affiliation and non-affiliation, and the type of synagogue or temple respondents belonged to or claimed identification with.

	77% affiliated	*21% non-affiliated*
	%	%
Orthodox	42	38
Conservative	51	44
Reform	7	18
	100	100

2% no report.

No striking difference was found between the affiliated and non-affiliated groups as to their religious denominational identification.

It is interesting to note that in this study a respondent's age was the most difficult item of information to obtain. Two recent studies by Sterne (1961) in Trenton, N. J., and by Goldstein (1964) in Providence, R.I., report substantial involvement on respondents' part in Jewish community activities.

STUDIES OF JEWS IN SMALL TOWNS

Studies in the literature have focused on the Jews as a cosmopolitan people and the majority of the above studies concentrated on Jews living in large or very near to large cities. Rose (1961), because of his interest in the small-town Jew, wanted to find the extent to which group traditions prevail in cases of relative isolation and whether identification is preserved in these cases.

Through his personal acquaintance with 20 Jews living in a small town, he was able, by what he terms the 'pyramiding process', to obtain 180 subjects for his study. The findings revealed that 86 per cent of the small-town Jews placed themselves in some Jewish category; 75 per cent asserted their affiliation with some religious congregation but also indicated that they rarely or never attended services because of the distances involved; 50 per cent celebrated Passover, 15 per cent maintained a strictly kosher home. Thus, the large majority of the small-town Jews maintained some effective affiliation with their religion, in spite of the geographic isolation in which they were placed.

By relating religiosity to the number of Jews living in small towns, Rose was able to show that the presence of several Jewish families in a town tended to reinforce religious identity and support religious practice. It is interesting to note that those with low religiosity thought that Gentiles considered them 'different' from the typical Jew. The author, however, predicts that with the present tendency of children to move away from the small town and settle in larger cities, the small-town Jewish population will rapidly decrease in years to come.

Like Rose, Kaplan (1957) was interested in the small-town Jew but conducted his study in three small Jewish communities in the South. His study was based on interviews, case histories, and demographic analyses. The author conceded that as a participant observer he would be vulnerable in his subjective evaluation of the community. In one of these communities, Kaplan indicates that the Jews had completely disappeared by 1910; in the second community Jews were in the process of extinction; while in the third community the Jews were well-integrated. The preservation of group identity in the third community was due to the fact that many Jews, predominantly of Eastern European background, had migrated to this area and sought to preserve enough of their Jewish distinctiveness. Kaplan is very pessimistic about the survival of the small-town Jewish communities and, like Rose, thinks that they will ultimately disappear.

Kramer and Leventman (1961) provide us with a portrayal of Jews in a typical American city which they named 'North City' located in the Mid-West. In their analyses they used both historical data of the community as well as interviews with three generations of Jews selected from social clubs, organizations, and synagogues. The sample was

selected to test specific hypotheses about the resolution of conflicts in a minority community rather than to permit generalizations about all American Jews.

The foregoing studies were based on interviews, study of documents, participant-observation, and various types of questionnaires differing in their degree of sophistication. Except for Rose and Kaplan who predict the gradual disappearance of Jewish communities in the smaller towns, the other authors remain somewhat optimistic with regard to the future of Judaism, despite the expressed fear that assimilation may make some inroads.

STUDIES CONDUCTED BY NON-JEWISH RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS ON THE GENERAL COMMUNITY

A large-scale study of the significance of religious factors in determining political and economic values was conducted by the University of Michigan under the direction of Lenski (1961).

Findings of this study revealed that while the associational (religious) bond among Jews was weak, their communal bond was extremely strong, even stronger than that of any other group; 77 per cent of the Jews indicated that all, or nearly all, of their close friends were Jewish. Another method used in this study was to ask respondents whether any of their friends or relatives would try to discourage them, be disturbed, or be unhappy if they joined another religious group. In response to this question, 96 per cent of the Jews indicated that they would expect some sanctions from family and/or friends as compared to 87 per cent of the Catholics and 75 per cent of the Protestants.

While evidence indicates that subjects belonging to the middle class are more highly involved in religious associations than lower class subjects, the trend appears to be reversed for the Jewish group. Using a larger sample of studies conducted in previous surveys in Detroit, Lenski indicates that while none of the middle class Jews reported weekly attendance at a synagogue, 19 per cent of the working class responded that they attended weekly services. Despite this weakening of involvement and participation in religious activities, the overwhelming majority of Jewish subjects indicated opposition to intermarriage (92 per cent). The percentages for the Catholics and Protestants were 81 and 75 respectively.

Another group of investigators at the University of Michigan, headed by Morgan (1962), studied the distribution of earned income among a cross-section of non-institutionalized population in the United States. A chapter was devoted to voluntary contributions and philanthropy. The general finding is that Jews give substantially more to individuals, houses of worship, and charitable organizations than any other religious group, including the Episcopalians, who enjoy a higher income than

the Jews. It is not only the magnitude of the contributions which are higher but also the pattern of giving which differentiates Jews from non-Jews. The explanation given by the author is as follows:

> The Jewish population has a cultural tradition with a high sense of community among its members, a well-developed organization for the extraction of money and the exertion of pressures, a long history of persecution and hostile environment providing a constant pressure to maintain a sense of community and innovation in techniques in collection.

The most dramatic finding of this study is a relationship between higher education and less philanthropic giving among the young, white, non-farm population. It will not be known whether this applies to Jews as well unless further analysis of the data is conducted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this survey I have included a number of studies conducted in Jewish communities for the purpose of defining attitudes towards giving, and of obtaining information about the demographic characteristics of the Jewish population in a number of large cities, suburbs, small towns, and villages.

Contributions to charity and acceptance of one's Jewishness were two of the major responses selected by donors as being 'essential to being a good Jew' in a number of studies. In the Essex County study it was found that more money was donated to Jewish causes. Big donors gave a larger share of their donations to Jewish causes than smaller contributors. In the Los Angeles study the U.J.W.F.'s primary function was reported to be helping Jews abroad. This type of image was projected more frequently by the big donor. In the New York Federation study, helping Jews abroad, however, was found to be stronger among the lowest income group, among younger people, and those of Orthodox or Conservative affiliation. The New York sample had a larger percentage of Reform-identified respondents (43 per cent) than either Essex (35 per cent) or Los Angeles (30 per cent). The St. Louis study is the only one among the four surveyed which reached the conclusion that giving to Israel should be de-emphasized and found that the major need was to give the Federation a more non-sectarian as well as a more local tone. We have already indicated that the actual data as presented by the writers of this report do not seem to justify their conclusions.

If we could generalize from the findings reported by the studies reviewed here, it would appear that membership in Jewish organizations and synagogues is lower in big cities. Jews in medium-size towns, because of the large membership in their synagogues, will be able to maintain their identity, while Jews in large cities, though tending to

have less contact with synagogues as indicated in the Lenski study, tend to have strong communal ties. Kaplan and Rose feel that Jewish community life in very small towns and villages is bound to disappear.

A complete compilation of Jewish studies is somewhat difficult since only a small number appear in the regular stream of social science literature and thus are never included in the usual abstracts. Therefore, the research worker has to rely on correspondence, news reports in Jewish bulletins, hearsay, etc. Considering the large number of social scientists who are Jewish, research in this area is scant. This has led Lipset (1955) to indicate that 'the phenomenon of Jewish scholars ignoring the Jews as a field of study is not unique to sociology, although the gap is more glaring there, since the study of immigrant and ethnic groups has been so important in the field'. Some writers, like Koenig (1948), have explained this dearth of research among Jews as being due to the group's extreme sensitivity. It seems that any kind of research by social scientists would set them aside and 'expose' Jewish life to the Gentile world. Since there is so much emphasis upon acculturation, research which might show differences would not be welcome. Koenig makes the following comments concerning this lack of empirical research:

> The Jews in America, as a group, have not only received attention, have not only been written about and discussed, but have also been generalized upon more than any other ethnic group. The basis, however, for any sort of sound generalization is a body of concrete data which in this case is largely lacking. The material that does exist is either mainly journalistic, or literary, or philosophical.

The above was written in 1948, but since then there have been some meagre attempts to conduct social science studies on Jews. Reviews of the literature in this area have been written by Fishman (1957–58, 1959, 1960) and Sanua (1962, 1963, 1964) all appearing in *Jewish Education*. A number of books have appeared in the last few years, primarily originating from Ph.D. dissertations: Kaplan (1957), Kramer and Leventman (1961), and Poll (1962). Volumes representing a compilation of studies or reports—Sklare (1958) and Graeber and Britt (1942)—have also appeared. The publications issued by the YIVO Research Institute are another major source of studies on Jews.

During the autumn of 1960 the Associated Y.M.-Y.W.H.A.s of Greater New York, with the support of the Russell Sage Foundation, initiated a research programme to conduct studies in community centres affiliated with the Associated Ys. While the major purpose of these developments has been prompted by the need of applying scientific methodology to the evaluation of services in community centres, the general field of social science research on Jews should be enriched through these efforts. A series of published and unpublished

reports, prepared by the present writer, have resulted from this co-operation (Sanua, 1963b, c, and d; 1964a, b, c, and d).

While there is a lack of social research on Jews, Jewish community relations agencies have been spending a great deal of effort in studying antisemitism, the antisemitic person, or authoritarian personality (Tumin, 1961, and Adorno, 1950). On the other hand, if they do conduct studies on Jews, the material is for limited circulation and never appears in the regular literature.

More and more students are becoming interested in social studies on Jews and these intellectual resources should be encouraged. Furthermore, the task requires the mobilization of the expressed interest of a number of social scientists, as well as the education of Jewish communal leaders to the importance of supporting a centralized programme for initiating and conducting research on the psychological and sociological characteristics of Jews in order to accumulate empirical and comparative information. The conditions are quite favourable today, since the expenditure of funds for research is being encouraged by governmental agencies and private foundations. The climate is propitious for initiating large-scale scientific inquiries into Jewish life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADORNO, T. W., FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK, E., LEVINSON, D. J., and SANFORD, R. N., *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York, 1950.

BALINT, M., Identification, in S. Lorand *et al.* (eds.) *The Yearbook of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. I, New York, 1945.

BARON, S., quoted by P. Klutznick (ed.), *No Easy Answers*, New York, 1961, p. 86.

BIGMAN, S. K., *The Jewish Population of Greater Washington in 1956*. Washington, D.C., The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, D.C., 1956.

BORSKY, P. N. *et al.*, *Motivation for Charitable Giving: A Case Study of Eastern Metropolitan Area*, University of Chicago, National Opinion Research Center, Report No. 78, July 1961.

CHEIN, I., 'The Problem of Jewish Identification', *Jewish Social Studies*, 1955, 17, 219–22.

COHEN, F., *An Investigation of Modified Probability Sampling Procedures in Interview Surveys*, American University (Washington, D.C.), Unpublished Master's Thesis, 1955.

FISHMAN, J. A., 'Social Science Research Relevant to American Jewish Education' (First annual Bibliographic Review), *Jewish Education*, 1957–58, 28, 49–60.

—, 'Social Science Research Relevant to American Jewish Education' (Second Annual Bibliographic Review), *Jewish Education*, 1959, 29, 64–71.

—, 'Social Science Research Relevant to American Jewish Education' (Third Annual Bibliographic Review), *Jewish Education*, 1960, 30, 35–45.

FOOTE, N., 'Identification as the Basis of a Theory of Motivation,' *American Sociological Review*, 1951, 16, 14–21.

FREUD, ANNA, *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defenses*, New York, 1946.

GOLDMAN, B. B., *The Jewish Population of New Orleans, Louisiana, 1953*, New York, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

GOLDSTEIN, S., *A Population Survey: The Greater Providence Jewish Community*, Providence, Rhode Island, The General Jewish Committee of Providence, 1964.

GRAEBER, I., and BRITT, H. (eds.), *Jews in a Gentile World*, New York, 1942.

HANSEN, M. H. *et al.*, *Sample Survey Methods and Theory*, Vol. I, New York, 1954, Chapter 7, Sec. 10.

HARTMANN, H., and KRIS, E., 'Comments on the Formation of Psychic Structure', *International Study of the Child*, 1946, 2, 11–38.

HOWE, LOUISE P., 'Sociological Aspects of Identification', in Muenstenberger, Axelrad (ed.), *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*, New York, 1955, pp. 61–82.

The Jewish Community Federation of Greater Lynn, Massachusetts, *The Jewish Population of Greater Lynn, Mass.: A Demographic Study*, Lynn, Mass., 1956.

KAHN, E. L., *et al.*, *Changing Patterns of Giving*, Jewish Federation of St. Louis, Mo. (prepared by Social Research Inc.), June 1960.

KAPLAN, B., *The Eternal Stranger: A Sociological Study of Jewish Life in the Small Community*, New York, 1957.

KLUTZNICK, P. M., 'Big Money and Big Givers', in *No Easy Answers*, New York, 1961, pp. 85–103.

KOENIG, S., 'Methods of Studying Jewish Life in America', *YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science*, Vols. II–III, New York, YIVO, 1948.

KRAMER, JUDITH, and LEVENTMAN, S., *Children of the Gilded Ghetto*, New Haven, 1961.

LAZERWITZ, B., 'Jews In and Out of New York City', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 1961, 3, 254–60.

LENSKI, G., *The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics and Family Life*, New York, 1961.

LEWIN, K., 'Bringing Up the Jewish Child', in *Resolving Social Conflicts*, New York, 1948, 169–85.

LEWIN, K., 'Psychosocial Problems of a Minority Group', in *Resolving Social Conflicts*, New York, 1948, 145–58. (This paper gives the theoretical discussion of marginality.)

LIPSET, S., 'Jewish Sociologists and Sociologists of the Jews', *Jewish Social Studies*, 1955, 17, 177–78.

MASSARIK, F., *et al.*, *What People Think About the UJWF: A Study of Characteristics and Attitudes of UJWF Prospects and Workers*. Prepared by the Research Service Bureau, Los Angeles, California, Jewish Community Council, 1955.

MASSARIK, F., *A Study of the Jewish Population of Long Beach, Lakewood, and Los Alamitos*, Jewish Community Federation, 1962.

MORGAN, J., *et al.*, *Income and Welfare in the United States*, New York, 1962.

MURPHY, G., *Personality, A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure*, New York, 1948.

OSGOOD, C. E., SUCI, G. J., and TANNENBAUM, P. H., *The Measurement of Meaning*, Urbana, Illinois, 1957.

POLL, S., *The Hassidic Community of Williamsburgh*, Glencoe, Illinois, 1962.

ROSE, P. I., 'Small-Town Jews and their Neighbours in the U.S.', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 1961, 3, 174–91.

ROSENTHAL, E., 'Some Recent Studies About the Extent of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States', *American Jewish Yearbook*, 1963, 64, 3–53.

SANUA, V. D., 'Social Science Research Relevant to American Jewish Education: Fourth Bibliographic Review', *Jewish Education*, 1962, 32, 99–144.

—, 'Social Science Research Relevant to American Jewish Education: Fifth Bibliographic Review', *Jewish Education*, 1963a, 33, 162–75.

—, 'Social Science Research Relevant to Jewish Group Service Agencies', *Program Aids*, 1963b, 1–6.

—, 'Preliminary Findings in Community Centers', *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 1963c, 40, 143–52.

—, *A Study of Attitudes of Mothers in Sending Their Children to a Jewish Community Center* (mimeographed) 30 pp. 1963d.

—, 'Social Science Research Relevant to American Jewish Education: Sixth Bibliographic Review', *Jewish Education*, 1964a, 34, 187–202.

—, *A Comparative Study of the Demographic Characteristics of Four Jewish Community Centers Located in Four Different Neighborhoods in New York City* (mimeographed), 34 pp., 1964b.

—, 'A Study of the Attitudes of Adolescents Attending Jewish Community Centers in New York, *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* (in press).

—, 'Relationship Between Jewish Education and Jewish Identification', *Jewish Education*, 1964d, 35, 37–50.

SEWARD, GEORGENE H., 'Learning Theory and Identification: Some Cultural Aspects of Identification', *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1954, 84, 229–36.

SHAPIRO, M. S., *Summary of Highlights from the Southville Survey of Jewish Attitudes*, conducted jointly by the Southville Jewish Community Relations Committee and the American Jewish Committee, August, 1959.

—, *The Bayville Survey: A Survey of the Attitudes of affiliated Jews in Dade County, Florida*, Greater Miami Chapter, the American Jewish Committee, 1961.

SHERIF, M., *A Social-Psychological Analysis of Group Identification and Withdrawal*, Conference on Group Life in America, Arden House, New York, The American Jewish Committee, November, 1956.

SKLARE, M. and VOSK, M, *The Riverton Study: How Jews Look at Themselves and Their Neighbors*, New York, The American Jewish Committee, 1957.

SKLARE, M. (ed.), *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group*, Glencoe, Illinois, 1958.

—, 'The Future of Jewish Giving', *Commentary*, 1962, 34, 416–26.

STERNE, R. S., *A Demographic Study of the Jewish Population of Trenton and Vicinity, New Jersey* (unpublished study), 1961.

STONEQUIST, E., 'The Marginal Character of the Jews', in I. Graeber and S. H. Britt (eds.), *Jews in a Gentile World*, New York, 1942.

TUMIN, M. M., *An Inventory and Appraisal of Research on American Anti-Semitism*, New York, 1961.

A. J. WOOD & Co., *A Comprehensive Analysis of the Activities of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York City*, prepared for the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, 1952.

WOOLSEY, T. W., *Sampling Methods for a Small Household Survey*, Public Health Monographs No. 40, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

THE DEFACEMENT OF A GHETTO EXHIBITION[1]

H. Lever

THE destruction and mutilation of their property is a phenomenon which is not unknown to Jews. However, the personal and social consequences of such destruction and mutilation have not been given the attention they require by social scientists.

This study is a report of a number of interviews with students concerning the defacement of an exhibition of photographs commemorating the victims of the Warsaw Ghetto. The incident took place at an English-speaking South African university. The purpose of the study was to obtain an understanding of the impact of the defacement upon the minds of the general student body. The study should be regarded as being of an exploratory nature. Although the study has its limitations, it is hoped that it will be suggestive of lines for further research.

The incident took place during April 1963. The Students' Zionist Association (S.Z.A.) had obtained the permission of the university authorities to place an exhibition of photographs commemorating the victims of the Warsaw Ghetto in the foyer of the main building. The exhibition was entitled: 'Lest We Forget'. The theme of the exhibition may be summed up in the following words: 'The tragedy of European Jewry in the Second World War should not be permitted to occur again. Remembering the brutality of the Nazis will assist in preventing the recurrence of the tragedy.' After the exhibition had been on view for three days, a person or persons (the plural will be used hereafter) who have not been apprehended or identified, removed twenty-two photographs and sprayed paint on a number of others. These persons appear to have had a particular dislike for Hebrew symbols. Photographs with Hebrew symbols were either removed or sprayed with paint. On the other hand, photographs of Hitler and of German soldiers were left untouched.

The executive of the Students' Zionist Association appeared to be bewildered by the incident. The exhibition was scheduled to remain on view for another two days. The first reaction of the Students' Zionist Association was to remove the exhibition. After a short while the Association replaced the mutilated photographs. The photographs were

removed once more by the Students' Zionist Association and again replaced.

Procedure

Interviews took place on the last two days of the exhibition. Respondents were not aware of the fact that they were being interviewed. Interviews were of an informal nature and were all conducted in the vicinity of the exhibition. Interviewers would appear to be viewing the exhibition, stroll close to the prospective respondent and strike up a conversation. The opening remarks were left to the discretion of each interviewer. The remark most frequently used was: 'When did this happen?' During the course of the conversation the interviewer was to ask five questions. The first question dealt with the respondent's conception of the persons responsible for the defacement. Interviewers could not ask: 'What do you think of the persons who defaced the exhibition?' since this suggested disapproval of the incident and may have produced biased answers. Instead the question was worded as follows: 'What do you think of the people who put paint on the pictures?' The second question was designed to obtain a measure of the extent of the respondent's anti-Jewish feeling. Respondents were asked: 'To what extent do you think that there is anti-Jewish feeling on the campus?' The rationale underlying this question is that prejudiced people tend to overestimate the extent of prejudice in the community.[2] However, this question was not found to be a reliable index of anti-Jewish feeling. Some respondents who made anti-Jewish remarks expressed the view, with feelings of regret, that there was not much anti-Jewish feeling on the campus. In view of this, ratings of anti-Jewish feeling were made by an independent rater on the basis of all information gleaned from the interview.[3] Respondents were rated as follows:

Pro-Jewish feeling	1
Neutral Jewish feeling	2
Anti-Jewish feeling present	3
Strongly anti-Jewish	4

The third question put to the respondents was designed to be of assistance to the Students' Zionist Association. The respondents were asked: 'Do you think that the photographs should be removed, or cleaned and restored, or left as they are?'

The fourth question was: 'Do you think that an exhibition of this sort should be held?'

Finally, respondents were asked whether they were Jewish or non-Jewish.

Sixty students were interviewed. There were 16 Jews and 44 non-Jews in the sample. The sex ratio was 36 males to 24 females. Since the student population is not distributed according to religion and sex in

the same proportions, it is unlikely that the sample is representative of the population from which it was drawn. Consideration was given to the possibility of obtaining a stratified random sample and making use of a questionnaire. But this would have meant (*a*) that by the time the necessary preparations had been completed, the incident would no longer have been topical, and (*b*) that the respondents would be less likely to give frank, uninhibited answers. Accordingly, the more exact method was sacrificed in favour of obtaining 'rich' qualitative data. In view of some of the remarks made by respondents, it would appear that the decision was the correct one in the circumstances.

The distribution of respondents on the anti-Jewish scale was as follows: 9 respondents with a score of 1; 44 respondents with a score of 2; 4 respondents with a score of 3; 3 respondents with a score of 4.

Interviews, on the average, were concluded within ten minutes. Some respondents, however, became so engrossed in the conversation that interviewers had difficulty in disentangling themselves after half an hour. Interviewers familiarized themselves with the questions, so that they could be put in a free and easy manner and without the respondents suspecting that they were being interviewed. Taking of notes during the interview was prohibited. Interviewers were instructed to record the respondents' answers immediately after the interview had terminated, so that the answers were still fresh in their memories. Twelve interviewers participated in the study.

Results

The respondents' conceptions of the persons responsible for the defacement fell into the following categories:

(1) Despicable persons of some sort. The most frequently used terms were 'low class', 'narrow-minded', 'mad', 'childish' and 'vandals'.
(2) Pranksters.
(3) Jews themselves. On the basis of the interviews taken as a whole, it would seem that the respondents reasoned as follows: 'Jews are ostentatious and publicity-seeking. They defaced the exhibition to draw attention to themselves. They thrive on being the centre of attraction'.
(4) Persons of good character.

Table I shows how the respondents were distributed according to their conceptions of the persons responsible for the defacement.

As appears from Table I, the majority of respondents (more than 70 per cent) expressed the view that the persons responsible for the defacement were of a despicable sort. Among those holding this view were three respondents having an anti-Jewish score of 3 (anti-Jewish feeling present).

Four non-Jewish respondents are seen from Table I to have

TABLE 1 *Distribution of Jewish and non-Jewish Respondents' Conceptions of the Persons Responsible for the Defacement*

Conception	*Jewish Respondents*	*Non-Jewish Respondents*	*Total*
Despicable persons	13	30	43
Pranksters	0	5	5
Jews themselves	1	1	2
Persons of good character	0	4	4
Don't know	2	4	6
N	16	44	60

expressed the view that the persons responsible for the defacement were of good character. Of these, three had anti-Jewish scores of 4 (strongly anti-Jewish) and the other had an anti-Jewish score of 3 (anti-Jewish feeling present).

The following extracts from the interviews are of interest.

Question: What do you think of the persons who put paint on the pictures?

Non-Jewish male: Well, it's hard to say . . . one is disgusted with them and dislikes them, but they are a low class and I suppose they can't help being like that. I mean it's their personalities—it is a pathological symptom. Normal people wouldn't do that.

Non-Jewish male: They were probably justified in doing it. We should forget what the Germans did during World War II.

There are enough Jews to go to the protest meeting. I will not go, I have better things to do. I am at residence and half the men are Jews.

I am not Jewish, but my best friend is German and he has not seen the exhibition.

Non-Jewish female: It could very well have been done by a Jew not necessarily connected with the S.Z.A.

Non-Jewish male who identified himself as German: Obviously the people who did it were not vandals or just doing it as a prank because they used their intelligence to deface only the Jewish posters. They are obviously antisemitic. There must be hate in them. There should be a guard around the exhibition as in Germany—but this would never happen in Germany today. It is disgusting.

Jewish male: (addressing the interviewer in a confidential tone) I think it was done by a Jewish student, probably even a member of the Students' Zionist Association.

Interviewer: Why do you say that?

Jewish male: It is too long to explain and also you wouldn't understand it.

Non-Jewish male: Jews are so ostentatious about everything. This was probably only done by students who are against this exhibition. It is an immature action, but done by those with correct insight.

Non-Jewish female: The Jews deserve it. They should not have put up such an exhibition in the first place. They know that there are German students on the campus. They should expect such a thing.

Replies to the question concerning the extent of anti-Jewish feeling on the campus fell into four main categories. These were:

(1) An extremely large amount of anti-Jewish feeling.
(2) A large amount of anti-Jewish feeling.
(3) Very little anti-Jewish feeling.
(4) No anti-Jewish feeling.

Jews tended to exaggerate the extent of anti-Jewish feeling. Six Jews (37·5 per cent of Jewish respondents) felt that there was either a large or an extremely large amount of anti-Jewish feeling on the campus. Only four non-Jews (9·1 per cent of non-Jewish respondents) shared this view. Thirty-six subjects (60 per cent of the sample and including five Jews) felt that there was very little or no anti-Jewish feeling on the campus.

The following extracts from interviews are of interest:

Question: To what extent do you think there is anti-Jewish feeling on the campus?

Non-Jewish male: No—not very much. I mean, well, everybody has Jewish friends. Some Jews may be hated, but not because they are Jewish. The Jews really are a fine people, you know. They're cultured and all that. Anyway at Medical School, sixty per cent, at least, of the students are Jewish so at least half of my friends are Jewish.

Non-Jewish male: Very little. I have a great regard for them—in the way through the ages they have kept to their religious beliefs. I do not believe in exclusive nationalism. I do not know what Zionism stands for. If it stands for destructive nationalism, then I can't support it. But if it stands for healthy nationalism, then it is a good thing. Judging from what I've seen, I think it is a good thing.

Jewish male: I think it is negligible. There is a slight amount of social anti-semitism. There is a small element with intense feelings.

Non-Jewish male: If there is any, and I hope there is, it is being caused only by the Jews. They are trying to build a heritage of emotion. They make me sick.

The majority of respondents (31) felt that the photographs should remain on exhibition in their defaced condition. In general, the reason was that it drew attention to the despicable behaviour of the persons responsible. Six students felt that the photographs should be cleaned and restored to the exhibition. Twelve students, including three with high anti-Jewish ratings, felt that the exhibition should be removed. Ten students said that they did not know. Although the majority of students felt that the photographs should remain on exhibition in their defaced condition, this was not necessarily the best course of action. Removal of the exhibition would, of course, have been regarded as a success by the persons responsible for the defacement. The author's view before this study commenced was that the photographs should have been

cleaned and the exhibition restored to normality. Permitting the photographs to remain in a defaced condition might have had some undesirable results. It might lead some people to think ill of the culprits, but also encourage others to follow their example. The defacement might also stimulate people who, although they are not anti-Jewish, are nevertheless prone to identify themselves with the 'villain of the piece'.[4] On the other hand, there might be some substance in the opinion that the photographs should remain on view in their defaced condition. As has been seen, some respondents having anti-Jewish feelings considered that the persons responsible for the defacement were of a despicable sort.

The following are some extracts from interviews:

Question: Do you think that the photographs should be removed, or cleaned and restored, or left as they are?

Non-Jewish female: I don't think they could be cleaned up. They should be left. They shouldn't take them down. People should stand up for themselves.

Non-Jewish male: They should take the pictures down and replace them because it looks rather stupid.

Non-Jewish male: Leave them as they are. People of any intelligence realize how despicable and how childish this was.

Non-Jewish female: It only creates sensation to leave the photographs as they are. Besides which, exhibitionism is up their (the Jews') alley. So I suppose the photographs will remain up.

The respondents were almost equally divided on the advisability of holding an exhibition on the lines of the one presented by the Students' Zionist Association. The distribution of opinion of Jewish and non-Jewish respondents on this issue is presented in Table II.

TABLE II *Distribution of Opinions of Jewish and non-Jewish Respondents on advisability of holding an Exhibition*

Opinion	*Jewish Respondents*	*Non-Jewish Respondents*	*Total*
In favour of exhibition	10	15	25
Against exhibition	6	21	27
Don't know	0	8	8
N	16	44	60

Three respondents having an anti-Jewish score of 4 (strongly anti-Jewish) and three respondents having an anti-Jewish score of 3 (anti-Jewish feeling present) felt that an exhibition should not be held. Eight of the nine respondents expressing pro-Jewish feelings felt that it was a good idea to have an exhibition of the type presented.

The following extracts from interviews are of interest:

Question: Do you think that an exhibition of this sort should be held?

Non-Jewish male: Why can't they forget it? There is no point in dragging it up. I have a great deal of sympathy for what the Jews suffered during the last war because I know what they went through. But I don't think the present-day Jews should rub it in. They are inclined to rub it in.

Non-Jewish male: Yes. Some people don't realize what went on. One must learn what the Nazis did. My father was killed, so I take an interest in what happened in the war.

Non-Jewish male: No. It is in very bad taste. It should never have been held. We must forget. It is a bad subject for an exhibition. It is probably only held for the Jews at varsity.

Jewish male: Why shouldn't we hold an exhibition like this? The Natives hold exhibitions and the Indians. Why not us?

Jewish female: Well, I'll tell you quite frankly, I don't think it is a good idea. Now this is something I hold against the Jews. It is very good to have a day of Remembrance, other people do too, but they should not have had an exhibition of pictures. It is not necessary to rehash these things and bring them up all the time.

Non-Jewish male (the German respondent whose reply to the first question was quoted): No, I don't. I think you should forgive and forget and let the world build a more glorious future of friendship without hate. Germany is trying to create this friendship with Israel by giving her money and also by trading with her. Germany is saying she is sorry for what happened and now only wants to be friends with the world. Forget the past and be friends in the future.

Jewish female: But I really think that we should find some other way of commemorating the six million. This, like the posters of the talk by that woman who survived Bergen-Belsen, they were worded in a way that would put anyone's back up. An exhibition is unnecessarily horrible and some other way of commemorating them must be found.

NOTES

[1] The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Professor O. Wagner, who was kind enough to read the manuscript and to make some helpful suggestions.

[2] G. Saenger and E. Gilbert, 'Customer Reactions to the Integration of Negro Sales Personnel', *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, 4: 74, 1950.

[3] The writer wishes to record his thanks to Mr. L. Schlemmer in this connexion.

[4] G. Saenger, *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*, (New York, 1953) pp. 182–3.

GLASGOW JEWISH SCHOOLCHILDREN

Paul Vincent

THE Jewish population of the greater Glasgow area has been estimated to be 13,400,[1] making it the fourth largest Jewish community in the United Kingdom (London 280,000: Manchester and Salford 28,000: Leeds 25,000[2, 3]).

The earliest records of regular Jewish settlement in Glasgow can be traced back to soon after the end of the Napoleonic Wars.[4] This earliest settlement remained small, being estimated to consist of only 150 souls in 1850.[5] They appear to have been on good terms with their fellow Glaswegians, as is shown by the fact that they rented a room in the College of Glasgow to serve as a synagogue and were granted a portion of land in the central Necropolis to serve as a burial ground. This Necropolis stands on a hill overlooking the Cathedral and was the most fashionable burial ground in the city.

The direct descendants of these first settlers form only a small proportion of the present population, for the majority of the Jews of Glasgow today are the descendants of migrants from eastern Europe who came to Glasgow mainly between about 1882 and 1913.

The immigrants, as is usual, tended to settle in one small central area of the city. This was on the south bank of the River Clyde in what at that time was a poor though reasonably pleasant district (Gorbals, postal district C.5) of well-built stone tenements which formed wide straight streets. The range of occupations followed by the immigrants was narrow, a large proportion of them being engaged in tailoring, cabinet-making, and various sorts of itinerant and other small trading.

By the early 1920s, a drift of population away from the Gorbals as an area of residence was beginning to take place as some members of the community achieved a higher economic status and the pace of acculturation increased. This drift was slow at first because of the fact that many of the small businesses were still located in the district. Increasingly throughout the later 1920s, however, Jewish residential and business premises moved out of the Gorbals. Business premises tended to move to the commercial centres of Glasgow north of the river, while the population drift was almost exclusively in a straight southward direction. Today a large part of the community has spilled over the central southern boundary of the City of Glasgow into those residential areas

of East Renfrewshire which now form part of the middle and outer southern suburbs of Glasgow. With the dispersion of the inter-war Jewish Gorbals population, there is now no part of Glasgow which has a distinctly Jewish flavour.

This movement of population out of the Gorbals first to the inner suburbs, then the middle suburbs, and now to the outer suburbs has reflected the increased, and increasing, economic and social status of the Glasgow Jew.

While no area of Jewish residence has a density of population which can in any way compare with that which used to exist in the Gorbals, the newer areas of Jewish residence are still well defined and restricted by choice to only some of the middle-class suburbs of Glasgow. The process of acculturation is, therefore, a modified one in that in choosing a house preference is still given to those areas in which a Jewish population and Jewish institutions are to be found. It would appear that this preference will increase rather than diminish owing to fairly ambitious plans for the building of new synagogues and communal centres to serve all organizations and age-groups in these areas. Should current plans for the middle suburb be completed, the provision of Jewish institutions and welfare services will be far greater than even that of the Gorbals in its hey-day. The first primary Jewish day-school was recently opened in the middle southern suburb, and some consideration is now being given to the possibility of building a secondary school in the area.

The statistical data given in this paper are based on information obtained through the educational authorities of the City of Glasgow, the County of Renfrewshire, the County of Lanarkshire, and the County of Dunbartonshire, these counties being immediately adjacent to the City of Glasgow. Information for those schools which do not receive funds from the local authorities has been obtained from the schools themselves.[6]

All figures refer to children whose parents have registered them at school as being Jewish. They therefore include all denominations (there is one reform synagogue among the eleven public synagogues in Glasgow) and some of the children would not be accepted as Jewish by the traditional rabbinical authorities. The figures, on the other hand, exclude those children who would be accepted by the religious authorities but whose parents have lost their Jewish identification to the extent of not registering their children at school as being Jewish. It is not possible, at the moment, to make a reasonable estimate of the numbers involved in these two groups. However, the figures for those who, not being Jewish, are registered as Jewish will to some extent compensate for those who are Jewish but who are not registered as such.

The main effect of registering a child as Jewish at school in Glasgow is that he is then allowed to be absent during Jewish festivals and to go home early on Friday afternoons in the winter when *Shabbat* begins

during school-hours or shortly after. The child is also exempted from formal periods of Christian religious instruction and prayers, and in many cases is provided with Jewish instruction during at least some of these periods.

The definition of a Jewish child used here is, therefore, sociological and not rabbinical, for a Jewish child is defined as that child whose parents regard it as being Jewish. The measure of this regard is the decision taken by the parent concerning the religion of the child when this has to be given to the school authorities.

There is no indication that because a child is isolated by being the only Jewish child at a school, or one of a very few, the parents prefer not to register the child as Jewish in order to make it less conspicuous. Headmasters have told me of a few doubtful cases, but most are convinced that the numbers are negligible. The local rabbinate makes strenuous efforts to find such children and few escape their records. In the course of the study some cases were encountered of families living in areas of non-Jewish residence in isolation from the Glasgow Jewish Community. These families had no reason to register their children as Jewish if they did not wish to do so, yet the children were so registered.

All schools whether wholly or partly supported by public funds are included as well as those schools which are completely independent and which receive no grant from public funds. It was found that in the greater Glasgow area 127 schools had, at some time during the last six years, had children registered as Jewish. Thirty-five of these schools were fee-paying. The term 'fee-paying' is used in a blanket sense to cover the wide spectrum of Scottish schools which are not completely supported by the local government authorities. The only schools excluded are special schools within Glasgow and boarding schools outside the area (the number of Glasgow Jewish children at these schools is very small indeed). Children of school age who were in hospital for more than one school session are also excluded. Again this number is very small.

Table I shows the total number of Jewish children attending school in the greater Glasgow area, classified into boys and girls, for the years 1958 to 1963. The year begins with the school session which starts in the autumn of the stated year. The decrease in total numbers from 1,804 in 1958 to 1,706 in 1963 requires further research before a fully satisfactory explanation could be given. Immigration and emigration of Jews in the Glasgow area appears to have been slight during the last ten years, and although there are indications that the latter has exceeded the former, it would be difficult to attribute the drop in the number of children to the excess of emigration.

In 1938 Dr. Friedlander, who was at that time headmaster of the Glasgow Talmud Torah (Hebrew College) calculated that there were 1,900 Jewish schoolchildren in the Glasgow area.[7] Although Dr.

Friedlander's methods of arriving at this figure are not known, the fact that in 1938 the community was still largely concentrated in the Gorbals and in an inner suburban area must have eased his task, for Jewish children were attending a relatively small number of local authority schools. The numbers attending fee-paying schools must certainly have been small and in most cases have been known personally to Dr. Friedlander.

Although this figure of 1,900 is unlikely to contain much error, it cannot be directly compared with the current data given in the tables. When Dr. Friedlander constructed his estimate, the minimum school leaving age was 14, whereas today it is 15. Further, owing to the social advances in the Jewish community and in society generally, a much higher proportion of children stay on at school today beyond the minimum leaving age than did so before the war. Thus, should one wish to compare the number of Jewish children today between the ages of 5 and approximately 16 with the number in 1938, an unknown number would have to be added to the earlier 1,900. Even though the number which would have to be added is unknown, a comparison of

TABLE 1

Total Number of Jewish Boys and Girls Attending all Schools in the Greater Glasgow Area

Year	*1958*	*1959*	*1960*	*1961*	*1962*	*1963*
Boys	961	951	950	931	954	932
Girls	843	885	875	841	782	774
Total	1,804	1,836	1,825	1,772	1,736	1,706

Dr. Friedlander's figure with those of Table 1 leaves little doubt that the number of Jewish children of school age has declined appreciably and, at the moment, is still declining.

An interesting feature of Table 1 is the excess in the number of boys over the number of girls. Table 2 shows this calculated as a six-year average classified into male and female children attending primary and

TABLE 2

Six Year Averages of Jewish Male and Female Children Attending Primary and Secondary Schools in the Greater Glasgow Area

	Primary		*Secondary*		*Total*	
	No.	%	*No.*	%	*No.*	%
Male	566·5	53·6	380·0	52·6	946·5	53·2
Female	490·8	46·4	342·5	47·4	833·3	46·8
Total	1,057·3	100·0	722·5	100·0	1,779·8	100·0

secondary schools. The ratio of boys to girls is 114·6 : 100, which one would hesitate to assign to a natural difference in the number of births of boys and girls or to a difference in their survival rates from birth to the age of 16.[8]

In order to attempt some comparison of this sex ratio, Table 3 shows

TABLE 3

All Scottish Male and Female Children of approximately School Age in 1962, thousands

	Age 5 and under 12		*Age 12 and under 16*		*Total*	
	No.	%	*No.*	%	*No.*	%
Male	299·8	51·1	223·7	51·1	523·5	51·1
Female	286·9	48·9	213·9	48·9	500·8	48·9
Total	586·7	100·0	437·6	100·0	1,024·3	100·0

a comparable breakdown for all Scottish children in 1962.[9] The sex ratio for the all-Scotland data for 1962 is 104·5 : 100.

A 2 × 2 chi-square test on the total number of male and female Jewish and Scottish children, as shown in Tables 2 and 3, gives $\chi^2 = 3{\cdot}0$ at $v = 1$, $0{\cdot}05 < P < 0{\cdot}10$.

The statistical data do not give a high level of confidence to the idea that there is a significant difference between the number of Jewish boys and girls as compared with the general population. However, some indirect evidence has been found in the course of the study which suggests that further research is needed to investigate whether, when there is a tendency for a family to weaken its ties with the community, this weakening is more readily found when the children are exclusively girls. If this were so, it would lead to a smaller proportion of girls than of boys being enrolled at the schools as being Jewish. The fact that in the 'cheders' (part-time Hebrew schools of religion which children attend outside secular school hours) the number of boys greatly exceeds the number of girls would also partly suggest that the matter is worth investigating. No attempt was made to find the attitude of inter-married parents to their male and/or female children so far as registering them as Jewish at school was concerned.

Table 4 shows the number of boys and girls attending primary schools and secondary schools. Children normally attend primary school from the age of 5 to about the age of 11. The number of Jewish primary schoolchildren has dropped from 1,175 in 1958 to 930 in 1963. This is a drop of 21 per cent. At the same time the population of Jewish secondary schoolchildren (attendance being compulsory until the age

TABLE 4

Total Number of Jewish Male and Female Children Attending all Primary and Secondary Schools in the Greater Glasgow Area

Year	*1958*	*1959*	*1960*	*1961*	*1962*	*1963*
Primary:						
Boys	643	595	568	549	537	507
Girls	532	537	536	477	440	423
Total	1,175	1,132	1,104	1,026	977	930
Secondary:						
Boys	318	356	382	382	417	425
Girls	311	348	339	364	342	351
Total	629	704	721	746	759	776

of 15, beyond that age voluntary) has risen from 629 in 1958 to 776 in 1963, a rise of 23 per cent.

The children at secondary schools were mainly born in the years 1941–51. This period includes the immediate post-war years when there was a substantial increase in the birth rate in the general population of the United Kingdom. If with this there is also taken into account the social trend towards more education, which is encouraging a higher proportion of children in any age group to stay on longer at secondary school, the increased number of Jewish children at secondary schools in the Glasgow area is probably understandable.

A more serious problem arises when the children who were born between 1947 and 1958 and who constitute the figures of those attending primary schools, are considered. For the data would seem to indicate either that there has been a sharp drop in the birth rate and/or that there has been a steady decline in the number of adults in the child-bearing age group. This drop in numbers would appear to be much greater than can be accounted for by the changes in the Scottish crude birth rates and fertility rates which reached their peak in 1947. Of all the schoolboys in 1958, 33 per cent were at secondary school, and this percentage had risen to 46 by 1963. The comparable percentages for girls are 37 in 1958 and 45 in 1963. The meaning of these percentages must, however, be counter-balanced against the decline in the number of primary schoolchildren described previously. Although the proportion of boys attending secondary schools has risen more rapidly than that for girls, it is merely a matter of the boys catching up until in the latest figures the proportion of boys and girls who attend secondary schools is virtually the same.

The distribution of Jewish children among the different types of secondary schools is also worth comment. In the non-fee-paying secondary schools of the City of Glasgow *alone*, of the 262 Jewish children attending these schools in 1963, 223 were at senior secondary schools (roughly the equivalent of grammar schools), 34 at junior secondary schools, and 5 were at comprehensive schools. The proportion of Jewish

schoolchildren of post-primary age who attend senior secondary schools (even if we exclude the number who attend fee-paying senior secondary schools) is, therefore, very high indeed, and is most significantly greater than the proportion in the non-Jewish population. No reliable statistics are available for the proportion of non-Jewish children of the same age and from comparable social strata in Glasgow who attend senior secondary schools, but informal opinions by a number of leading educationalists in Glasgow suggest that even for a middle-class group the Jewish figures are very high.

This high proportion would lend support to recent sociological investigations[10] which have shown the importance of aspects of the home background in determining a child's chance of obtaining and making use of a particular type of education.

The inverse correlation between small family size and high I.Q. might also be relevant here.[11, 12] Although no accurate figures have so far been obtained on the average number of children in Glasgow Jewish families, there is every indication that the figure is a very low one. This, combined with the high incentive towards education found in many Jewish homes and the fact that in Glasgow a large proportion of the families are roughly middle class, could well explain the rather staggering proportion of Jewish secondary schoolchildren who are at senior secondary schools.

It would not be invalid to conclude from the data that with the great expansion in the universities and colleges being undertaken at the moment in Glasgow, an increasing proportion of Jewish children are likely in the future to obtain the necessary qualifications to enable them to enter institutions of higher education, even although not all children at senior secondary schools pursue a strictly academic course. Should the present situation be at least maintained, the social structure of Glasgow Jewry would change slowly from that of a community whose members are largely engaged in commerce to that of a community with a high proportion of its members engaged in professional and other similar occupations. The effects that this will have on the character of the community, its institutions, and the community's relationships with the majority population, are clearly of sociological interest.

Evidence of this change is further strengthened by the data in Table 5 which show the Jewish children in the greater Glasgow area who have attended non-fee-paying and fee-paying schools over the last six years, expressed in absolute numbers and as percentages. It will be seen that in 1958, 76 per cent attended non-fee-paying schools and 24 per cent fee-paying schools. By 1963 the respective proportions were 62 per cent and 38 per cent. This change followed a very steady pattern so that by 1963, four out of every ten Jewish children in the area were attending fee-paying schools. This proportion is, again, very much higher than that for the general population, and also probably significantly higher

TABLE 5

Total Number of Jewish Children at All Non-fee-paying and All Fee-paying Schools in the Greater Glasgow Area

Year	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-fee-paying	1369	76	1321	72	1299	71	1238	70	1178	68	1061	62
Fee-paying	435	24	515	28	526	29	534	30	558	32	645	38

than for the non-Jewish section of the population of Glasgow which might be comparable to Glasgow Jewry in socio-economic status.

The data on the changing proportion of Jewish children attending fee-paying schools probably illustrate more clearly than any other piece of statistical information available the extent to which Glasgow Jewry has become middle class and is intent on changing its social status by means of education.

Table 6 shows the number of Jewish children attending all non-fee-paying schools in different parts of greater Glasgow. Area I is the most

TABLE 6

The Geographical Distribution of Jewish Children at Non-Fee-paying Schools in the Greater Glasgow Area

Area	Postal District	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
I	C.5	36	22	20	17	16	13
II	S.1, S.2, S.4	762	744	713	675	711	528
III	E. Renfrewshire	443	456	464	456	471	437
IV	S.3, S.5, S.W.1, S.W.2, S.W.3, S.E., C.3, C.4	78	56	53	47	51	58
V	W.1, W.2, W.3, W.5, N.1, N.2, N.W., E.2, E.3	27	18	23	21	11	16

central, being the older Gorbals district on the south bank of the Clyde. Area II lies south of Area I and is the older residential inner suburb. Area III lies further south still, and includes the middle suburb (mainly built in the 1930s) and the outer, somewhat more expensive, suburb (built partly pre-war and partly post-war).

Area IV contains small parts of the city just north of the river and large areas of the south-west of the city, the latter containing many extensive areas of council houses. Area V contains the residential west-end, the north of the city and some eastern districts. Some of the northern and some of the western districts also contain large areas of council houses.

Fee-paying schools have been excluded, as most of the children attending them come from different parts of the Glasgow area. The numbers at these schools, therefore, give no direct indication of the geographical location of the homes of their pupils. The non-fee-paying schools of the local authorities, on the other hand, draw their pupils from the immediate area around the schools. Dunbartonshire and Lanarkshire are excluded as only a handful of Jewish children attend schools in these counties at the moment. The breakdown of the City of Glasgow is by postal districts.

As the original settlement of the Jewish population between 1882 and 1913 was in the Gorbals (Area I, postal district C.5), and even as late as the 1920s most of Glasgow Jewry still lived there, the results of the dramatic exodus of the population from the district can be seen.

The figures for 1963 suggest that most of the Jewish population live in Areas II and III. Table 7 shows a breakdown of Area II into

TABLE 7

Jewish Children Attending Primary and Secondary Non-Fee-paying Schools in Postal Districts S.1 and S.2 of Area II

Year	*1958*	*1959*	*1960*	*1961*	*1962*	*1963*
Primary	443	394	375	342	306	252
Secondary	238	268	259	258	226	204
Total	681	662	634	600	532	456

primary and secondary non-fee-paying schools for the two postal districts S.1, and S.2, i.e. the districts where most of the Jewish population is to be found.

The table shows that there has been a very rapid decrease in numbers over the six-year period. As this decrease is not matched by increases in any other parts of the Glasgow area, the drop in the number of children is unlikely to be fully explained by younger couples of childbearing age moving out of the district in fairly large numbers.

It will be seen that, once again, the greatest decline by far is in the number of primary schoolchildren. This decline is spread fairly evenly among all the primary schools in the area.

This leaves as the principal possibilities either that the 'missing' primary schoolchildren are being switched to fee-paying schools, or that districts S.1 and S.2 are populated by an ageing population. As general enquiries in the schools and among parents in the area give little indication of switching to fee-paying schools, it would appear that the population of S.1 and S.2 is an ageing one, and probably in numerical decline also. The effect of this apparent decline might prove to be one which weakens the whole Glasgow community, as the most actively Jewish youth live within this area which also supplies a high proportion of Jewish students.

From Table 8 it will be seen that the total number of Jewish children attending all schools in East Renfrewshire shows no real change or

TABLE 8

Jewish Primary and Secondary Children Attending Non-Fee-paying and Fee-paying Schools in East Renfrewshire

Year	*1958*	*1959*	*1960*	*1961*	*1962*	*1963*
Non-fee-paying:						
Primary	311	302	297	290	280	246
Secondary	132	154	167	166	191	191
Total	443	456	464	456	471	437
Fee-paying:						
Primary	67	76	85	81	71	76
Secondary	12	18	22	25	25	30
Total	79	94	107	106	96	106
Grand Total	522	550	571	562	567	543

trend. For those who know the Glasgow area this may seem surprising as, conventionally, East Renfrewshire is considered to be *the* area in which Jewish newly-weds try to find a home. One would, therefore, normally have expected a reasonable increase in the number of primary schoolchildren. Instead, since 1958 anyway, there has been a gentle decline in numbers followed by a sharp drop. An examination of the source tables in which the primary children are given by sex shows that, while the number of girls has been maintained, there has been an unaccountable and sharp fall in the number of boys. These missing boys have not switched in any significant numbers to fee-paying primary schools either within the county or the city.

The number attending secondary schools has increased as it has done in the whole of the Glasgow area, but the proportion of children of post-primary age who are taking senior secondary courses at non-fee-paying schools in the area is lower than the proportion for the City of Glasgow which was described previously.

Over the rest of the city, Table 6 shows that the number of Jewish children is spread very thinly and is declining: this holds for all the council housing estates, where very few Jewish families are to be found.

It is an interesting exercise to use the data on the schoolchildren which have been presented to try to estimate the Jewish population of the greater Glasgow area.

For the whole of Scotland there were in 1962, 923,200 children aged 5 and under 16 in a total population of 5,235,700, i.e. there were 176 children of this age-group to every 1,000 total population.[13] The proportion for the general population of the City of Glasgow in 1961 was 181 per 1,000.[14] As about one-third of the population of Glasgow

is Catholic, the all-Scottish proportions rather than the Glasgow ones will be used as the basis for estimation and comparison.

The average number of Jewish children at primary school over the six-year period 1958–63 was 1,057 and the average number at secondary school about 722. The figure for the number at secondary school does not match the age-group 12 and under 16 exactly, since no figures are available at the moment as to how many Jewish children stay on at secondary school beyond the minimum leaving age of 15. As it has been shown that a large proportion of post-primary Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow are at senior secondary school, it is not likely that a large proportion leave at 15.

In order to make the Jewish and Scottish figures more comparable, the figure of 722 would, therefore, have to be reduced by those who are included as being at school but who are 16 years of age or over. An estimated allowance of 140 children in this school age-group is not likely to be seriously inaccurate. This would leave an estimated average number of about 580 Glasgow Jewish children under the age of 16 at secondary school, making a total of about 1,640 Jewish children between the ages of 5 and under 16.

If the proportion of Jewish children aged 5 and under 16 to the adult Jewish population were the same as that for the all-Scotland population, then by simple proportions the estimated total Jewish population of the Glasgow area would be approximately 9,300.

The Jewish population is, however, a more urban one than that for the whole of Scotland. It is also more middle class. Added to this, the population of Scotland contains a considerable Catholic minority with a high reproduction rate. Thus, the estimate of 9,300 Jews in the Glasgow area would be a minimum one.

If the Jewish population of Glasgow were 13,400, as stated in *The Jewish Year Book*, then the Jewish children aged 5 and under 16 would form as little as about 12·2 per cent of the population, i.e. 122 per 1,000.

If the two proportions 140 per 1,000 and 150 per 1,000 between these two extremes are taken, they yield an estimated total Jewish population for the greater Glasgow area of from 10,900 to 11,700.

Thus, either the Jewish population of the Glasgow area is between about 11,000 and 12,000 or else, if it is more than this, the children form an unusual and dangerously small proportion of the population. From this we can conclude either that the population is an old one compared with the general population, and/or that the recent reproduction rate among the Jewish population is very low.[15]

If we accept the probability that the Jewish population of Glasgow is an ageing one, then, given that the birth rate of the children at present being studied does not increase substantially on that of their own parents, a decrease in population may be expected in the future. This

decrease may be even more emphasized owing to the sex disproportions, for unless the excess of men in the future can find Jewish wives from areas outside Glasgow, the Jewish marriage rate is likely to decrease and the rate of intermarriage, other things being the same, to increase.

If a picture of the Glasgow Jewish community were to be made on the basis of the statistics given in this paper, it would show a community still in process of moving southwards, having abandoned its original settlement in the centre of the city and now abandoning its inner suburban settlement and concentrating more and more outside the southern boundary of the City of Glasgow: a community which is greatly increasing the amount and the quality of the secular education of its children, and, therefore, likely to change its occupational structure to that of a largely middle-class professional group—most of all, however, a community which appears to be suffering, or which is likely to suffer, first a change in age structure in which the proportion of older persons increases, and then probably a population decline.

NOTES

[1] H. Harris, ed., *The Jewish Year Book, 1964*, London.

[2] See E. Krausz, *Leeds Jewry*, Cambridge, 1964, for amended estimates for Leeds.

[3] Harris, op. cit.

[4] A. Levy, *The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, 1812–1895*, privately published, 1949.

[5] V. D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850–1950*, London, 1954.

[6] I should like to thank the Rev. Dr. I. K. Cosgrove who kindly put much of his information on these schools at my disposal.

[7] *The Glasgow Jewish Year Book, 1937–1938.*

[8] An account of some American studies on sex ratios is given in M. Sklare, ed., *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group*, Glencoe, Ill., 1958. See particularly 'Some Aspects of Jewish Demography' by B. B. Seligman and A. Antonovsky, p. 97, 2nd edition, 1960.

[9] *Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland, 1962* (No. 108), H.M.S.O., 1963.

[10] E.g. J. W. B. Douglas, *The Home and the School*, London, 1964.

[11] Ibid.

[12] J. Maxwell, *The Level and Trend of National Intelligence*, London, 1961.

[13] *Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland*, op. cit.

[14] *Census 1961, Scotland County Report, Vol. One, Part 2, City of Glasgow*, H.M.S.O., 1963.

[15] M. Freedman, ed., *A Minority in Britain*, London, 1955. See particularly p. 72 in the demographic essay by Dr. H. Neustatter.

KURT BLUMENFELD ON THE MODERN JEW AND ZIONISM

Shaul Esh

KURT BLUMENFELD (b. 1889) died in 1963. His memoirs had been published during the previous year,[1] and we are now in a position to attempt an assessment of the personality and achievements of this well-known Zionist leader.

There can be no doubt about the significance of the man and his work during his lifetime; everybody agrees, supporter and opponent alike, that Blumenfeld exerted great personal influence by his engaging personality, and that he bore within him an inspiration which can be described but not analysed. The late Richard Lichtheim, another of the German Zionist leaders, testifies that Blumenfeld was 'a brilliant speaker', 'extremely able',[2] and 'one of the most influential people among the German Zionists because of his personality and his oratory'.[3] Dr. Tramer, one of his pupils and the editor of his memoirs, considers him 'the greatest orator of German Zionism'.[4] And we may note that Blumenfeld himself thought his true vocation lay in the exercise of his talent for oratory (*Memoirs*, p. 48). Indeed, his power was his gift of oratorical persuasion. Can the message sent by such men survive the passing of their living personality? Can we of a later generation remain under Blumenfeld's spiritual influence? Can the modern Jews of the Diaspora apply his teaching to the conditions of their lives? Blumenfeld wrote rather little, and even what we have from him in writing, including most of his memoirs, was in the main taken down by others. Are we able to say of such a man that he provides us with a comprehensive body of teachings, teachings moreover intended to be valid beyond the time at which they were expounded? In what follows I shall try to answer these questions in regard to some aspects of Blumenfeld's thinking.

It is necessary in the first place to stress the complete integrity of the man; it appears to us in his intellectual struggles and effort to crystallize his ideas. He described his own and his close friends' thoughts as a 'multiple chaos'.[5] And if he emerged from this chaos it was only by dint of a 'heavy inner struggle', as he admits (*Memoirs*, p. 43). The result of the struggle was a change in personality so great that he felt it to be like a revelation (*Memoirs*, p. 39). It can be said of Blumenfeld, as of other thinkers, that, having first seized an idea by intuition, he

strove to place it on a firm basis and submit it to analysis. He began with a conviction which, even when it was not capable of being proved, was not to be undermined.[6]

The basic concept from which his deep inner conviction started and drew strength was the much discussed 'Jewish question' (*Judenfrage*). 'To probe it was from now on the aim of our lives', as he confesses, speaking of himself and his fellow students (*Memoirs*, p. 43). The origin, development, and range of meaning of the concept had not hitherto been subjected to so profound a treatment. The convinced assimilationists of the day of course denied the existence of the problem; while in our own time they are followed by some of the Jews in Israel. Both have passed judgement on an ill-defined concept.

We are able to dig into its meaning as it was conceived by Blumenfeld by examining his own words. The Jewish problem was not due to any one or any combination of the factors usually adduced: the economic, political, or social power of the Jews in any country of the Diaspora; the preponderant number of Jews in any one profession or occupation; their high concentration in certain residential areas; and so on. The negative attitude displayed towards the Jews by the people among whom they lived was the result of the basic fact of Jewish existence in the Diaspora: Jews were separate and different by the mere fact of their being Jews. The western Jews who denied this basic fact asked what the character of Jewish difference was. It is of course an old question and many have tried to answer it. Blumenfeld confronted the problem in his youth (*Memoirs*, pp. 27 ff.) and strove to clarify the character of the Jew to his own satisfaction. But he had finally to abandon all the attempts to find a definition based on content, and he became convinced that 'the fact of being a Jew cannot be described by attributing any content whatsoever. All those who have tried to discover the Jewish national character by reducing all Jews to a common denominator have failed. . . . To the question which often faced me whether it is at all possible to find something unique and all-embracing in the Jewish world, I at long last came upon an answer which until today I have not been able to replace: it is not content that forms the determining factor, but rather the way in which Jews deal with their situation.' Here Blumenfeld introduced the term *das Jüdisch-Funktionelle* to describe his approach; it was a more powerful method than one relying on the contents of Jewishness; functional Jewishness survived all attempts at suppression and conscious assimilation (*Memoirs*, p. 104). Blumenfeld certainly knew that ideas of this kind could not be 'proved', but he thought them a necessary part of conceptions of 'the essence of national character in general' (loc. cit.). And it is worthy of note that Alfred Weber, the German scholar, who was undoubtedly far from being antisemitic, inclined to the same view of the question of the Jewish character.[7]

The difference between the Diaspora Jew and the people among whom he lived was not to be denied; it was sensed and discussed by many non-Jews who did not think of themselves as being antisemitic, as well as by Jews who were deeply anchored in the culture of their native countries.[8] Facing this fact was a difficult first step, but those who were sensitive enough to do so asked themselves about the practical implication of Jewish difference; some considered that there was no 'solution' to the problem.[9] Blumenfeld's approach was different. Having perceived the soundness of making a fundamental distinction between modern Jews and their neighbours, he proceeded to his analysis of the 'Jewish problem' that greatly exercised German Jewry because of antisemitic pressure and Jewish reaction to it. There were, Blumenfeld maintained, both subjective and objective aspects of the problem.[10] He did not dispute the subjective integrity of those Jews (and they were the majority, as is well known) who considered themselves to be German. But their feelings, although a psychological reality, were irrelevant to the civil and political status of the Jews in a non-Jewish environment. It was for the Germans to decide whether Jews were to be considered German (*Memoirs*, p. 54). For this reason most of the defensive polemics conducted by the Jews against their accusers failed of their purpose. The 'alienation' from the Jews felt by so many Germans did not depend on what the Jews did or on their behaviour, real or imaginary. The refutation of all the arguments used by antisemites would only show that 'Jew-hatred is genuine'. Basic relations between human beings were beyond disputation: 'love and hate have no need of arguments' (*Memoirs*, p. 54; and cf. p. 103).

Blumenfeld goes on to explain 'the subjective Jewish problem' in another way: as a problem of the man with a Jewish consciousness who sees himself as belonging at one and the same time to the spiritual world of the Jews and to that of the environment whose culture he has absorbed. This is the '*Kulturkonflikt* . . . which has to be fought out in all places and countries where Jews live' (*Memoirs*, p. 144). The point is not, however, to be taken literally. The situation into which Blumenfeld was born and in which he was brought up was not characteristic of all Diaspora Jewry. *Kulturkonflikt* is inherent in a situation of symbiosis between Jews and their surrounding society and emerges at a point where the Jews suddenly realize that their cultural ambience is not quite the same as that of their friends, acquaintances, and colleagues.[11] The assimilated and educated Jews feel that 'the more creative they become, the more sensitive they grow'—that they are basically different from the non-Jews in 'the pattern of their thinking'. They find it a 'terrible tragedy' to have to think in a language which is not adequate to their creative abilities'.[12] *Kulturkonflikt* has become 'a problem of the Jewish personality' (*Memoirs*, p. 88).

At this point in the argument it may be interesting to consider what

has been written recently on the possibility of a full realization of Jewish creativity in non-Jewish languages.[13] The following ideas sound as though they had been conceived along the same lines as Blumenfeld's reasoning. 'Everywhere he [the Jew in the Diaspora] found languages which had sprung from historical realities and habits of vision alien to his own. The very words belonged to the heritage of Slavonic or Latin Christianity . . . Where it relinquished Hebrew and passed . . . to the use of European vernaculars, the eastern Jewish sensibility had to slip into the garb and glove of its oppressors. Languages codify immemorial reflexes and twists of feeling, remembrances of action that transcend individual recall, contours of communal experience as subtly decisive as the contours of the sky and land in which a civilization ripens. An outsider can master a language as a rider masters his mount; he rarely becomes as one with its undefined subterranean motion . . .' These words were written about Heine and Kafka; and in connexion with the latter the passage goes on to say that he 'may be seen as admonitory to the Jewish genius of the likelihood that it is in Hebrew, not in the borrowed dress of other tongues that a Jewish literature will strike root'.

What stood to Blumenfeld's advantage was something that in others might have proved a handicap: his experience of life and his way of thinking were in harmony. We learn from what he wrote that his awakening and self-identification as a Jew were not the result of anti-semitic affronts. He made the decision that shaped his life while he was still at the *Gymnasium*. When he told a Catholic friend that he had met an East European Jew on the street and had tried to avoid him, the friend asked him: 'Do you belong with the Polish Jews or the beautiful German actress [who was present]?' The young Blumenfeld's reply was clear, and he recalls that it 'was to be my destiny' (*Memoirs*, p. 28). While it may seem strange that Blumenfeld does not explain why he behaved in this way, we may infer his motives from the tenor of his reminiscences. What he felt at this time was to become a conscious conviction: a man's most important aim is to realize to the full the potentialities inherent in him, to develop, in other words, his personality. Blumenfeld studied in a humanistic *Gymnasium* at a time when it was not yet under the influence of German chauvinism (*Memoirs*, p. 28). The spirit of the pupils was moulded by the world composed of classical culture and German poetry. The human ideal as defined in Goethe's 'Öst-westlicher Divan' was often on Blumenfeld's lips, as the editor of his memoirs tells us.[14]

> Volk und Knecht und Überwinder
> Sie gestehn zu jeder Zeit:
> Höchstes Glück der Erdenkinder
> Sei nur die Persönlichkeit.

Jedes Leben sei zu führen
Wenn man sich nicht selbst vermisst;
Alles könne man verlieren
Wenn man bliebe, was man ist.

The recognition that the greatest of man's achievements, the attainment of a harmonious personality, is not possible except by being faithful to one's spiritual origins, is the fruit of Western culture in its true form. And it is of the first importance that this conception of European culture turned Blumenfeld not only into a Zionist but also into a radical one. He was aware of the fact at the beginning of his Zionism; he spoke of 'this [German] culture which gave them [the Western Zionists of his own persuasion] the analytical tools for recognizing their own special character'.[15]

Others may have taken this same path before Blumenfeld, but we know of no other Zionist ideologue and leader who was driven on towards and fortified in his Zionism by the general culture on which he was nourished. And it was only when Blumenfeld had decided to embrace Zionism that he came to Judaism and through it to an understanding of Jewish history. In this light we must understand Blumenfeld's interpretation of the famous saying of Herzl's at the opening of the First Zionist Congress: 'Zionism is a homecoming to the Jewish fold even before it becomes a homecoming to the Jewish land.'[16] Blumenfeld stressed the word 'is' in order to underline the existential force of Zionism. The paradox of Blumenfeld's spiritual career is that it was not Judaism that made him a Zionist (for we know that in his youth he was ignorant of the Jewish religion), but Zionism that made him a Jew. By stressing the word 'is' he tried to show that the decision to become a Zionist was something in itself and not simply a pre-condition for something else.[17] Naturally, if one took the decision one had also to learn something about one's own people, but this was only an elaboration following on the taking of the main decision.[18] In this light we need to understand the expression 'post-assimilationist Zionism' (*postassimilatorischer Zionismus*) which Blumenfeld tried to define as the type of Zionism appropriate to a particular Diaspora situation. At the beginning he thought this situation was to be found only in Western Europe: the Zionism 'which includes all those who had left assimilation behind in order to gain the safety of Judaism' was a 'specifically Western' form of Zionism.[19] But in the period between the world wars, when assimilation had spread widely in many countries, Blumenfeld came to emphasize that the two kinds of Zionism, pre- and post-assimilationist, were not identical with East and West European Zionism respectively: 'the two kinds exist both in the East and the West'.[20]

Post-assimilationist Zionism differs in a further respect from the Zionism which had grown out of a deeply-rooted relationship with Judaism (whether the relationship was based on religion, culture, or

descent). Through Zionism the assimilated Jew gains his freedom. Before deciding to embrace Zionism he has lived 'in a state of inner bondage'. 'A new state of consciousness' is now created in him, the basis of which can be expressed in the following words: 'only a person who lives according to his own rights and laws, in his own country, is free'. And if he does so, 'to be a Zionist and a free man is for him one and the same thing'.[21]

Blumenfeld was never blind to the decisive character of his Zionism. It removed the Jew from the expedient conventions to which he had been used, and brought him into opposition to—or at least into a state of tension with—his environment. But the convenient situation in which he had previously found himself had been illusory (as both Jew and non-Jew had shown), because it had not allowed the Jew to be himself. The tension in which he must live from now on is the result of—and at the same time a condition for—facing the world as an alien in the Diaspora.

As Blumenfeld saw it, what was at stake was self-identity. To be mentally stable and to feel personally secure a man's identity must be clearly established. Although the assimilated Jew has adopted 'an attitude', that is, he has found a formula for his life in the Diaspora, and adjusted his being to this attitude, yet it cannot free him from the elementary existential lack of security which caused the leaders of the assimilationists to see themselves as 'the step-sons' of the very German people whom they looked upon as their own (*Memoirs*, p. 51). The spiritual bondage of the Diaspora Jew is to be observed in his constant awareness, vis-à-vis his non-Jewish surroundings, of his own behaviour and its consequences. In this context Blumenfeld used to refer sardonically to a 'diet of life', comparing it to a regimen in which one who follows it 'asks himself at every mouthful . . . is it allowed or not?' (ibid.).[22] A healthy man does not behave like this. And it was this mental health that Blumenfeld had in mind when, in answer to the demand by the anti-Zionists that he define 'the Zionist attitude', he replied: 'We are passing from the insecurity of the attitude to the calmness of the movement' (ibid.).[23] His opponents were quick to point out that nobody could understand this formulation, whereupon Blumenfeld went on to explain: 'the feeling of inner security is important to us. We can influence other people only by our own existence, not by intellectual interpretations that everybody can understand as he wishes' (ibid.). That is to say, contrasted with the insecure Jew who tries to live according to the 'attitude' formulated in such a way as to conceal the basic fact of his being in the Diaspora, stands the Jew who openly admits that he is himself, a Jew like all other Jews, however far removed from him in time and space. This identification gives him the basic security for his existence as a personality. And the feeling of being part of a Jewish entity places him in 'the movement'. This is the renaissance movement of the Jewish people,

not to be confused with Zionist organization or with a particular party.[24] Zionism is an all-embracing movement not restricted to justificatory attitudes. If in Zionist argumentation there are proofs and formulae—as was the case at the beginning of modern Zionism—this was merely a transitional phase. 'The feeling for the special position and the community of fate of Jews, the mainspring of every group's activity, was alive in him [the Zionist] from the very first day.'[25] Zionism does not rest on any formula because it is not revealed 'as a new conception whose standpoint can be proved wrong by a better critical insight, but which reveals itself by the new productive creativity of the Jewish spirit'.[26]

In these words is to be seen the dynamic character of Blumenfeld's Zionism. Because of this character, it seems he chose the word 'movement' and used it extensively. According to him, a Zionist should forever be reshaping and re-adapting himself because it is obligatory for Zionism to readjust itself to the intellectual framework within which it lives. In the modern world 'in which powerful movements seize upon and grasp the people'[27] Blumenfeld believed that the Zionist movement was one of these 'powerful movements' and that 'it could every year afresh become such a movement. It must, however, reassert itself each year anew.' And the criterion for its being a movement in the true sense of the word is to be found in its ability 'to find every year a new meaning vis-à-vis the world it confronts'.[28]

We have seen that, in Blumenfeld's view, Zionism is a movement which embraces all facets of life and is not merely a spiritual trend or a school of thought. Then how can it be understood in real life? 'The Zionist life in Palestine, the Hebrew language, the new school, the Zionist organization, *the psychological transformation* of the Zionists into courageous people, devoted to ideals, with an instinctive aversion from all that is decadent and merely critical—these are the *fundamental acts* which we are able to point to.'[29] And although the place is not mentioned where all these nation-reviving achievements are to be seen, it is nevertheless implied; and it is no accident that at the head of Blumenfeld's list appear items organically connected with the revival of Jewish life in Palestine. In another passage we read that 'the Zionist seed can grow fruit only in Eretz Israel', and that only there can a Jew get 'a full taste of the life entailed in security and independence'.[30] The realization of the effort of every individual Jew—the development of his personality to the fullest possible extent—necessitates his going to Eretz Israel. This explains the second concept which Blumenfeld formulated in the Zionist world: 'Palestine-centred Zionism.'[31] This concept will be misleading if it is confused with that of the 'Zion Zionists' (*Ziyyone Ziyyon*) dating from the time of the Uganda controversy. Between the latter and Blumenfeld's concept there is no connexion. 'Palestine-centred Zionism' also completely disregarded the 'Zionism' of the Territorialists, who were ready

to agree to the establishment of a Jewish state outside Palestine. Blumenfeld knew very well that the emotional tie between the Jewish people and the land of Israel was too deep to allow of a substitute. This was part of his general understanding that 'the greatest strength of Zionism lies in the irrational and the unprovable'.[32]

However, he had to face the problem of realizing Zionism in his own generation. Could it be realized in the Diaspora through work within Jewish communities for their greater prosperity and well-being, or should the greatest effort be put into educating Jews towards emigration to Eretz Israel? His decision was clearly and strongly in favour of the second alternative. For him communal work was of little importance, and throughout his Zionist activity in Germany there was a constant struggle between him and the group of Zionist leaders and workers—some of them well known in the world Zionist movement—who devoted the best of their abilities to this kind of activity. Blumenfeld admitted in his *Memoirs* that 'communal work was of no interest to me' (p. 87). In the propaganda work which he carried on from 1908, first as Secretary of the Zionist Organization in Germany, and later as Secretary of the World Zionist Organization, he succeeded within a few years in bringing the majority of the active Zionist workers in Germany over to his side. At the conference of the German Zionist Organization held in Posen in 1912 a motion was put and accepted which meant a great victory for Palestine-centred Zionism. The resolution, in Blumenfeld's words, said: 'Every Zionist is obliged to include emigration to Palestine in his life's programme, and is urged to arrange economic interests for himself in Palestine' (p. 90).[33] Thenceforth this resolution formed the Blumenfeld school of thought which left its mark on German Zionism, especially in the days of the Weimar Republic and, more particularly, in the years 1924–33 when Blumenfeld was President of the Zionist Organization in Germany.

This was certainly a radical form of Zionism and Blumenfeld knew it. By being radical it provoked antagonism in the Zionist camp of the time and was later also subjected to criticism. Writing on the history of German Zionism after the extermination of German Jewry, Richard Lichtheim maintained that 'it has to be admitted that Blumenfeld's national idealism was possible only at one time, when the liberal conception of the state suffered such radical notions without drawing consequences from them which could endanger the existence of Jews as citizens. Today the totalitarian tendencies which are everywhere noticeable, even in the relatively free and tolerant states, do not allow such an avowal to a nation which does not constitute a nation-state.'[34] It is true that we have not as yet seen the growth of *post-assimilationist* Jewish nationalism in any democratic state. In the largest Jewish community in the West, in the United States, the tendency has grown (as it did in liberal Europe) to consider Judaism a religion alongside the Christian

religions (as in the well-known formula 'Protestant-Catholic-Jew'); but the use of the term 'ethno-religious group' leaves an opening to an expanding nationalist conception in the spirit of Blumenfeld's ideas, although not, of course, in his language.

Blumenfeld realized, as we have seen, the radical nature of his views. Yet he tried to show that his approach was the necessary outcome of Zionism. He emphasized that it was not his personal opinion but a necessity that 'the starting point of Zionism as a whole is the so-called negation of the *galut*, that is, the conception that, despite all efforts, a full and creative Jewish life is impossible in the conditions of the *galut*. The negation of the *galut* does not mean the negation of its existence. We recognize Jewish life the world over, but only as *galut* existence'.[35] As a result, the German Zionism of Blumenfeld's day discouraged its members from taking part in the political life of Germany. Blumenfeld's profound knowledge of the existential alienation of the Jews in the Diaspora allowed him to think that one should not 'make use of the possibilities of complete emancipation'.[36] There are limits in general society and the Jew should not cross them. And so it happened that in the years 1919–33 when the German Jews enjoyed full rights, the majority of the Zionists did not participate in German political life—either in the parliaments of the Laender or the Reich. It would seem that this abstention was peculiar even within the Zionist movement and cannot be explained in terms of local conditions alone.

The problem of Jewish personality had brought Blumenfeld to Zionism (*Memoirs*, p. 88). In it he saw not a 'solution' but 'the answer of our generation to the Jewish question. But what we do in our lifetime and what we are able to do are important'.[37] He was very deeply involved in the constant encounter of the Zionist Jew with the world of general culture and in the effort to work out his Jewish and Zionist conceptions within the intellectual world of his generation. So Blumenfeld worked all his life, and there is no doubt that his efforts could serve as a starting point in the thought of modern Jews everywhere.

NOTES

[1] The German original *Erlebte Judenfrage*, Stuttgart, 1962, appeared when the author was still alive; the Hebrew translation (by Shimshon Melzer) was published by the Zionist Library, Jerusalem, 1963. In the text the quotations are from the original German (abbreviated as *Memoirs*).

[2] Richard Lichtheim, *Die Geschichte des Deutschen Zionismus*, Jerusalem, 1954, pp. 154, 156.

[3] Richard Lichtheim, *The Remnant Shall Return—Reminiscences of a Zionist from Germany* (Hebrew), Tel Aviv, 1954, p. 132.

[4] *Erlebte Judenfrage*, p. 14.

[5] In his article on the occasion of 'Richard Lichtheim's 75th Birthday' (Hebrew), *Ha'aretz*, 16 February 1960.

[6] Cf. his words (*Erlebte Judenfrage*, p. 53): 'As always, I first had the perception and experience, and then the spiritual conception pertaining to it.'

[7] Cf. 'They are Eastern people, we are Western. The differences in the emo-

tional structure which derive from this still exist. We feel it, for instance, in the alien nuance of the way in which they worship and adore . . . we are incapable of unconditional, self-destructive personal devotion . . . and so on, and there are yet other differences which reach the unconscious depth.' See *Judentaufen* (ed. A. Landsberger), Munich, 1912, pp. 127–8. On this miscellany cf. Blumenfeld's *Erlebte Judenfrage*, pp. 102–3 (where he attributes the editorship erroneously to W. Sombart). A similar sentiment finds expression in the words of a well-known American Jewish sociologist who is certainly not acquainted with the ideas of Blumenfeld and his friends. I am referring to Professor S. M. Lipset, who wrote, in connexion with the *Commentary* symposium on 'Jewishness and the younger Jewish intellectuals', on 'the power of *that vague something in the Jewish background* which makes for achievement in the various fields of culture' (*Commentary*, July 1961, p. 69; italics mine, S. E.).

[8] As is well known, the literature on this subject is enormous, and it will suffice to cite but a few examples from both sides. On the German side: Alfred Weber's contribution mentioned in the previous note; the contribution by Hermann Bahr to *Judentaufen*, op. cit., pp. 21–2; the essay by Wolfgang Schumann and Wilhelm Michel in *Der Jude, Sonderheft Antisemitismus und Jüdisches Volkstum*, Berlin, 1925, pp. 33 ff., 52 ff. On the Jewish side: the well-known essay by Moritz Goldstein, 'Deutsch-Jüdischer Parnass' which appeared in *Der Kunstwart*, March 1912 (and see also the recent essay by the author, setting out the background to the controversy in which the original article arose, 'German Jewry's Dilemma', *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book II* (1957) pp. 236 ff.); the book by Jacob Wassermann, *My Life as German and Jew*, Am. ed., N.Y., 1933, pp. 78 ff., Eng. ed., London, 1934, pp. 64 ff.

[9] Cf. the English essay by Moritz Goldstein mentioned in the previous note, p. 243. To this could be added in recent times authors such as Albert Memmi (to cite an example from French culture) or the late Bernard Berenson, who was during the greater part of his mature life completely estranged from his Jewish origins. The diaries of his last years (*Sunset and Twilight*, New York 1963) bear striking evidence of this. We quote one instance only:

'I doubt whether Sephardim enjoy it [sc. the 'return to Mother's cooking' as he calls it earlier in the same passage] or many of German extraction, and probably no Anglo-Saxons [i.e. American or English born Jews] of third generation. For them their Jewishness counts as little as Catholicism to Catholics in matters political, indeed even less, and yet a Catholic can count as wholly, unquestionably English or American, while I doubt whether in either community a Jew ever ceases being a stranger' (op. cit., p. 323, entry for 29 October 1953).

[10] It should be noted that the expressions *objektive* and *subjektive Judenfrage* as used by Blumenfeld are not identical with the similar terms used by Eva G. Reichmann; cf. her *Hostages of Civilization*, London 1950, e.g. pp. 62 f., 94.

[11] This notion is, of course, not concerned with the difference which one can perceive between Jews and Germans with regard to the extent of their respective German culture and its tendencies. Cf. the interesting remarks made by E. Simon in his *Aufbau im Untergang*, Tübingen, 1959, p. 22. Nevertheless, it seems that his statement requires further confirmation; e.g. the book review sections of the most important Jewish periodicals, systematically examined, would clarify, to a large extent, the character of the *German* culture of German Jews in different periods.

[12] See his article 'Deutscher Zionismus', *Jüdische Rundschau*, 2.9.1910, which was included in the collection of his articles, *Zionistische Betrachtungen*, Berlin, 1916, p. 12.

[13] *The Times Literary Supplement*, 7 June 1963, p. 398.

[14] See Tramer's introduction to *Erlebte Judenfrage*, p. 15.

[15] 'Deutscher Zionismus' (note 12 above), loc. cit.

[16] According to *The Congress Addresses of Theodor Herzl* (translated from the German by Nellie Straus, New York, 1917, p. 5). This translation seems to me more adequate than the one usually quoted. See e.g. A. Bein, *Theodor Herzl: A Biography* (English ed., London, 1957, p. 233): 'Zionism is the return of the Jews to Judaism even before their return to the Jewish land.' And cf. Bein's

discussion of this on p. 261, ibid. The original reads: 'Der Zionismus ist die Heimkehr zum Judentum noch vor der Rückkehr ins Judenland' (See *Protokoll des I. Zionisten-Kongresses*, reprint, Prague, 1911, p. 16). The difficulty of the translation arises of course out of the double meaning of the expression *Judentum* which connotes both Judaism and Jewry. By the way, the German original was frequently inaccurately quoted, even by Blumenfeld himself.

[17] Cf. his article 'Deutscher Zionismus' in *Zionistische Betrachtungen*, op. cit., p. 13, where the return to Jewry has become an apposition to Zionism: 'Der Zionismus, unsere Rückkehr zum Judentum', etc.

[18] 'Deutscher Zionismus', op. cit., p. 14. See also Tramer's remarks on this subject, *Erlebte Judenfrage*, p. 12.

[19] 'Deutscher Zionismus'. op. cit., p. 14.

[20] From his address at the 15th Zionist Congress (*Protokoll des XV. Zionisten-Kongresses Basel 1927*, London, 1927, p. 353). One can also assume personal influences which brought about the broadening of Blumenfeld's concept of post-assimilationist Zionism. Men like Victor Jacobson, Shemaryahu Levin, and Vladimir Jabotinsky taught him to see the gravity of the Jewish-Russian *Kulturkonflikt* and the attractive force of Russian culture (*Memoirs*, pp. 72 and 77).

[21] 'Deutscher Zionismus', op. cit., pp. 12, 14.

[22] And cf. *Memoirs*, pp. 113, 116.

[23] In his original: 'Wir kommen aus der Unsicherkeit des Standpunktes zur Ruhe der Bewegung.' In another passage in the *Memoirs*, he formulated this idea in the following way: 'Redemption can come only if the anxiety of the Jews is broken by their moving from the insecurity of the attitude to the calmness of the movement' (p. 171).

[24] Cf. also the remarks made by Adolf Boehm in the introduction to his *Die Zionistische Bewegung*, Vol. I, second edition, Berlin, 1935, p. 8, where he explains why he chose this title for his book (and not 'History of Zionism' or something of the sort).

[25] See 'Standpunkt und Bewegung', *Jüdische Rundschau*, 21.5.1915; quoted here as in *Zionistische Betrachtungen* (note 12 above), p. 9.

[26] Op. cit., loc. cit.

[27] From his address at the 14th Zionist Congress; see *Protokoll des 14. Zionisten-Kongresses, Wien, 1925*, London, 1926, p. 169.

[28] Ibid., p. 170.

[29] See his article mentioned above (note 25), p. 9.

[30] See *Beiträge zur Frage unserer Propaganda*, Berlin (1928), p. 30.

[31] In the original: 'palästinozentrischer Zionismus'. The expression is not a very happy one, and it seems that Blumenfeld himself felt it. Cf. his remarks that the expression in itself was 'clumsy and angular' (*Memoirs*, p. 90).

[32] See *Protokoll des XV. Zionisten-Kongresses*, op. cit., p. 351.

[33] See also his *Memoirs*, p. 198. The full text of the resolution is as follows: 'As a consequence of the overwhelming significance of the work in Palestine for liberating the individual, and also as the means to achieve our final aim, the convention declares that it is the duty of every Zionist, in the first place of those who are economically independent, to include in their life programme emigration to Palestine.' On the Posen convention see ibid. and *Jüdische Rundschau* of the same year, especially, nos. 21–3, pp. 183–5, 195–9, 206–8. The resolution mentioned here was printed on p. 198 and again on p. 222. On its significance see also p. 206. Cf. also Richard Lichtheim's *Geschichte des Deutschen Zionismus*, op. cit., pp. 167 f. and *The Remnant Shall Return* (Hebrew), op. cit., p. 133; Martin Rosenbluth, *Go Forth and Serve*, New York, 1961, p. 165; Robert Weltsch in: *In Zwei Welten, Siegfried Moses Zum Fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, Tel-Aviv, 1962, p. 35.

[34] Lichtheim, *Geschichte*, op. cit., pp. 167 f.

[35] See *Beiträge* mentioned above (note 30), p. 36.

[36] For this opinion he coined the phrase *Grenzüberschreitung*; cf. *Memoirs*, p. 196, pp. 199–200. See also ibid., p. 173, where he wrote: 'German Zionism *had forbidden* its members to take a leading part in German political life, etc.' (*italics* mine, S. E.).

[37] *Memoirs*, p. 112. We find this formulation also in other articles and utterances of Blumenfeld. Cf., e.g., his article in *Mitteilungsblatt*, Tel-Aviv, 29 May 1959, p. 10 at the bottom.

THE JEWISH POPULATION OF JERUSALEM

O. Schmelz

INTRODUCTION

THE present survey is a continuation of my paper published in 1961 in this *Journal* (Vol. II, No. 1) on the 'Development of the Jewish Population of Jerusalem during the Last Century', and attempts to present in general terms the demographic position of the Jewish population in Jerusalem in recent years.[1] It is based mainly on the Israel Census of Population and Housing 1961, which yielded detailed data on Jerusalem; these have been summarized here for the first time. The results of the census and some even more recent data will sometimes be preceded by a few remarks on previous developments in order to acquaint the reader with both persisting traits and changes discernible in the demography of the Jewish population of Jerusalem.

The Census of Population and Housing was carried out in May and June of 1961. It was in two stages: the first (stage A) covered the whole of the population and was designed principally to count the number of inhabitants in each settlement and urban area and to gain information on a few basic demographic characteristics; in the second (stage B) a large sample of the population (20 per cent) was investigated and detailed questions were asked on various subjects. In Jerusalem, the census (in particular the second stage) met with some opposition on the part of ultra-orthodox circles, but the Central Bureau of Statistics succeeded in furnishing the necessary information from other data collected in the city at approximately the same time.

The present survey deals with the population in the entire municipal area of Jerusalem. It does not enter into a description of the demographic differences between, and the developments in, the various territorial components of the town. The area of Jerusalem inhabited by Jews has grown very considerably since the establishment of the State of Israel.

Most of the figures quoted in the survey have been taken from various censuses, from official population estimates, and from official statistics on births and deaths.

THE SIZE OF THE JEWISH POPULATION OF JERUSALEM

In the mandatory period the Jewish population of Jerusalem increased considerably but much less so than the Jewish population in the rest of the country, including the two other principal towns. The comparative decline of Jerusalem in population growth and absorption of immigrants (who constituted the main element of increase of the Jewish population) became more pronounced in the course of time (Table 1). This was due, to a considerable extent, to the limited possibilities for making a living in this town. In respect of population size, Tel-Aviv and Yafo together overtook Jerusalem around 1931, and Haifa during the War of Liberation.

TABLE 1. *Jewish population in Jerusalem and other localities, 1922, 1931, 1946*

*Locality**	*1922*	*1931*	*1946*
	Absolute figures		
Whole country	83,800	174,600	593,800
Jerusalem	34,100	53,800	99,300
Tel-Aviv and Yafo	20,200	54,200	214,700
Haifa	6,200	16,000	81,500
	Indices (1922 = 100·0)		
Whole country	100·0	208·4	708·6
Jerusalem	100·0	157·8	291·2
Tel-Aviv and Yafo	100·0	268·3	1062·9
Haifa	100·0	258·1	1314·5
	Percentage of the total Jewish population in the country		
Jerusalem	40·7	30·8	16·7
Tel-Aviv and Yafo	24·1	31·0	36·2
Haifa	7·4	9·2	13·7

* The population of each locality for the present municipal area.

Towards the end of the mandatory period the Jewish population of Jerusalem was estimated at approximately 100,000, though there is reason to believe that the estimates current at that time were in fact somewhat exaggerated and that the number of Jews reached only about 95,000.

The War of Liberation and, in particular, the sufferings occasioned by the siege of Jerusalem caused a considerable exodus from the city. At the census of November 1948, only 82,900 Jews indicated Jerusalem as their permanent place of residence, but of these no more than 77,700 were then actually in the town (or serving in the armed forces). The majority of those who left Jerusalem at that time did not return afterwards.

While the absorption of the mass immigration had already started in the rest of the country in 1948, Jerusalem, because of the siege and its

aftermath, participated in it only as from 1949. The number of Jews in Jerusalem grew by two-thirds from November 1948 until the end of 1951, i.e. in the period of mass immigration. After this had terminated, Jerusalem as well as Tel-Aviv and Haifa experienced some years of very slow growth, when only natural increase compensated for the losses caused by a negative migration balance (some of the new immigrants did not succeed in settling down in these towns and moved to other parts of the country). From the mid-fifties there was in Jerusalem a continual but moderate growth in the number of inhabitants (Table 2), but this too was largely due to natural increase.

TABLE 2. *Jewish population in Jerusalem, 1948 to 1962*

Date	*Absolute numbers*	*Index of growth since 1948*	*Percentage of the total Jewish population in the country*
Nov. 1948	82,924	100·0	11·6
End of 1951	138,600	167·2	9·9
End of 1954	142,000	171·2	9·3
End of 1957	150,200	181·2	8·5
May 1961	165,022	199·0	8·5
End of 1962	173,000	208·7	8·4

From November 1948 until the end of 1962, the Jewish population in Jerusalem and in the two other principal towns (within their municipal boundaries) increased relatively less than the population in the State as a whole, because many new immigrants were directed to development areas; and in the case of Haifa and, particularly, Tel-Aviv, because of the considerable growth of the localities around these towns. This caused a reduction in the percentage of each of the three main towns in the total Jewish population of the country. From the low ebb of its population in November 1948, Jerusalem increased relatively more than the municipal areas of Tel-Aviv and Haifa, but less than these two towns together with their surrounding localities (Table 3).

Towards the end of the mandatory period Jews constituted only about 60 per cent of the population of undivided Jerusalem. From the War of Liberation the Israel part of Jerusalem emerged as a town in which 99 per cent of the inhabitants are Jewish. In the 1961 census 2,400 non-Jews were counted among the permanent residents of Jerusalem (excluding diplomatic and consular personnel, etc.).

POPULATION MOVEMENTS

Births, deaths, and natural increase

After the early years of independence there was a marked decline in the birth-rate among the Jewish population in Israel—only partly connected with an unfavourable turn in the age composition—and also a

TABLE 3. *Jewish population in Jerusalem and other localities, 1948 to 1962*

Locality	*Jewish population*			*Percentage of the total Jewish population in the country*	
	Absolute numbers (000's)		*Index of growth since Nov. 1948*	*Nov. 1948*	*End of 1962*
	Nov. 1948	*End of 1962*			
Whole country	716·7	2,068·9	288·7	100·0	100·0
City of Jerusalem	82·9	173·0	208·7	11·6	8·4
City of Tel-Aviv Yafo	244·8	387·0	158·1	34·2	18·7
District of Tel-Aviv	302·1	729·0	241·3	43·2	35·2
City of Haifa	94·7	181·0	191·1	13·2	8·7
Sub-district of Haifa	116·4	271·6	233·3	16·6	13·1

certain decline in the death-rate. The same applies to the Jews of Jerusalem. As in the mandatory period, so also in the period of independence, the crude birth-rate in Jerusalem was higher than in the whole of the country, especially so in recent years, and greatly exceeded the birth-rate in Tel-Aviv and in Haifa. The crude death-rate in Jerusalem has in recent years been only slightly higher than in the rest of the country. The rate of natural increase was up to 1957 alternately higher in the whole country and in Jerusalem. Since then the increased difference in the birth-rate has led to a definitely higher rate of natural increase in Jerusalem. Jerusalem much exceeds both Tel-Aviv and Haifa in the rate of natural increase (Table 4).

Fertility of women

Detailed demographic investigation of the fertility of Jewish women in the country shows that during the mandatory period it was much higher in Jerusalem than in the whole of the *Yishuv*. After the establishment of the State, however, the fertility of the Jewish women in the country as a whole approached that of Jerusalem because of the increasing similarity in the composition of the population according to continent of birth, owing to the mass immigration from Muslim countries. Nevertheless, according to data from 1952–4, there persisted a slightly higher fertility among the Jewish women in Jerusalem, not only on the whole, but also in each of the main sub-groups—whether born in Israel, in Asia and Africa, or in Europe and America.

The census of 1961 allows us to compare the average number of children born to women resident in Jerusalem and in the whole country according to the women's age and continent of birth. The women of Jerusalem had on the average more children than those of parallel age-and-origin-groups in the whole country (Table 5), with the sole exception of the youngest fertile age-groups (this being apparently connected

TABLE 4. *Natality, mortality, and natural increase in Jerusalem and in other localities (rates per 1,000 of the Jewish population), 1951 to 1962 (selected years)*

Year	Whole country	Jerusalem		Tel-Aviv Yafo	Haifa
		Absolute figures	Rates		
			Natality		
1951	32·7	4,453	34·8	26·1	26·9
1954	27·4	4,080	28·8	19·9	20·2
1957	26·0	4,041	26·9	19·0	19·3
1961	22·7	4,261	25·7	16·4	17·2
1962	21·8	4,208	24·6	15·4	16·1
			Mortality		
1951	6·4	986	8·0	6·5	6·0
1954	6·4	1,108	7·9	6·9	6·1
1957	6·2	1,145	7·6	6·8	6·1
1961	5·7	1,128	6·8	6·4	6·7
1962	5·9	1,036	6·1	7·2	6·8
			Natural increase		
1951	26·3	3,467	26·8	19·6	20·9
1954	21·0	2,972	20·9	13·0	14·1
1957	19·8	2,896	19·3	12·2	13·2
1961	17·0	3,133	18·9	10·0	10·5
1962	15·9	3,172	18·5	8·2	9·3

TABLE 5. *Average number of children born to Jewish married women* in the whole country and in Jerusalem, by continent of birth and selected age-groups, Census of 1961*

Age	Place	Total	Israel	Asia and Africa	Europe and America
Total	Whole country	2·8	2·0	4·2	2·0
	Jerusalem	3·2	2·7	4·7	2·2
Up to 19	Whole country	0·6	0·3	0·7	0·4
	Jerusalem	0·5	0·2	0·6	0·1
25–29	Whole country	2·2	1·6	2·9	1·6
	Jerusalem	2·3	1·8	3·0	1·8
35–39	Whole country	3·1	3·0	5·1	2·1
	Jerusalem	3·8	3·5	5·4	2·4
45–49	Whole country	3·1	3·5	6·0	2·1
	Jerusalem	3·8	4·1	6·6	2·4
55–59	Whole country	3·1	3·9	6·1	2·0
	Jerusalem	4·0	4·6	6·8	2·2
65 and more	Whole country	3·7	3·9	5·8	3·0
	Jerusalem	4·8	5·4	7·2	3·2

* By first marriage only.

with higher percentages of unmarried women at these ages in Jerusalem: see Table 16, p. 258). A somewhat greater fertility was found in Jerusalem even with respect to immigrants from Asia and Africa. As can be seen from more detailed unpublished data, this applies both to women who immigrated up to 1947 and to those who immigrated from 1948 onward.

Table 5 shows how big is the difference in fertility between women born in Asia and Africa and those born in Europe and America; the Israel-born women are in an intermediate position but closer to the Europeans, and especially so in the younger age-groups.

Migrations

In the mandatory period the attraction of Jerusalem for new immigrants declined sharply. During the period of independence too, the percentage of immigrants absorbed by Jerusalem was, at any time, lower than the city's proportion of the total Jewish population of the State; consequently this proportion kept on declining. Nevertheless there were in Jerusalem in September 1953 nearly 44,500 persons who had immigrated since 1948 (56 per cent of the foreign-born in the city), and according to the 1961 census, 52,000 (65 per cent).

From Table 6, based on the 1961 census and earlier data, it appears also that throughout the mandatory period Jerusalem attracted a larger percentage of immigrants born in Asia and Africa than those born in Europe and America. This tendency, which was important in determining the ratio of the people originating from various continents within the Jewish population of Jerusalem, also continued during part of the period of independence.

TABLE 6. *Inhabitants of Jerusalem per 100 foreign-born residents in Israel, by continent of birth and period of immigration, Census of 1961*

Period of immigration	*Total foreign born*	*Asia and Africa*	*Europe and America*
Total	6·6	8·0	5·5
Immigrated up to 1947 (Total)	8·4	16·2	6·8
up to 1931	12·4	28·1	8·7
1932–9	8·0	18·1	6·9
1940–7	5·8	7·6	5·1
Immigrated 1948–1954 (Total)	6·2	7·9	4·4
1948–51	6·2	8·1	4·2
1952–4	6·5	6·2	7·4
Immigrated 1955 to May 1961 (Total)	5·0	4·8	5·2
1955–7	4·9	4·9	4·8
1958–May 1961	5·1	4·3	5·5

During the second half of the mandatory period, few veteran inhabitants of the country, including native-born persons, took up residence in Jerusalem. Those who did were mainly new immigrants. In the first years of independence there was some movement towards Jerusalem on the part of people who came to Israel before 1948; this was to a considerable extent due to the transfer of government offices to the capital, but since then few veterans have settled in the city.

According to the census of 1961, there had settled in Jerusalem since 1948: 4,800 foreign-born who immigrated up to 1947 and 5,800 Israel-born aged 15 and above (the younger ones were mainly children of immigrants who had arrived since 1948). However, according to the practice of the census enumeration in regard to persons with two addresses, these figures include many of the students who had come from elsewhere without intending to stay permanently in Jerusalem.

The negative character of Jerusalem's migration balance after the end of mass immigration can easily be demonstrated in the following way. The growth of the population is made up of two components: natural increase (that is to say, the balance of births and deaths) and the migration balance. In the nine and a half years from the beginning of 1952, i.e. after the end of mass immigration, and until the census of May 1961, the number of Jews in Jerusalem increased by 26,400, but the natural increase in the city amounted to 29,900—which means that the total balance of immigration, including the absorption of new immigrants, showed a loss of 3,500. As the census of 1961 counted 14,500 people in Jerusalem who immigrated from 1952 onwards, it can be inferred that the migration balance of people who were in the country already at the beginning of 1952 was negative to the extent of 18,000. However, a large part of these departures were by people who had come to Israel, and to Jerusalem, only during the years of mass immigration.

In each year between 1952 and 1956 the natural increase in Jerusalem was larger than the actual growth of the population, which means that even the addition of new immigrants which never ceased did not suffice to balance the departures from the city. From 1957 to 1959 the total migration balance of Jerusalem was positive, but this happened only thanks to the absorption of new immigrants, while with regard to the existing population the departures continued to be more numerous than new arrivals. Only during the years 1960 to 1962 (according to the data as yet available), did the migratory movements of the existing population in Jerusalem roughly balance. Similar tendencies prevailed also in Tel-Aviv and in Haifa within their respective municipal boundaries, though there it must be taken into consideration that many of the departures were to neighbouring localities which virtually constitute suburbs.

All these results are also borne out by a study of the notifications of change of residence to the Population Register.

Moreover, in the census of 1961 people were asked where they had lived five years earlier: in the same locality, in another locality in the country, or abroad. Among people who were in Israel five years before the census and changed their place of residence, the number of those who left Jerusalem was greater than that of those who came to settle there.

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Country of birth and origin-groups of the native-born

During the mandatory period Jerusalem's Jewish population was characterized, in comparison with that of the whole country, by the following features:

A. A far higher percentage of Sephardim and members of Oriental communities in the total population and of immigrants from Asia and Africa among the foreign-born; this being largely due to the composition of the immigrants who chose to settle, and stay on, in Jerusalem.

B. A higher percentage of native-born owing to the long existence of a numerically large Jewish population in Jerusalem, the greater fertility in the city, and the relatively smaller absorption of immigrants there.

C. A higher proportion of persons from Central and Western Europe among all the European-born, a feature due in part to the employment possibilities for educationally qualified individuals in the city's cultural institutions and public offices.

Tables 7 and 8 show that these particular characteristics in the composition of the Jewish population of Jerusalem by origin also obtain today. So do, on the whole, the causes indicated above for these peculiarities.

Out of over one million immigrants who came to Israel in the period of independence, there was actually a small majority of people born in Asia and in Africa—in contrast to their slight proportion during the mandatory period. As a result, their percentage increased in the whole country and also in Jerusalem. The relative increase was greater in the State as a whole with an ensuing narrowing of the difference between the respective percentages there and in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, there remained a clear difference: among all foreign-born in the 1961 census, the immigrants from Asia and Africa constituted 43 per cent in the whole of the State, but 52 per cent in Jerusalem; on the other hand, they were only 30 per cent in Tel-Aviv Yafo and 20 per cent in Haifa. In the mandatory period there was only in Jerusalem, of all the localities with more than 10,000 Jews, a large proportion of people from Asia and Africa; today this phenomenon occurs, in a much more pronounced form than in Jerusalem itself, in numerous towns and townlets inhabited mainly by new immigrants.

The percentage of native-born decreased in the first years after the

establishment of the State both in Jerusalem and in the whole country because of the wave of mass-immigration. Since then it has increased again both in Jerusalem and in the whole country but continues to be considerably higher in Jerusalem.

TABLE 7. *Jewish population in Jerusalem and other localities, by continent of birth (percentage), 1948, 1953, 1961*

Locality	*Percentage of native born*	*Foreign born*				
		Total	*Asia and Africa*			*Europe and America*
			Total	*Asia*	*Africa*	
				1948		
Whole country	35·5	100·0	15·1	12·5	2·6	84·9
Jerusalem	57·0	100·0	33·9	30·1	3·8	66·1
Tel-Aviv Yafo	32·6	100·0	17·5	15·3	2·2	82·5
Haifa	29·6	100·0	8·5	6·2	2·3	91·5
				1953		
Whole country	28·2	100·0	38·0	27·7	10·3	62·0
Jerusalem	44·6	100·0	47·9	34·9	13·0	52·1
				Census of 1961		
Whole country	38·0	100·0	43·2	24·8	18·4	56·8
Jerusalem	52·4	100·0	52·4	33·3	19·1	47·6
Tel-Aviv Yafo	37·4	100·0	29·9	22·5	7·4	70·1
Haifa	36·4	100·0	20·2	9·3	10·9	79·8

Out of every hundred of Jerusalem's residents in 1961 there were 52·4 per cent native-born, 25 per cent born in Asia and Africa, and 22·6 per cent born in Europe and America.

The census of 1961 shows also that, among all people born in Europe and America, Jerusalem continues to have a higher percentage of persons born in Central and Western Europe and in America than the whole country (Table 8).

TABLE 8. *Persons born in Europe and America in the whole country and Jerusalem, by region of birth (percentage), Census of 1961*

Region of birth	*Whole country*	*Jerusalem*
Total born in Europe and America	100·0	100·0
Eastern Europe	49·4	43·7
Balkan countries*	30·0	21·9
Central Europe†	15·9	25·3
Other European countries and America	4·7	9·1

* Including Rumania.
† Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

Among the native-born, there are in Jerusalem relatively more frequent than in the whole country: persons whose fathers were born in the country, and, among those whose fathers were born abroad, persons of Asian and African origin (Table 9).

TABLE 9. *Native-born Jews in the whole country and Jerusalem, by father's continent of birth (percentage), Census of 1961*

Father's continent of birth	*Whole country*		*Jerusalem*	
Total	100·0		100·0	
Israel	14·6		31·9	
Abroad—Total	85·4	100·0	68·1	100·0
Asia and Africa	39·3	46·0	38·3	56·2
Europe and America	46·1	54·0	·29·8	43·8

A special investigation I undertook into the origin-groups of the native-born in Jerusalem whose fathers were also born in the country, showed a small majority of 53 per cent Ashkenazim as against 47 per cent Sephardim and members of oriental communities. However, among the native-born whose fathers were foreign-born, there were 56 per cent of Asian-African origin (Table 9), this being due mainly to the high fertility of the new immigrants from Asia and Africa whose locally-born children fall into this group. Among all native-born, in 1961, people of Sephardi or oriental origin constituted 53 per cent.

In the total Jewish population of Jerusalem the percentage of Sephardim and members of oriental communities fluctuated approximately as follows in the course of the last decades: 1939—47 per cent, 1947—41 per cent, 1950—43 per cent, 1961—53 per cent.[2]

The results of the 1961 census give a breakdown of the native-born by father's country of birth. By grouping together those actually born in a certain country and the Israel-born children of such people, we arrive at the following figures for the contribution of the respective countries to the composition of Jerusalem's Jewish population in 1961 (excluding 28,000 native-born persons whose fathers were already born in the country; as stated, these comprised 53 per cent of Ashkenazim). Only countries with 2,000 or more persons are listed here, in descending order: Poland and U.S.S.R.[3]—30,900; Iraq—21,800; Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia—20,100; Iran—10,900; Germany and Austria—7,700; Turkey—7,100; Rumania—6,600; Hungary—5,000; Yemen and Aden—4,900; Czechoslovakia—3,300; Syria and Lebanon—3,100; Yugoslavia—2,500; Egypt and Sudan—2,200; Bulgaria and Greece—2,100. The immigration which came after the establishment of the State brought a greater variety in countries of birth. The cumulative percentage of the natives of the five foreign countries of birth most strongly represented in Jerusalem decreased from 67 per cent in 1948 to 63 per

cent in 1953. Thereafter there was another slight increase in that percentage, but the countries of birth which were numerically strongest throughout the period—Poland and U.S.S.R. (together)—today contribute a much smaller proportion than at the end of the mandatory period (Table 10).

TABLE 10. *The five principal countries of birth of foreign-born Jews in Jerusalem (percentage), 1948, 1953, 1961*

	1948		*1953*		*1961*	
Rank No.	*Country of birth*	*% of foreign born*	*Country of birth*	*% of foreign born*	*Country of birth*	*% of foreign born*
1	Poland and U.S.S.R.	34·2	Poland and U.S.S.R.	20·4	Poland and U.S.S.R.	20·8
2	Germany and Austria	13·5	Iraq	16·4	Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia	16·2
3	Iraq	9·8	Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia	10·9	Iraq	15·3
4	Iran	4·8	Germany and Austria	8·0	Iran	7·0
5	Rumania	4·5	Rumania	7·1	Rumania	6·5
1 to 5	All the above countries	66·8	All the above countries	62·8	All the above countries	65·8

Period of immigration

Because of the decreasing absorption of new immigrants in Jerusalem during mandatory times, at the end of that period there were among the foreign-born there relatively more long-established people than in the whole country and in the two other principal cities. On the other hand, between the two censuses of November 1948 and May 1961, the number of foreign-born increased as follows: in the whole country—160 per cent, in Jerusalem—120 per cent, in Tel-Aviv Yafo—45 per cent, in Haifa—68 per cent. Therefore, in the census of 1961 the percentage of persons who immigrated up to 1947 was smaller among the foreign-born in Jerusalem than in Tel-Aviv and Haifa, though larger in Jerusalem than in the whole of the country (Table 11).

Again owing to differences in the ratio of new immigrants, a higher percentage of 'veterans' was found in Jerusalem: at the end of the mandatory period, among people born in Asia and Africa; at present, among people born in Europe and America (Table 12).

Duration of residence in Jerusalem

At the end of the mandatory period there were, according to the census of November 1948, 52 per cent of Jerusalem-born among all

TABLE 11. *Jewish population in Jerusalem and other localities, by period of immigration (percentage), 1948, 1961**

Period of immigration	*Whole country*	*Jerusalem*	*Tel-Aviv Yafo*	*Haifa*
		1948 (foreign born)		
Immigrated up to 1931	18·8	35·9	20·5	14·4
		Census of 1961 (all inhabitants)		
Total	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0
Native born	38·0	52·4	37·3	36·4
Immigrated up to 1947	17·0	16·7	28·1	24·4
1948–54	33·0	23·9	28·3	31·4
1955 and onward	12·0	7·0	6·3	7·8
		Census of 1961 (foreign-born)		
Total	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0
Immigrated up to 1947	27·4	35·1	44·9	38·4
1948–54	53·3	50·3	45·1	49·4
1955 and onward	19·3	14·6	10·0	12·2

* Data from stage B of the Census.

TABLE 12. *Foreign-born Jews in Jerusalem, by continent of birth and period of immigration (percentage), 1948, 1961*

Period of immigration	*Total foreign born*	*Asia and Africa*	*Europe and America*
		1948	
Percentage of those who immigrated up to 1931	35·9	51·4	29·6
		Census of 1961	
Total	100·0	100·0	100·0
Immigrated up to 1947	35·1	21·0	50·4
1948–54	50·3	63·7	35·7
1955 and onward	14·6	15·3	13·9

TABLE 13. *Jewish population in Jerusalem and other localities, by period of settlement in the locality (percentage), Census of 1961*

Locality	*Percentage locally born*	*Born outside locality, by period of settlement*				
		Total	*up to 1947*	*1948–54*	*1955–57*	*1958–61*
Jerusalem	45·7	100·0	26·7	41·5	13·5	18·3
Tel-Aviv Yafo	27·0	100·0	32·2	33·5	15·2	19·1
Haifa	24·0	100·0	24·6	39·2	14·2	22·0

Jewish inhabitants of the city and 94 per cent among all native-born. At about that time, 74 per cent of all foreign-born in Jerusalem, and even 84 per cent of those born in Asia and Africa, had settled in the city within the calendar year of their arrival in the country. All these findings reflected the paucity of internal migration towards Jerusalem throughout the mandatory period; most of the inhabitants were either born in the city or settled there immediately on their arrival.

In the period of independence there was a certain change. The proportion of locally-born decreased in Jerusalem to 44 per cent of all the inhabitants and to 84 per cent of the native-born (75 per cent of the native-born aged 15 and over). Only 60 per cent of the people who immigrated from 1948 onwards settled in Jerusalem within the calendar year of their arrival, and the respective percentage among those who immigrated in the last years before the census, 1958 to 1960, was no more than 33 per cent. Apparently under conditions when many new immigrants are 'directed' to development areas, it takes them longer, on the average, to settle in the main towns.

Table 11 showed that in Jerusalem there is a greater percentage of immigrants since 1955 than in Tel-Aviv and Haifa. On the other hand, Table 13 indicates that a smaller percentage of the residents (born elsewhere) settled from 1955 in Jerusalem than in Tel-Aviv and Haifa. This may be explained by a relatively smaller volume of internal migration towards Jerusalem, during the time under consideration, than towards either Tel-Aviv or Haifa.

Age structure

To understand the age structure of the Jews in Israel and its changes over time, it is necessary to bear in mind the following:

(*a*) Owing to the large fertility differential, there is among Sephardim and members of oriental communities a higher percentage of children (age-group 0–14) than among the Ashkenazim; e.g. in Jerusalem children up to the age of 14 constituted among Sephardim and oriental communities: 44 per cent in 1939, and 40 per cent in 1961, but among Ashkenazim: 26 per cent in 1939, and 28 per cent in 1961.

(*b*) It often happened in the past that the conditions under which immigration took place led to an increased share of young adults (as were the pioneers and many of the 'illegal' immigrants) among the newcomers, and subsequently in the local population. But as time went on, those formerly young people growing older caused a bulge at higher levels of the age-pyramid: in Table 14 it can be seen that the percentage of those aged 15 to 29 among the Jewish population in Israel was very marked in 1931; the ageing of this group of people and of others who immigrated while still young during the second half of the mandatory period is one of the reasons why the Jewish population of Israel in 1961 shows relatively many persons from 45 years upwards.

The age structure of any Jewish population in Israel, country-wide or local, at a given date is influenced mainly by the above two factors, the ratio between the origin-groups and the age composition of past immigrants. Any change occurring in these two factors influences the age structure of the population.

Since the establishment of the State, the composition of the total population by continent of birth has become more similar to that in Jerusalem; consequently the respective percentages for the main age-groups (0–14, 15–64, and 65 years and over) in the whole country and in Jerusalem now resemble each other rather closely. In Tel-Aviv and in Haifa there are fewer children and more people aged 45 and over (Table 14).

TABLE 14. *Jewish population in Jerusalem and other localities, by age (percentage), 1931 to 1961*

Locality	*All ages*	*0–14*	*15–64*				*65 and over*	*Median age*
			Total	*15–29*	*30–44*	*45–64*		
				1931				
Whole country	100·0	32·6	63·4	31·7	19·8	11·9	4·0	24·3
Jerusalem	100·0	37·0	57·7	27·9	17·5	12·3	5·3	22·3
				1948				
Whole country	100·0	28·7	67·4	26·4	26·0	15·0	3·9	27·1
Jerusalem	100·0	34·3	59·3	23·2	19·2	16·9	6·4	24·6
Tel-Aviv Yafo	100·0	26·7	68·9	23·0	27·8	18·1	4·4	30·2
Haifa	100·0	25·8	70·4	23·4	29·8	17·2	3·8	30·5
				1953				
Whole country	100·0	31·8	63·9	24·3	22·3	17·3	4·3	26·2
Jerusalem	100·0	32·4	61·0	26·3	17·6	17·1	6·6	24·6
				Census of 1961				
Whole country	100·0	34·7	60·0	21·2	18·8	20·0	5·3	25·6
Jerusalem	100·0	34·3	59·7	25·4	16·5	17·8	6·0	23·9
Tel-Aviv Yafo	100·0	28·8	64·4	19·8	18·2	26·4	6·8	31·6
Haifa	100·0	29·3	64·9	18·8	19·8	26·3	5·8	31·8

During the last ten years, there has been among the Jewish population of Jerusalem a marked percentage of young adults, aged between 15 to 29. The census of 1961 found in Jerusalem the highest percentage of this age-group among all settlements in the country with 10,000 or more Jewish inhabitants. This is apparently connected with the fact that in Jerusalem there are, on the one hand, fewer children than in new urban settlements inhabited mainly by immigrants from Asia and Africa, and on the other hand, fewer ageing persons than in veteran towns inhabited primarily by Ashkenazim.

Sex

During the mandatory period there were among the Jews in the whole country more males than females owing mainly to the influence of immigration. In Jerusalem, however, throughout the same period, there was an excess of females. This can be explained by the assumption that the tendency not to settle in Jerusalem, or to depart from this city, for economic reasons, was more pronounced among men than among women.

After the establishment of the State, the ratio between the two sexes in Jerusalem approached that in the country as a whole, and there are today relatively more males, particularly among the adults, in Jerusalem than in Tel-Aviv and Haifa (Table 15). However, while there is a slight excess of males over females in the whole country both among native-born and foreign-born, in Jerusalem this is found only among the native-born—adults as well as children.

TABLE 15. *Proportion of males to every 1,000 females among the Jewish population in Jerusalem and in other localities, by age, Census of 1961*

Locality	*All ages*	*0–14*	*15–19*	*30–44*	*45–64*	*65 and over*
Whole country	1,028	1,063	1,030	962	1,055	943
Jerusalem	1,018	1,064	1,050	1,013	933	913
Tel-Aviv Yafo	1,004	1,058	992	911	1,028	1,005
Haifa	1,000	1,054	980	930	1,046	901

Marital status

Among all males and females aged 15 and over, there was in Jerusalem in 1961 a higher proportion of persons never-married than among the Jewish population of the whole country. In part this is connected with the considerable proportion of young adults in the city, many of whom are not yet married. (Cf. Table 14.) However, in each age-group up to the threshold of old age, there is in Jerusalem a greater percentage of persons who never married than in the whole country. The most pronounced difference is to be found among young women aged 20–29, which indicates a higher marriage-age in Jerusalem than in the country as a whole.

In the ages from 65 and over, the majority of women are widows compared to a much smaller proportion of widowers (Table 16).

Household size[4]

Because of the greater fertility of women in Jerusalem, the average number of persons per household is slightly larger there than in the whole country and considerably higher than in Tel-Aviv and Haifa. This has been found in some sample surveys carried out during the last

TABLE 16. *Jewish population in the whole country and Jerusalem, by sex, age, and marital status, Census of 1961*

Age	Whole country		JERUSALEM							
	Percentage never married		Male				Female			
	Male	Female	Never married	Married	Divorced	Widowed	Never married	Married	Divorced	Widowed
All ages 15 and over	26·6	16·8	33·7	62·9	1·2	2·2	23·0	62·2	2·2	12·6
15–19	99·0	90·3	99·0	1·0	0·0	—	92·7	7·1	0·1	0·1
20–24	75·8	33·8	80·5	19·2	0·3	0·0	47·7	51·1	0·9	0·3
25–29	30·7	9·0	37·1	61·8	1·1	0·0	16·6	80·7	2·0	0·7
30–34	12·7	4·1	15·5	82·9	1·3	0·3	7·4	88·4	2·7	1·5
35–44	5·8	2·5	9·5	88·4	1·6	0·5	4·7	87·6	3·1	4·6
45–54	3·2	2·5	4·8	91·8	1·7	1·7	3·8	79·8	3·4	13·0
55–64	2·5	2·9	3·5	90·3	1·9	4·3	3·9	62·6	3·3	30·2
65–74	2·1	2·7	2·5	84·8	1·7	11·0	3·7	39·2	1·8	55·3
75 and over	2·4	2·6	2·3	69·8	1·6	26·3	3·3	18·5	1·1	77·1

TABLE 17. *Average number of persons in Jewish households in Jerusalem and in other localities, Census of 1961*

	Whole country	Jerusalem	Tel-Aviv Yafo	Haifa
Incl. single-person households	3·7*	3·6	3·2	3·2
Excl. single-person households	4·0	4·2	3·6	3·5
Percentage of single-person households	9·7	14·5	11·9	10·6

* Not including Kibbutzim.

ten years. However, attention should be paid to the fact that the proportion of single-person households is particularly pronounced in Jerusalem—perhaps because of the relatively large number of students coming from other localities. Therefore, the average household size in Jerusalem stands out more clearly when single persons are excluded from the calculation.

Similar results were also obtained in the census of 1961, but the average for the whole country (excluding collective settlements, which would have lowered it) came out slightly higher than in Jerusalem—as long as the computation is allowed to include single persons, who again proved to be relatively numerous in the city; if the single-person households are eliminated, the census, too, shows a higher average of persons per household in Jerusalem than in the whole country (Table 17).

Educational standard

In the 1961 census answers were obtained on the years of schooling of the population aged 14 and above. Preliminary results (specifying only sex) show that the Jews of Jerusalem comprise, on the one hand, a relatively large percentage of people, and in particular women, who never went to school (0 years of schooling in Table 18), and on the other hand, a particularly pronounced proportion of people with 13 and more school years, which corresponds to attendance at institutions of higher learning. This reflects, in terms of educational standards, the particularly varied composition of Jerusalem's population: on the one hand, there is a large percentage of oriental Jews (reinforced by some of the women of the Ashkenazi 'Old Yishuv') and, on the other hand, a conspicuous proportion of persons from central and western Europe, etc., with high educational attainments.

TABLE 18. *Jewish population (aged 14 and over) in Jerusalem and other localities, by sex and number of years of schooling (percentage), Census of 1961*

Locality and sex	*Years of schooling*							*Median*
	Total	*0*	*1–4*	*5–8*	*9–10*	*11–12*	*13 and over*	
Whole country total	100·0	12·6	7·5	35·4	18·3	16·3	9·9	8·4
male	100·0	7·7	7·4	36·3	18·8	17·9	11·9	8·9
female	100·0	17·6	7·6	34·4	17·8	14·8	7·8	7·9
Jerusalem total	100·0	14·0	5·1	29·6	16·3	16·3	18·7	9·2
male	100·0	8·0	4·7	29·6	16·4	17·4	23·9	9·9
female	100·0	19·9	5·5	29·6	16·1	15·3	13·6	8·3
Tel-Aviv Yafo total	100·0	9·0	6·5	36·0	18·4	18·5	11·6	8·8
male	100·0	5·3	6·3	36·9	18·2	19·2	14·1	9·2
female	100·0	12·6	6·7	35·1	18·6	17·8	9·2	8·5
Haifa total	100·0	6·1	7·5	34·2	20·3	19·2	12·7	9·2
male	100·0	3·7	7·0	33·5	19·5	20·4	15·9	9·6
female	100·0	8·3	8·1	34·9	21·0	18·1	9·6	8·8

Labour force participation

From the inception of the Israel labour force surveys in the mid-fifties, the participation of Jerusalem's population aged 14 and over in the labour force presents itself as follows: among males—smaller than in the whole country, in Tel-Aviv, and in Haifa; among females—greater than in the whole country and in the two other principal towns; among both sexes taken together—approximately equal to that in the whole country, and slightly higher than in Tel-Aviv and Haifa. These findings were confirmed by the census of 1961 (Table 19).

The greater participation in the labour force by women, characteristic of Jerusalem, is connected with the particular economic structure of the city: public institutions constitute there an important source of livelihood and absorb a considerable number of women engaged in the liberal professions or in clerical work.

TABLE 19. *Percentage of persons (aged 14 and over) participating in labour force in Jerusalem and other localities, by sex, 1955 to 1962 (selected years)* *

Year	*Whole country*	*Jerusalem*	*Tel-Aviv Yafo*	*Haifa*
		Total		
1955	54·4	53·5	53·1	54·5
1959	53·9	55·1	51·8	51·3
1961 census	53·2	52·6	51·5	52·1
1961	54·4	53·4	51·7	50·0
1962	54·5	53·5	53·0	50·8
		Males		
1955	80·3	76·9	80·7	83·8
1959	79·5	74·4	79·3	79·4
1961 census	77·0	72·9	76·9	77·9
1961	79·0	75·7	78·0	76·5
1962	78·5	75·0	78·7	76·0
		Females		
1955	27·9	30·4	26·2	25·2
1959	28·0	34·7	24·6	24·2
1961 census	29·2	32·3	26·4	26·8
1961	29·4	31·2	25·4	24·5
1962	30·3	32·3	27·8	25·7

* The data of the 1961 census relate to Jews only. All the other data are taken from labour force surveys, and are, since 1957, yearly averages. The percentages for the whole country relate only to Jews, but those for individual localities to the whole population.

Employed persons by economic branch

The breakdown by economic branch shows a conspicuous proportion of persons employed in services in Jerusalem. Since the early years of independence there are data indicating that about half of Jerusalem's labour force is engaged in services: a small proportion in personal services, and a large majority in public administration and in educational, health, legal, and welfare services (Table 20). The outstanding import-

ance of services in its economy sets Jerusalem apart from Tel-Aviv and Haifa, where manufacturing, commerce, and transportation play a much greater part; and also from the whole country, where in addition a considerable percentage of the labour force is employed in agriculture. The prominence of services reflects Jerusalem's function as a capital and as a religious, spiritual, and educational centre; it also allows one to visualize how important it was for Jerusalem's economy that the capital of the State was established there and that the main government offices and centres of national services were transferred to Jerusalem.

TABLE 20. *Employed persons (aged 14 and over) in Jerusalem and other localities,* by economic branch (percentage), Census of 1961*

Economic branch	*Whole country*	*Jerusalem*	*Tel-Aviv Yafo*	*Haifa*
Total	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	11·9	1·3	1·1	1·4
Manufacturing (industry and crafts, mining and quarrying)	25·3	16·8	29·6	23·2
Construction (including Public Works)	8·3	8·5	6·8	8·4
Electricity, water, and sanitary services	2·2	1·4	2·4	4·4
Commerce, banking, and insurance	12·7	13·0	19·7	16·1
Transport, storage, and communication	6·6	4·6	7·5	13·7
Services, total	33·0	54·4	32·9	32·8
Government and public services	10·3	18·4	10·3	10·4
Educational, health, legal services, etc.	15·3	28·3	14·3	16·3
Personal services and recreation	7·4	7·7	8·3	6·1

* The data for the whole country relate to Jews only; those for individual localities to the whole population.

Occupations

The breakdown of Jerusalem's labour force by personal occupation shows a prominent proportion of professional, scientific, and technical workers. As far as the clerical workers are concerned, their over-all percentage is not higher in Jerusalem than in Tel-Aviv and Haifa, but a much larger proportion of them are employed by government or other public institutions. Among the working women there is in Jerusalem also a larger proportion of those engaged in service occupations (in the restricted meaning that the term 'service' has in the classification of occupations, viz., primarily domestic servants, charwomen, waitresses, etc.). On the other hand, there is in Jerusalem's labour force, as compared with Tel-Aviv and Haifa, a relatively limited percentage of persons employed in production, commerce, and transportation. According to the 1961 census, 61 per cent of all people employed in Jerusalem, and even 82 per cent of the employed women, were concentrated in the following three groups of occupations: 'professional, scientific and technical workers', 'administrative, managerial, and clerical workers', and 'service, sport, and recreation workers' (Table 21).

TABLE 21. *Employed persons (aged 14 and over) in Jerusalem and in other localities, by sex and occupation (percentage), Census of 1961*

Occupation	*Whole country*	*Jerusalem*	*Tel-Aviv Yafo*	*Haifa*
		Total		
Total	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0
Professional, scientific, and technical	13·3	23·5	13·8	15·9
Administrative, managerial, and clerical	19·3	25·2	24·9	24·7
Traders, agents, and salesmen	8·7	8·2	12·6	11·0
Farmers and fishermen	12·0	2·0	1·0	1·4
Transport and communications	4·8	4·5	5·4	7·3
Construction, quarrying, and mining	7·2	7·4	5·5	6·5
Craftsmen and production	23·1	16·6	26·3	22·5
Service, sport, and recreation	11·6	12·6	10·5	10·7
		Per 100 employed males		
Professional, scientific, and technical	9·7	19·4	10·9	12·1
Administrative, managerial, and clerical	18·7	24·7	23·3	23·3
		Per 100 employed Females		
Professional, scientific, and technical	23·2	33·0	22·8	27·5
Administrative, managerial, and clerical	20·7	26·3	29·5	29·4
Service, sport, and recreation	23·6	22·3	17·6	19·4

CONCLUSIONS

During the mandatory period, the Jews of Jerusalem had become increasingly atypical of the total Jewish population in the country, which, unlike that in the city, was at that time preponderantly of European origin. Since the establishment of the State of Israel something like a 'normalization' has taken place in the demographic position of the Jews of Jerusalem, within the total Israeli context, owing to the changed conditions created in the rest of the country by the mass influx from Asia and Africa. Although there is still a higher percentage of immigrants from these two continents in Jerusalem than in the whole country, the city is now far surpassed in this respect by many urban settlements inhabited mainly by newcomers. In recent years, Jerusalem has been close to the national average in such demographic respects as sex and age structures, average household size, and vital statistics. Tel-Aviv and Haifa, on the other hand, whose demographic characteristics were typical of the whole *Yishuv* during the mandatory period, are now far removed from the national average, especially with regard to the origin composition, age structure, and natural increase of the population.

NOTES

[1] I wish to express my thanks to the Central Bureau of Statistics and its Director, Professor Roberto Bachi, for permission to use here some data not yet published elsewhere and also to the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University for sponsoring the investigation. This paper is a modified version of one published (in Hebrew) in the collective volume *Jerusalem*, ed. by H. Toren and S. Kremer, 1964.

[2] Of these data, only the percentage for 1939 was obtained from answers to a direct census question about the origin-group of the residents. The data for 1947, 1950, and 1961 were obtained by indirect methods which resulted in a slight underestimate of the proportion of Sephardim and members of oriental communities.

[3] In view of the great territorial changes which occurred in the course of the last fifty years in these countries, it is preferable to show them together.

[4] A 'household' is defined as a group of persons who live permanently together and who prepare at least part of their meals together. A household may include persons who are not related to one another. Any single person who does not live with other people and share their meals is considered as a household.

BOOK REVIEWS

MR. MEMMI ON JEWISHNESS AND THE JEWS

Elie Kedourie

(*Review Article*)

MR. ALBERT MEMMI is a Tunisian Jew born in 1920, the son of a saddle-maker in the Jewish quarter of Tunis. Like so many Oriental Jews he was given an entrance into Western, and more particularly, French culture through one of the excellent schools founded and maintained for the last century all over the Muslim world by the Alliance Israélite Universelle. Mr. Memmi is the author of two interesting novels, *La Statue de Sel* and *Agar* in which autobiography looms very large, and of a short essay, *Portrait du Colonisé précédé du Portrait du Colonisateur*, which contain reflections of a 'progressive' kind on what is known as imperialism and colonial liberation. *Portrait of a Jew** was first published in French in 1962, the English translation coming out a year later. Like the novels, the *Portrait* contains a large element of autobiography, and it is perhaps this which largely makes for its interest; like the essay, it is full of 'philosophical' speculations which arouse a great many objections, and make the work somewhat less readable than it might have been. The book is divided into four parts: The misfortune of being a Jew, The mythical Jew, The shadowy figure, and The heritage. Of these, the second part is devoted to the discussion of various European racial and economic myths about the Jews; it is not only a showing-up of these popular idiocies for what they are (something which has been done many times), but also an incisive discussion of the role of myth in the structure of the psyche, a role which in no way depends on its truth or falsehood, however these terms may be understood. Chapter 21 in the fourth part also calls for special mention. It is a *locus classicus* of sociological religion, an account of what being Jewish means to someone of Jewish parentage who continues to consider himself a Jew without believing in or practising Judaism as usually and traditionally understood.

* Translated from the French by E. Abbot; London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1963, pp. vii + 326, 25*s*.

Mr. Memmi begins by asserting that there is 'a universal Jewish fate', that 'precisely the same situation exists everywhere'; towards the end of his book, he states that the portrait he has painted is a portrait of himself, but also by extension a portrait of other Jews; and other Jews describing their various experiences would, he feels confident, paint essentially the same portrait. To write of his own destiny—and by implication of the destiny of all Jews—seems to Mr. Memmi a necessary enterprise; necessary to him personally: 'I refuse', he writes, 'to spend my life brooding over my situation as a Jew. Since the issue cannot be dodged, it seemed to me preferable to see it through, at least once.' Brooding is indeed the right word, and the book is full of an obsessive self-pity and self-depreciation which make of it yet another highly interesting example of the destructive effect of Europe on Jews and Judaism. His attitude can be easily illustrated from the abundance of statements which litter his book; p. 21: 'I know scarcely any Jew who rejoices in being one'; p. 26, quoting from a book by a certain Clara Malraux: 'You cannot explain to others what it is to be a Jew nowadays. It is as though you suddenly discovered you had syphilis, as it was to have syphilis in other times when there was no known treatment for it'; p. 27: Judaism is a neurosis, an inescapable fatality; p. 28: no Jew is natural or sure of himself; p. 31: Jews cannot peacefully lie still in the sun; p. 32: Jews are always on the move; p. 38: 'The misfortune of the Jew concerns all Jews, who are called Jews largely because of that gloomy peculiarity'; p. 40: it is not easy for a Jew to be an explorer or a world traveller; p. 54: 'I say in short, that I am a problem'; p. 57: to be a Jew is first and foremost to find oneself called to account; p. 59: to be a Jew is to be set apart from other men; it is also to be set apart from oneself; p. 60: a Jew cannot help looking at himself with astonishment and suspicion; p. 80: the Jew 'is truly insolvent in his private life both as a citizen and as an historical man'; etc., etc. These statements, be it noted, are cast in the universal mode, purporting to apply to all Jews at all times and everywhere; but this universality is of course spurious, and what is supposed to describe a universal and inescapable Jewish fate refers in reality, but in an eccentric and mystificatory manner, to the sombre history of European Jewry, when, after 1789, it tried to make its way into a European society which seemed increasingly incapable of accommodating religious or linguistic diversity. This foreshortened and inadequate view of Jewish history leads the author to try and force the diversity of Jewish experience into his one mould. Thus, when he comes to speak, as he rarely does, of his own Tunisian community in relation to its Muslim overlord, he gives the impression that Jewish disabilities under Muslim rule were of the same kind as Jewish disabilities under Christian rule; again, in order to show that the Jewish fate is the same everywhere, he discovers a hitherto unknown catastrophe involving Ottoman Jewry, writing p. 44: '1908 to 1925:

15,000 Levantine Jews flee the revolt of the Young Turks'; finally, a significant linguistic confusion is worth noting: the author has so imbibed a certain modern European version of Jewish history that in referring to the Jewish quarter of Tunis he calls it a ghetto, and by using this term conjures up a state of affairs quite alien to Muslim institutions and the structure of Muslim cities.

The author also indulges in these dubious universalities when discussing other than Jewish matters. He writes, p. 238, that it is the desire of Jews to belong which makes them adhere in Italy to Fascism, in Germany to Nazism, and in France to Gaullism! We wonder whether this is sober truth or rhetoric which, in order to persuade, finds it convenient to speak of Jewish Nazis and to equate Fascism, Nazism, and Gaullism in their attitude to politics in general and to Jews in particular. Or consider the following passage (pp. 51–2): 'Society as a whole calls the Jew to account, insistently and continuously; with bitter incidents to be sure, but on a chronic basis. There is no rupture, no real break between the anti-Semite and his people, but a gradation, an exasperation, a systematization. Just as there is a simple gradation and not a difference in nature between the good employer and the bad, and perhaps, ultimately, the slave-trader.' In this passage it is not so much the assertion about antisemitism as the analogy by which it is buttressed which is so arresting. In Mr. Memmi's book it is the employer as such who is the carrier of evil, and it must follow that the good employer is as bad as the slave-trader, is *perhaps* (to emulate the author's caution) responsible for the slave-trader. How convenient.

This work, then, must not be considered a treatise conveying information and wisdom about the world, but rather an exhibit which illustrates a state of mind, an experience, a prevalent illusion. We have to ask not whether what the author says is true, but rather why exactly he should be saying the curious things he does say. And here we must put first, but perhaps not foremost the literary influence. The book is dedicated to Jean-Paul Sartre and bears many traces of the philosophical style associated with him, both in its strong points, such as the discussion on myth, and in its weak, such as the equation of a good employer with a slave-trader. But there is an even more direct influence, namely Sartre's own views not so much on Judaism as on Jewishness. Sartre's views may be summed up in a sentence which Mr. Memmi quotes towards the end of his book (p. 262): 'The Jew', writes Sartre, 'is a man whom other men consider a Jew and who is obliged to make decisions starting from the situation in which he is placed.' Mr. Memmi criticizes this view for making the Jew mere negativity, a creation of what others think of him; but if he criticizes it, he is nevertheless profoundly influenced by it as the quotations about the misfortune of being a Jew amply show. But it would be mistaken to think that Mr. Memmi speaks in this way only because he is Sartre's disciple. He says

(p. 186) that he is neither a believer nor scarcely ever a practising Jew. Since therefore he has shed the only characteristics which have traditionally defined a Jew, it is no wonder that he is perplexed as to his own identity, that Sartre's definition of a Jew should attract him so much, and that he should exert himself to prove the falsity of the antisemitic vulgarities which popular science and universal education have spread in Europe in modern times, and which must loom very large in the horizon of one who is unsure of his own identity. What makes Mr. Memmi's case interesting is that, by origin, he belongs to Oriental Jewry, which has nestled for so long in the benign shadow of Islam and which Europe and Zionism have contributed so powerfully to dislodge and pulverize. Since neither popular science nor democracy, nor the theological odium which has so mercilessly pursued European Jewries, had any hold on the Muslim world, it would never have occurred to an Oriental Jew to take seriously those calumnies so familiar in Europe or think them worth discussing. That Mr. Memmi should exert himself so much in this matter is an indication not merely of literary influence, but of the presence and influence of European antisemitism in North Africa, which was introduced and propagated by the French settlers. This is common knowledge, but Mr. Memmi's own work, in particular *La Statue de Sel*, powerfully illustrates the corrosive effect of this antisemitism on a young Jew who had grown up sheltered within the ancient communal institutions sanctioned by Islamic practice.

The autobiographical passages in the *Portrait* (which are much the most interesting part of the work) also strikingly illustrate this point. In a passage which occurs towards the beginning of the work (p. 37) the author writes: 'I do not know what other young men in the world discussed around campfires or during long winter nights, but the subject that interested us, the one we argued passionately was the nature of anti-Semitism.' One hopes for the author's sake that this is hyperbole, but if he did use his leisure in so dismal a fashion, the impulse surely cannot have arisen from the circumstances of indigenous society, must rather have been generated by contact with Europeans. Another passage in the book indicates that this was in fact so: 'I did not really understand', he writes (p. 61), 'what anti-Semitism was; only little by little did I become aware of it and, not until later, when I went to Europe where outsiders mingled freely with the Jewish community and I came in contact with non-Jews, did I fully realize their rejection of us.' In another passage (p. 83) he describes the shock which he sustained when he found that European writers whom he admired hated or despised Jews; writers like Shakespeare, Molière, Voltaire, and Gide ('Gide! Gide whom I admired so much . . . Gide of all men . . .'). Finally, there was an experience beside which literary abuse and the settlers' malice was of little import, namely the short German occupation of Tunis and the Nazi terrorism which the author personally

experienced. We may then fairly say that the book is a quite typical reaction to European culture and to its persistent anti-Judaism which, when the author was growing up, was in an acute and murderous phase. Typical also in a sadder and deeper sense, in that like so many European Jews in the modern period, whether 'assimilationist' or 'Zionist' he has taken over the assumptions and attitudes of the enemies of the Jews.

A personal experience here comes to mind. As an adolescent in Baghdad during the Second World War, I came to know an Italian Jew, Enzo Sereni, a Zionist long settled in Palestine who, under cover of war work, had been sent by the Palestinian Zionists to preach their creed to the Jews of Iraq, whom they could not otherwise have hoped to reach. Sereni was in many ways an attractive figure with a gift for gaining the confidence and devotion of the young. I was much attracted by his stimulating and varied discourse—for he was not the usual narrow and dim-witted ideologue. But I still vividly remember the occasion when he started discussing what he called 'Jewish self-hate', and how incomprehensible and repulsive the whole notion was to me. What I suppose he meant—though this, of course, I only appreciated much later—was the state of mind of European Jews who, being introduced to a seemingly superior European culture in the eighteenth century and finding some of the foremost representatives of this culture, people like Voltaire, Kant, Lichtenberg, profoundly and eloquently anti-Jewish, believed that this too was a necessary part of Enlightenment. Some such attitude, or some variant of it, has been widely prevalent among European Jews and has led either to 'self-hate', or an apologetic, defensive attitude, or a radical rejection of Jewish life as it is, in favour of some bronzed, heroic future exaltation. This last variant is of course the corollary of Zionism, and the mythic way by which it rejoins antisemitism. This attitude Mr. Memmi has imbibed, as may be seen from the quotations given above. He has imbibed it in a specifically Zionist form, and we find him exhibiting that strand of populist demagoguery which East European conditions wove into Zionism. Thus, as a young man, he disliked rich Jews because they were rich; he records (p. 124) how he and his young Zionist comrades 'were so furiously angry at the rich German Jews that we received the announcement of their early tragedies rather coldly and, I must confess, almost with satisfaction: those powerful communities had always refused to receive our comrades, whether as propagandists or fund-raisers'. Again (p. 130): 'I had no doubt that the real Jew was the poor Jew, for I myself was the real Jew. Perhaps, as luck would have it, the ghetto [he means the Jewish quarter of Tunis] may have saved me from a little of that torturing Judeophobia so common among Jews themselves.' Common as Mr. Memmi may think such sentiments, at least among his own forbears they must have been highly uncommon.

Along with so many other commonplaces of European culture, Mr.

Memmi has also acquired a taste for political salvation, and developed a need for being absorbed in a mass. Religion for him is strictly civic in character, a social cement, something like the rite of a kin-group, or the ceremonial union between a polis and its tutelary god. Thus he complains that as a Jew in France, he cannot take part in Christmas, that he cannot identify himself with Clovis, and goes so far in confounding Jewish history with his own yearnings that he speaks (p. 216) of 'the persistence of my people in seeking to be admitted into the confraternity of their fellow men, something they have sought so humbly for centuries'! The assumption here is that the relation between citizens is and ought to be like the relation between brothers. For Mr. Memmi this seems the obvious truth. He does not appear to realize that in fact this is a very recent (and catastrophic) notion spawned by the *sans-culottes* of European political thought, or that (with the notable exception of ancient Greece) all that men, including 'my people', generally wanted out of politics, before the last hundred and fifty years or so, was only to secure to them a mere modicum of law and order.

Far then from being an account of the universal Jewish fate, this book is so much a product purely of its time and place that it is unable to master and explain even the author's own particular experience. It is a book to sadden a reader, but not so much in the sense intended by the author; sadden him not at the recital of Jewish sufferings in modern times (which many others have rehearsed more eloquently than Mr. Memmi); but at a reaction to these sufferings so uncritical, so sentimental and lacking in fortitude, so much the unconscious victim of current slogans, so passively immersed in the turgid flow of words and events, that it becomes a prime example of that spiritual subversion by which modern Europe has given so refined a twist to the ancient oppression.

THE JEWS OF BRITAIN UNDER STUDY

Max Beloff

(*Review Article*)

THE proceedings of the important conference on the problems of studying the present phase in the history of Anglo-Jewry through the application of sociological techniques* have taken a long time to appear, and some steps towards implementing some of its recommendations have already been taken; nevertheless the volume is well worth having, and the editors are to be congratulated on having managed to produce not merely the papers presented to the Conference but also an unusually full record of the discussions.

The Conference itself forms only one in a series sponsored by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry in its effort to 'gain', as Professor Moshe Davis, its Head, put it 'world perspectives on the contemporary Jewish situation'. It was attended by Professor Davis and some of his colleagues, and by many prominent figures in the Anglo-Jewish community as well as by some of the scholars on whom the further development of such studies must depend. If there was a weakness in its composition it was in the relative paucity of the representation of non-Jewish sociologists, and one is tempted to agree with the Rev. W. W. Simpson, the General Secretary of the Council of Christians and Jews, in regretting that no paper looking at the relations between the Jewish community and the non-Jewish society within which it has its being was presented to the Conference, and to add that such a paper by a non-Jewish sociologist would have been particularly appropriate. One's feelings here are strengthened by the penetrating contributions to the discussions of Mr. John Highet.

Both from the wider viewpoint of the Institute at Jerusalem and from the narrower practical concerns of those responsible for planning the institutions of the Jewish community in Britain, the importance of getting a clearer picture of the present composition and attitudes of the Community is undeniable. On the whole the literature of the subject is not very considerable and it is notable how often speakers at the Conference were forced to rely on statistics or surveys dating from a number

* *Jewish Life in Modern Britain, Papers and Proceedings of a Conference held at University College London on 1st and 2nd April, 1962, by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, under the auspices of the Board of Deputies of British Jews*, edited by Julius Gould and Shaul Esh, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964, pp. xiv + 217, 28*s*.

of years back, and not necessarily reliable as a guide to the present. It appears for instance that a decade ago, Jewish students at British Universities 'accounted for 2·8 per cent of the total number of students, although Jews account for only about 1 per cent in the general population'. Does this proportion still hold good in the much increased University population of today? Or does this earlier figure represent merely the predominantly middle-class composition of the present-day Anglo-Jewish community?

For the lack of work in this field three main reasons emerged in the course of the Conference. In the first place, as compared with some other countries, statistics are particularly difficult to get for reasons which arise out of the general development of British society as well as from the particular circumstances of Jewish emancipation here. The census does not look into religious affiliations; there are hardly any enactments relating to the Jews as a separate community, and those which exist are not productive of statistics or of archives, and so forth. Nearly all the statistics that are needed as a basis for any other kind of inquiry have to be compiled painfully and by indirect methods. In the second place, there is a general shortage of sociologists—let alone good sociologists—in Britain, and little career incentive for specialization in the Jewish field even for the Jews among them. The second point is connected with the third, the relative indifference of the Anglo-Jewish Community to scholarship as reflected in its response to appeals for financial support to (other than Israeli) Jewish institutions of learning. It is difficult indeed for those who wish to promote such studies to find the appropriate 'angel', the role filled by Dr. Alec Lerner in relation to this Conference.

Nor does one feel that it is only Jewish sociology that is liable to lack both men and money. (There is of course, as was pointed out, a particular difficulty about sociology, in the possibly unwelcome nature of its findings on certain issues where people prefer closed minds to open ones).

Dr. Vivian D. Lipman gave a very useful paper on 'Topics and Methods of Future Research in Contemporary Anglo-Jewish History' with some helpful notes on sources. But even historians are not going to be easy to find. One reason is that the history of Anglo-Jewry, like any other history of a small minority in a single country, is always in danger of degenerating into mere antiquarianism. It can only be corrected if it is treated as a part of wider history, that of the Jewish people as a whole. The most obvious lack in the intellectual resources of the Community is indeed of Jewish historians. With the retirement of Dr. Cecil Roth (whose own paper at the Conference on 'The Anglo-Jewish community in the Context of World Jewry' was the most important and original single contribution) from his Oxford readership, this gap is being made painfully obvious. Or consider what Jews as

well as the general public owe to someone else just retired, a Christian clergyman, the Rev. James Parkes, for his writings on so many different aspects of the Jews' relations with their neighbours through the centuries. Many reasons for such failings might be adduced. As far as the Conference was concerned the most important contribution on this score was that by Dr. Esh, the Israeli co-editor of the present volume, when he pointed out that with the elimination of the once flourishing '*secular* educational institutions' of Eastern Europe such studies had now been left mainly to the Western hemisphere: 'in Anglo-Jewry apparently even the idea of this type of education never came to mind and was not brought into discussion. It might be useful to bear in mind that Jewish *religious* education is not a matter of course and not the only possible course of Jewish education.' As a comment on the paper presented by Isidor Fishman and Harold Levy this was perfectly fair; but it also reveals the wider distinction between the approach of the Israeli scholars and some at least of the Anglo-Jewish members of the conference.

Mr. Adolph G. Brotman's paper on Jewish Communal Organization provided useful reference material on all those aspects of Jewish life in the country which call for organized effort.[1] But as Mr. Leonard Stein among others pointed out, Mr. Brotman's paper did not at all reflect the enormous impact upon the Community at many points of the existence of Israel—an impact by no means exhausted by a catalogue of Zionist organizations of various kinds. It extends also to the relationship between the Jewish community and the rest of the country. If Israel had not come into existence being a Jew would not have prevented Lord Mancroft from directing the Norwich Union or presiding over the London Chamber of Commerce. The existence of Israel makes it tolerably certain that the first Marquess of Reading will go down in history as the last as well as the first Jew to be British Foreign Secretary. On the other hand, were it not for Israel the Community on its present showing might well decline into a small religious minority of no greater consequence (except in its own eyes) than any other. For contact with Israel is not only a problem in some of the Community's relations with its host-country, it can also be a source of fruitful co-operation with the wider society.

Commenting on Mr. Norman Cohen's paper on 'Trends in Anglo-Jewish life'—a paper much out of line with the others in its personal nature and lack of any sociological underpinning—Mr. M. Richardson, the United Synagogue's welfare and youth officer, disputed the view that the Jewish community is more 'integrated' with the wider society than before: 'ideologically we are moving towards a greater ghetto than ever before'. It was a pity no-one took him up on this point, which is worthy of inquiry.

But if contacts with Israel are to be beneficial there is going to be

much need for understanding on both sides. Some of the speakers were criticized for analysing and describing the Community too exclusively in terms of the synagogue. It was pointed out that such an approach left out of the reckoning a large number of people who probably regarded themselves as Jews, were certainly regarded as Jews by others, but whom statistics based upon synagogue membership would omit altogether. And these people need to be understood as well if we are to predict the future course of the community. On the other hand, any definition other than the religious one of 'who is a Jew?' makes any form of statistical inquiry more difficult than ever. The difficulty is that whereas the religious approach has been natural ever since the beginnings of the era of emancipation and is self-evident in the Diaspora, it is not so in Israel: 'I am under the impression,' said Dr. Esh, 'that our students have to make quite an effort to grasp fully this fact.'

Of the other papers Mr. Ernest Krausz's 'The Economic and Social structure of Anglo-Jewry' provided both a conspectus of what is known, and a background against which to assess the paper on 'Topics and Methods of Future Research' by Maurice Freedman and Julius Gould. Two others may be regarded as footnotes to them both: Dr. S. J. Prais's examination of the technical statistical problems involved and the paper on 'Oral History' and its potential application by Dr. Esh and Geoffrey Wigoder. Although it is worth having one's attention called to Jewish applications of 'oral history' it was perhaps not worth a whole paper at the Conference when so much important matter was perforce omitted from the programme.[2]

Mr. Krausz is perhaps of most general interest when he talks of trends in occupational distribution; the declining importance of Jews in the 'city' will no doubt come as a surprise to many. Other significant observations are made but their implications not fully brought out. For instance, does the established preference of Jews for self-employment reflect some psychological characteristic, a desire to be freer to observe the Sabbath and perform other religious duties, or does it merely show the effects of discrimination among employers such as has been suggested in connexion with office-workers?[3]

Or again are there any beneficial consequences that can be assumed to follow in family life from the fact that only 11 per cent of Jewish women go out to work as against 34 per cent in the general population? Or is this figure (which relates to a dozen years ago) simply an indication again of the class composition of the Community?

It is very important also, as Professor Gould suggests in his postscript and elsewhere, that the sociologist should not shirk the difficult task of making qualitative as well as quantitative judgements. Educational statistics are all very well, but one wants to know what makes people opt for a particular kind of education or opt out of it; what the pupils actually acquire through education and what their level of achievement

may be. Having been told that Jewish university students are this and this proportion of the national total, one wants to know if their performance shows any particular curve of distribution, how they compare with their fellows in both study and extra-curricular activities, what benefits the Jewish community itself, and the wider society, derive from the prolongation of their exposure to the educational process and so forth.

Or again, what proportion of Jewish 'intellectuals'—the kind of people of whom the cant saying goes 'it makes one proud to be a Jew'—are in fact active members of the Jewish community in the religious sense or any other?

Clearly also, and on a much larger issue, the Community's values include survival. Are the motives for this exclusively religious, or do people believe that there are other specifically 'Jewish values' which the Community's existence helps to preserve? Does the Community believe them superior to the values held in the general environment, and if so in what respects? Here again one must be aware of the context of such questions and certain of one's ground. An anthropologist, Miss Strizower, who touched upon this ground remarked: 'while among coloured people "passing" is permissible (and those too dark to attempt it will nevertheless assist their more fair-skinned kinsfolk where possible) we tend to regard the "passing" Jew as a social renegade'. One wonders whether this comparison does not refer to an earlier phase in the history of the American negro? Does 'passing' not now incur the same odium though not on religious grounds as 'assimilation' has always incurred within the Jewish community? If so, some interesting conclusions might follow as to the likelihood of a Jewish Community being kept alive in the Diaspora except on the basis of religion; religion to the Jew being then equated with colour in the case of the Negro—the mark of difference. But again what relevance has Soviet experience here?

Obviously such inquiries can never be meaningful on a purely local basis, and Professor Gould and Dr. Freedman were abundantly right to warn their audience against the danger of excessive parochialism in the pursuit of greater knowledge of British Jewry. Sociology is of its nature a comparative study. The question is: 'What do we compare?'

One line of argument is that of Professor S. M. Lipset in the paper he gave to the Third World Congress of Jewish studies in 1961.[4] It would mean the study of Jewish communities in relation to the particular society in which they find themselves. In the case of Britain it would involve asking not the question 'how Jewish is Anglo-Jewry?' but the question 'how "Anglo" is Anglo-Jewry?' The difficulty is that British society has so far been subjected to less sociological analysis than the American society from which Professor Lipset draws his principal illustrations. Another route would be that of comparing the different Jewries of the Diaspora—the idea that seems to lie behind some of the

thinking of the Israeli Institute. But then one must ask what there is that can be measured. Dr. Roth points to the new importance of the Anglo-Jewish community, the second (or now more probably third) largest in the non-Communist world. Is it well-equipped to discharge its responsibilities to Jewry as a whole in material support or spiritual and intellectual sustenance? One's optimism on the last point is somewhat increased by the achievements of this Congress; but as Professor Gould would be the first to admit, there is a long way to go before we can be satisfied with the self-knowledge which the Greeks held was the beginning of all knowledge.

NOTES

[1] But he should not refer to O.R.T. as a 'relief' organization. It is indeed the opposite; since it has worked from its beginning on the assumption that what Jews living in conditions of discrimination required is not 'relief' but the technical training that would make them fully self-supporting.

[2] It is no longer true as the authors state that there is no oral history project in Britain; there is a modest equivalent of the Columbia University enterprise at Nuffield College, Oxford.

[3] 'Situation Vacant', by Geoffrey Moorhouse, *The Guardian*, 29 August 1964.

[4] S. M. Lipset, 'The Study of Jewish Communities in a Comparative Context', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. V, No. 2, 1963.

SHORTER NOTICES

JAMES PARKES, *Antisemitism*, xiii + 192 pp., Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., London, 1963, 22*s*. 6*d*.

There are two reasons for writing of James Parkes's *Antisemitism* from a personal angle. It is ungracious, without apology, to criticize for minor faults a book to which one gives warm emotional assent and which contains so much valuable material; it is flattering, to one who is neither a Jew nor a sociologist, to be asked to comment on such a subject in this journal.

Having made my apology and registered my gratification, let me deal first with minor irritations. This book is a revised version of the author's Penguin Special, *An Enemy of the People: Antisemitism*, of 1945, and there is some contrast between more rapidly written later passages and what I take to be earlier remnants. Such a sentence as: 'Arabs are not to that extent so unrealistic that they cannot accept that the past cannot be unwritten' (p. 140) ought surely, after the first draft, to have been pruned of redundancies. And the quickly running pen may cause a weakness in analysis; Dr. Parkes writes (on p. 5) that there are 'two elements which are essential to any exploitation of a scapegoat'—the psychological needs of the majority group, and 'the manner in which the particular victim becomes the target of these needs'. But unless this last phrase is interpreted very widely, there are three ingredients; the whole tenor of his book illustrates his awareness that the psychological needs of the majority in themselves seldom produce exploitation on a massive scale; nor do the circumstances of the victim; this occurs only when there are also social, economic or political purposes of the majority to be served. Again, Dr. Parkes is so reluctant to voice the

shortcomings attributed in popular mythology to the Jewish stereotype that sometimes (notably pp. 84–5) it is not easy to gather his meaning, which is (I think) that there are some Jews to whom some of these shortcomings can truly be attributed and that, in view of the strains on the community, it is surprising there are not more. Sometimes, too, he falls backwards into traps he sees clearly enough when they lie before the feet of his enemies. It is legitimate to say that Judaism is an optimistic religion (p. 127) but not, surely, to say: 'Jews are by nature optimists, more concerned with the future than the past.' One might argue that it is their concern with the past that makes them an identifiable group, but apart from that, Jews are people, some of them optimists and some pessimists. This indeed is the essence of Dr. Parkes's own teaching. One might just as well say that bicyclists are optimists—or any other group who take part in the dangerous business of living. Finally—and this is my last grumble—Dr. Parkes is so vigorous an anti-antisemite that he becomes a little inclined to seek an antisemite under every bed. That the outbreak of swastika-daubing in 1959 was followed by similar episodes all over the world, *may*, as he suggests, have been due to some central source, but to me seems far more likely to be hysterical imitation.

My grumbles are mostly at form of expression; only the last concerns emphasis. Once these are done with, I can dwell with pleasure on the value of a book which includes in one cover a short and readily intelligible account of the mechanism of prejudice against a minority, of the political use made by Bismarck, by the Tsarist bureaucracy, by Stalin and others of the psychological predisposition they found ready-made. There are also wise discussions of the basis for Arab hostility and of ways of sterilizing prejudice—not, alas, of eliminating it, as Dr. Parkes once hoped. The whole book forms an admirable reminder of the dangers to which freedom and democracy are desperately vulnerable, particularly at the moment of writing.

Can one ask for more? Not perhaps from this book within its self-imposed limits. But there are many questions still to be answered. The Parsees are an identifiable group with a separate religion who, like the Jews, are urban, progressive and commercial; psychologically and socially they would seem likely to attract a similar animosity; why have they not? If the answer is that they have not been held guilty of the Crucifixion, the question shifts. The men of the Middle Ages persecuted ostensibly because they believed, perhaps the more ruthlessly because they knew they did not live up to their beliefs. That is intelligible. But the bitterest persecutions of modern times have been from Communists and Nazis, who rejected Christianity. Did their leaders, as Dr. Parkes thinks, imbibe when young prejudice with a religious background and use it for political purposes because it suited them to find a scapegoat? This seems probable so far as it goes, but if the real enemy was, in Russia, religion and a fixed ethical standard, why has not the attack on the Orthodox Church been pushed home as vigorously as on the Jews? Dr. Parkes suggests that the mechanism is similar to that by which the progressives and democracy were attacked by attacking the Jews in Germany, but the analogy does not entirely hold; no one can identify the Orthodox Church with Jewishness, nor is it too strong to be attacked directly. Perhaps there lingers a shred of superstitious doubt—a grand perhaps!—that there may be a God after all and therefore it is safer to vent anti-religious hate on the chosen who were rejected? It is more convincing to believe that the key is less the survival of religion than a separate allegiance. In this respect the Orthodox Church is to the Communist less suspect than the Roman Catholic or than the Jews, particularly since the sovereignty of Israel was established. The Parsees have no outside allegiance and this may be one reason for their immunity; another may be that cow-killing Muslims are more offensive to the Hindu majority than Parsees; there is a more obvious channel for hatred. This leads to the Negro in the United States; as he becomes a rival to the majority, does antisemitic feeling grow less intense? How far can one carry Dr. Marie Jahoda's point that to some Americans the Negro is the personified *Id* and the Jew the personified *Super-Ego*? And if this is a real part of antisemitism, is it affected by the general disrepute of authority in the Anglo-American culture? Are the rudderless less intolerant than their fathers of a figure embodying the success and hard work they despise? Or is envy the greater because they only pretend to despise?

These are questions beyond the range that Dr. Parkes has set himself. But it is to be hoped that one day he will write a wider book that will deal with them.

PHILIP MASON

MICHAEL BANTON, *The Policeman in the Community*, xiv + 276 pp., Tavistock Publications, London, 1964, 30*s*.

Countless films, stories, and novels, have made the policeman an almost mythical figure. On the one hand, he is frequently portrayed as an heroic or dedicated figure, unlike other human beings, without fault. On the other, he is often pictured as a very nearly dissolute sadist preying upon the unfortunate poor. To my knowledge, no major sociological or anthropological account of the police as an occupational group has hitherto been published to counteract the nonsense. With the appearance of Dr. Banton's study, however, a first-rate contribution has finally appeared.

Dr. Banton's book is mainly about police patrolmen—those uniformed policemen who attempt to maintain public order within the community. Thus Dr. Banton distinguishes two police roles: one is that of law officer whose contacts with the public tend to be of a punitive or inquisitory character. The 'law officer' is typically what in America we would think of as a detective and what the English would regard as an inspector. The other is the role of 'peace officer'—in America 'the cop on the beat', in England the constable. The law officer's main job is speaking to offenders or investigating crimes; by contrast, the peace officer's role may have relatively little to do with the business of crime and many more of his contacts with citizens may centre on assistance rather than the apprehension or conviction of offenders. There is a book to be written about the law officer and Dr. Banton has not attempted to write it. Instead, he has chosen to conduct a first-rate inquiry into the occupational role of the peace officer.

The book is the result of five separate studies in Scotland and the United States—an especially apt comparison since other observers have noted the relative similarity between the two countries. The main object of enquiry is the urban Scottish constable studied in different phases during parts of 1960 and 1961. Dr. Banton also studied police in several Scottish villages. In 1962 he concentrated on studying one urban Massachusetts police department and two urban southern American police departments. In addition, he briefly visited several other police departments.

The book has two main themes. One of these has to do with the nature of the peace officer's role. Dr. Banton contends that the peace officer spends the bulk of his time in non-law-enforcement activities. Much of the book is an elaboration of this theme. Thus, Chapters 2 and 3 are detailed ethnographic accounts of patrol work in one Scottish and some American cities. In addition to this sort of detailed ethnography, Dr. Banton also makes a number of incisive observations on the work of the policeman in the community. As an American observer, I found most intriguing the problem faced by Scottish police as a result of the more highly stratified class system of the British Isles. For instance, the policeman is on the one hand an authority, but on the other he is also a man with a community social status. Consequently, when the Scottish policeman, who in terms of the general society occupies a lower middle class position, is faced with the issue of handing out a parking ticket to an upper class offender, he must, in contrast to the American officer, observe fairly explicit rules of deference and demeanour. Thus, 'Scottish officers have told me that at times, when speaking to high-status motorists who have committed some offence, they have put their hand on the door or rested their notebook on some part of the vehicle and the motorist has promptly snapped, "Take your hand off my car". The policeman has had to obey; he has not risked making any reply but has confined himself to eliciting the information he is legally bound to obtain. Impersonal behaviour on the policeman's part prevents the motorist from bringing other roles into play' (p. 183).

Dr. Banton's main theoretical theme is an attempt to explain the differences between Scottish and American police in carrying out their peace officer roles. Scottish police are portrayed as reserved, dignified, impersonal, detached, and socially isolated from the communities which they serve. By contrast, American police are portrayed as friendly, casual, breezy, more impulsive, more human and approachable. Dr. Banton explains the difference in police demeanour as stemming from differences in social density and heterogeneity between Scotland and the United States. By 'social density' he means to indicate the range of social choice afforded to people. Thus, in a small village community, one finds high social density in that the same

two individuals may have to interact with each other in a greater variety of roles than in the city.

Consequently, Dr. Banton holds, in 'socially dense' cultures it is necessary to develop a highly elaborated etiquette in order to manage cross-cutting social relationships. 'The etiquette which enables Europeans to manage relations with persons while holding them at a distance is relatively little developed in the United States, and in that culture seems something cold and artificial' (p. 227). Thus, the Scottish policeman can deal with people knowing that they will interpret his actions as being associated with the role of policeman. By contrast, Dr. Banton points out that the police officer in America has a more difficult task since the boundaries of his injunctions are not as clear as they would be in a region of greater social stability.

In my opinion, Dr. Banton's ethnography is well drawn and well documented and some of his specific insights are superb. But I am not persuaded by his theoretical explanation of the difference between Scottish and American police demeanour. Dr. Banton has implicitly constructed an ordinal scale of social density. Where it is highest, as in the Scottish village, the policeman is most reserved; where it is lowest, as in the American city, the policeman is least reserved. However, Dr. Banton has omitted a key control group, the American village policemen. The theoretical explanation would predict that the American village policeman would be more aloof and unapproachable than his American city counterpart. I doubt, however, whether this situation would in fact be found. My observations suggest just the opposite. In the American small town—with its high 'social density'—the policeman is less reserved and even more approachable than in the city.

Consequently the theoretical issue is broader than Dr. Banton states it: it is not whether there is a situation of high or low social density which explains the policeman's demeanour; rather, one must isolate the conditions under which high social density results in aloofness or in approachability. If I may take the liberty of speculating, I would suggest that the answer may lie in the difference in historical formation of the American and Scottish village. The contemporary Scottish village is rooted in a social structure which implies a system of stratification unlike any which might be found in the United States. In the latter, the village or small town is basically a frontier formation. It is made up of socially similar people who often banded together to settle what may have formerly been wilderness.

In such a situation, we find two fundamental differences from the Scottish village. First, the range of status differences is far less since there is a history of equality. Second, with this history, there is a greater degree of upward or downward social mobility. In such conditions, the practice of etiquette appears presumptuous since the subordinate or the subordinate's son may rise to the position of superordinate within a relatively short period of time.

Dr. Banton's book can be read with much profit, however, simply as an excellent description of the work of the peace officer. Indeed, most of the book is of this order and when the author writes in this vein he is at his strongest.

I have reviewed this book as a contribution to the field of occupational sociology, which is what it sets out to be and achieves. But since I am writing for *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* I also feel an obligation to point out some implications for the special interests of readers of this publication. These are not contained in the book itself, and to be fair to its author I must acknowledge full responsibility for the speculations that follow.

One of the recurrent themes of sociological studies of occupations is the effect a man's occupation has on his outlook on the world. Does one tend to perceive things differently as a doctor, a janitor, a lawyer, or a worker on the assembly line? Dr. Banton, for example, talks about the notion of the 'police mind' and the theme of policemen as 'a race apart'. Seen in this perspective, a man's occupation may be conceived of as being, at least from a theoretical viewpoint, similar to such encompassing social characteristics as race or religion. All of these, it seems to me, could be contained within a broader category of sociology that might be termed the sociology of identity. This would suggest a more social-psychological emphasis in which to understand the cognitive aspects of encompassing identities. It would also suggest to the sociologist of Jewry that Jewishness be seen not so much as an ethnic characteristic as a factor affecting the identity of those so labelled.

Another interesting issue is the broader question of the relation between occupation and ethnicity. Are, for instance, certain occupations most inviting to members of various ethnic groups? Thus, a book on the police as an occupation raises the issue of the distribution of Jews in police forces relative to the proportion of Jews in the population. I would suggest that the number of Jewish policemen rises in relation to the degree that a specifically Jewish identity wanes. There are any number of reasons for this, some of them being purely practical—it is extremely difficult for Jews to be policemen and at the same time to observe religious ritual in an orthodox fashion.

But it is also unlikely that many Jews of non-orthodox persuasion are to be found in police forces. There are of course several reasons. One has to do with the integration of the Jew into the political society—the less the Jew perceives himself as being really a part of the political order, the less likely is he himself to desire to become a policeman. In addition, there is the factor of prejudice and exclusion of Jews from police ranks. But in many areas of the United States such exclusionary policies are no longer in force. Under conditions of acceptance, Jews still do not become policemen to any degree, although I believe that the situation is changing.

Perhaps the most significant reason for Jewish withdrawal from police activity is a broad one—a lack of convergence between European (Ashkenazi) Jewish values and the requirements of police culture. Generally speaking, the police are a para-military organization and require the qualities stated by Dr. Banton—of reserve, aloofness, commitment away from the family, toughness, and readiness to be exposed to violence. These demands would seem to put off most Jews from perceiving the police as a desirable occupation to follow. Indeed, given the comparative contrast presented by Dr. Banton, one could additionally suggest, as an hypothesis, that the occupation would appear least attractive where para-military police qualities are emphasized, as in the British Isles, than where the policeman has greater freedom to inject his own personality into the role, as in America.

These speculations, to be sure, are no more than mere conjecture, but I hope they may be of some interest as an indication of more general theoretical formulations which the sociology of occupations would suggest to those concerned to understand the role of the Jew in society.

JEROME H. SKOLNICK

THOMAS W. PERRY, *Public Opinion, Propaganda and Politics in Eighteenth-Century England, A Study of the Jew Bill of 1753*, x + 215 pp., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962, 46*s*.

This is an excellent and little known study of what is normally quoted as the most extreme manifestation of antisemitism in modern British history. The 'Jew Bill' of 1753 repealed the religious stipulations that had hitherto prevented aliens of Jewish origin from taking out British citizenship. It was a favour conferred by the Whig Ministry of Lord Pelham upon the wealthy Jews of London in return for their loyalty during the Jacobite troubles of 1745–6 and their 'frequent and valuable co-operation' in matters of official finance. The act was seized upon by the Ministerial opponents and made the occasion of a nation-wide clamour only at a very late stage in its parliamentary progress, and it in fact became law. The clamour however grew. The Pelham Ministry panicked and repealed the Act six months later.

The author examines the political scene in the mid-eighteenth century, the detailed events of 1753–4 and the pamphlet propaganda on both sides in fascinating detail. He concludes that the fate of the Bill was not so much due to an outburst of anti-semitism as of xenophobia in general, as to the way in which the Act touched the foundations of the differences between Whig and Tory, the relations between Established Church and State. Antisemitic sentiments of the most unpleasant kind were uttered, but they were used not to incite to antisemitic violence but to anti-Whig purposes, and the violence of the language used is characteristic of all eighteenth-century political propaganda. The fate of the Bill had in fact no effect on Britain's Jewry and proved no hindrance to the continuance of Jewish immigration into England. A fascinating book.

D. C. WATT

MOSHE DAVIS, *The Emergence of Conservative Judaism*, xiv + 527 pp., Jewish Publication Society of America, 1963, $5.50.

It is a very good thing that American Jewish scholars are developing a serious interest in the history and institutions of American Jewry. For the contribution of the American community to a study of Jewish history and of the Jewish community to a study of American history are both of absorbing interest, and both in their own way unique. There is no immigrant community in America which witnesses so complete a transformation of its situation and relationships as the Jewish; and there is no modern Jewish community which has had so seriously to grapple with the political and religious consequences of the contemporary scene as the American.

In the centre of this unique picture is American Conservative Judaism. Unlike the Union of American Hebrew Congregations which has its roots in German Jewish liberalism of the early nineteenth century, or American orthodoxy and super-orthodoxy, which has refused to make any adjustments to the contemporary scene —consciously at any rate—American Conservative Judaism is an entirely American product of the adjustment of a most ancient tradition to a most modern environment.

It is therefore natural that it starts with the diverse adjustments created by outstanding personalities or compelled by outstanding compulsions. It seeks to impose a pattern, it seeks to coalesce with other American Jewish patterns; it is driven to unity by the unusual power of protest at injustice imposed on Jews elsewhere which American democracy offers. Then gradually it finds its own role, emerges as a clearly defined movement of its own. The volume of Moshe Davis, in which the first part of the story is admirably and vividly described, carries the narrative down to 1902. That is the year after Dr. Solomon Schechter arrived in New York from Cambridge, bringing the *Jewish Quarterly Review* with him, and initiating a new and fruitful period in the life of American Conservatism by injecting new life into the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York. I hope that Professor Davis is well on his way with the second volume, which should be of still more absorbing interest. For the adjustment of an ancient tradition to contemporary life must either become a new and brittle orthodoxy or must be continually changing, at any rate the pattern of the waves which it makes on the surface. Sometimes also it has to take courage to re-examine the depths. Reconstructionism was one such re-examination. But the problem of Conservatism is that each generation will demand its own conservation, and so its own re-examination. More than any other form of Judaism it can never stand still.

My main criticism is of the Index. A book so packed with materials demands a full index. That indeed it has; but many entries have over a hundred undifferentiated references. At that point they cease to be useful guides to the author's material and treatment.

JAMES PARKES

Z. A. B. ZEMAN, *Nazi Propaganda*, xiii + 226 pp., Oxford University Press in association with the Wiener Library, London, 1964, 35*s*.

This is a detailed and very well documented survey, beginning with the first serious Nazi campaign in April 1926 and ending with the last meeting of Propaganda Ministry officials in April 1945. Much of what it presents is, of course, not new. However, this is the first time that all the relevant material has been made available together—and in English. Mr. Zeman has thus done a great service to those of us who continue to be interested in certain elementary questions which, despite all that has been written, have yet to receive an adequate answer. Exactly how did the Nazis manage to turn the discontents of the Weimar period to their own advantage and reduce to impotence the German Left with its mass support and its splendid organization? And how did their regime preserve an extraordinary measure of stability almost to the eve of its final collapse? For part of the answer certainly lies in the actual technique of propaganda which the Nazis learned from the Communists, but which they managed to adapt most successfully to the needs of an ideology which lacked the immediate mass appeal or the inner consistency of Marxism. The Nazi contribution to the history of propaganda is illuminatingly analysed, and Mr. Zeman

does well to stress their knack of making a virtue of the very stupidities and contradictions in their programme.

Of course, part of the answer lies in the historical circumstances and here, despite the objection that there are already many, perhaps too many, books on this subject, Mr. Zeman could have given us rather more background to provide points of reference for his own argument. The Versailles Treaty—a cardinal German grievance after all—receives but cursory treatment in this sense. We should like to have been told, from the same excellent factual approach which Mr. Zeman uses for his main theme, precisely what its effect on German public opinion was in the late twenties. And what sort of reactions were there to Hitler's demands for *Lebensraum* in the thirties?

A more serious criticism is that comparatively little attention is paid to Nazi antisemitism. True, we have a chapter entitled 'Constant Themes: Jews and Communists', but out of its 27 pages the Jews get 6. And, apart from the remark that one reason why antisemitism formed part of Nazi propaganda was that Hitler genuinely hated the Jews, we are given the general impression that antisemitism was essentially nothing but one of the many means by which the Nazis sought to ingratiate themselves with the German masses. Yet Mr. Zeman must know well that, for example, both Goebbels in his fundamental book *Der National-Sozialismus, Fragen und Antworten*, and Feder ('the Party ideologist' as Mr. Zeman rightly calls him) stress over and over again how antisemitism and Nazism are almost one and the same thing. He must know that it formed an integral part of the original party programme long before a national propaganda campaign had been launched or thought of—not to speak of Hitler's famous declaration that the fight against the Jews was, for him, the work of the Lord. And then there is the test of events, surely not an illegitimate form of hindsight to determine the just proportions of a historical survey. We know now that the attempts at the 'Final Solution' were the only serious attempts made by the Nazis to fulfil the 'social promises' made in their propaganda. Antisemitism gradually achieved the highest priority: the transports to the death camps often took precedence over troop movements and the provision of vital military supplies. Surely facts like these are significant enough. Mr. Zeman himself points out the failure of Nazi antisemitic propaganda in Britain. He could with advantage have stressed how the Nazis continued with it, despite the risk of damage to their 'image' as a whole. The antisemitic obsession was, indeed, the stumbling block, and it is a pity that a book of this quality says so little about it.

ANDREW SHARF

SIEGFRIED HESSING, ed., *Spinoza Festschrift 1632–1932*, pp. 205, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, second edition, 1962.

None of the twenty contributors is a professional philosopher. That is a fact which need not be deplored. It shows how Spinoza fascinated numerous men and women who found something specially appealing in 'Spinozism'. No less a man than Goethe was, or thought he was, a 'Spinozist'. Among the contributors to this Festschrift, first published in Czernowitz in 1932, are some splendid names: David ben Gurion, Romain Rolland, Arnold Zweig, and Simon Dubnow. Statements by Einstein, Sigmund Freud, and Jakob Wassermann are added to the articles. They all attempt to show that Spinoza was a great Jew and should be considered not as a Jewish heretic but as belonging to the fold of Jews believing in the God of the prophets and the classical rabbis. In this attempt the contributors naturally fail. But that does not diminish their success in showing the great genius of Spinoza, whose work was deeply rooted in Jewish tradition. The Cartesian philosophy which shaped the modern scientist received through Spinoza's interpretation a warm humanity and for a long time prevented the break-up of European tradition into the 'two cultures'. This break-up has happened now, and in this crisis Spinoza is not the saviour the editor and the contributors to the Festschrift make him appear to be.

All the articles make good reading, except perhaps for Carl Gebhardt's 'Der gotische Jude' (The Gothic Jew) which distinguishes the Sephardic 'race' of Spinoza from the 'race' of the 'Slavic Jews' and gives the former greater value.

IGNAZ MAYBAUM

MORRIS JANOWITZ, *The Military in the Political Development of New Nations, An Essay in Comparative Analysis*, vii + 134 pp., University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1964, $4.50 or 33*s*. 6*d*.

The establishment of new states and recrystallization of old societies accompanied by radical upheavals have recently made social scientists aware of the phenomena of 'political modernization' and 'nation-building'. One of the topics most neglected in the study of these phenomena has been the role of military and para-military organizations in the consolidation of 'old societies and new nations'.

Professor Janowitz's book may certainly be considered one of the major contributions in this field of study, primarily on account of its wide scope and the comparative nature of its analysis. The aim of the book is to explore and sketch a variety of types of civil-military relations in new nations and to formulate a number of hypotheses about the political capacity of the military to rule and to modernize. Two basic questions raised by the author constitute the object of the study: first, 'what characteristics of the military establishment of a new nation facilitate its involvement in domestic politics'; second, 'what are the capacities of the military to supply effective political leadership to a new nation striving for rapid economic development and social modernization?' (p. 1). The difficulties with which the military as a ruling group is confronted are attributed mainly to its internal organization, which includes several dimensions, such as the skill structure and career lines, social recruitment and education, professional and political ideology, and cohesion and cleavage in the military elite. Professor Janowitz tries in a very convincing way to prove that the natural history and the origins of the military (i.e. ex-colonial, national liberation, post-colonial, and non-colonial armies) or the length of time that has elapsed since the attainment of independence and the level of demographic and economic development 'supply at best a limited point of entrance for understanding differences in the political role of the military in the new nation' (p. 23). The paradoxical phenomenon, according to Professor Janowitz, is that although the organizational format designed to carry out military functions is at the root of the ability of these armies to intervene politically, it is also the source of their inability to become an ideal agent of modernization. The main reason for this is the ineffectiveness of the military oligarchy in developing an apparatus of mass political support and adjusting itself to the principles and mechanisms of political communication and manipulation.

There is no doubt that the organizational features of the military do indeed present a crucial variable in the analysis of the capacity of the military to supply effective political leadership for new nations, and Professor Janowitz should receive due credit for illuminating this aspect. But by placing the main emphasis on this aspect, the author unfortunately deals rather vaguely with the characteristics of the social culture and the stratification system in which the various civil-military relations are formed. This apparently is the reason why the author does not make use of the models of civil-military relations which he presents in the first chapter and in the appendix. The reader becomes a little confused about the advantages and disadvantages of the various models, since their relation with the empirical data presented in the other chapters is neither very clear nor well integrated. The main difficulty with these models lies in the fact that they deal with civil-military relations mainly in terms of the degree of mutual interdependence between the military elite and the political elite, thus neglecting a typology based on multiple role analysis of the military in various institutional spheres of the society.

One can find in the book several inaccuracies which are perhaps unavoidable owing to the fact that it is a comparative study which refers to dozens of countries, but certain corrections in later editions are nevertheless essential. For example the dates of the independence of India and Pakistan, Iraq, and Sierra Leone are not 1950, 1954, and 1941, but 1947, 1932, and 1961, respectively.

M. LISSAK

R. KÖNIG AND J. WINCKELMANN, eds., *Max Weber zum Gedächtnis*, 488 pp., *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Sonderheft 7, Westdeutscher Verlag, Köln und Opladen, 1963, D.M. 29.50.

To commemorate the centenary of Weber's birth Professors König and Winckelmann have collected 32 reminiscences and obituary notices of Weber by, among others, L. von Wiese, H. Plessner, L. Brentano, E. Troeltsch, T. Heuss, J. Schumpeter, H. Kantorowicz, H. Rickert, and F. Meinecke. Nearly all were first published over thirty years ago, and, as each author proclaims Weber a master in the analysis of ancient society, bureaucracy, comparative religion, or methodology, the reader is readily convinced that his reputation is no recent invention and is inclined to accept Meinecke's assessment of him as the only scholar of his generation who can without reservation be termed a genius. But perhaps more intriguing to the modern reader is the constantly recurring theme of regret for the political leader Germany never had. Evidently Weber dominated lecture audiences and informal gatherings, but it is hard to resist the conclusion that to have seen a national leader in a man whose small experience of active politics betrayed only indecision exhibits just that political immaturity among Germans of which Weber so often complained. In spite of Professor König's emphasis on Heuss's admiration for Weber, the style of the Swabian Bundespräsident had little in common with plebiscitary charismatic leadership, and, on the evidence of this collection, it was this notion which inspired Weber's contemporaries in their evaluation of him and his work, rather than any concern he may have had for democracy. Even the respect due on the occasion of a centenary cannot make of Weber a political prophet for the Bundesrepublik.

The centrepiece of the volume is a 110 pages long, hitherto unpublished, memoir, 'Max Weber in Heidelberg' by the late Paul Honigsheim, whose recollections of university life in Heidelberg and account of Weber's views on contemporary philosophers, historians, economists, sociologists, and theologians make a vivid and engrossing biographical source and an essential supplement to the uxorial devotion of Marianne Weber's biography.

The editors justify the final 200 pages of essays by various authors by arguing that Weber's achievement has become an anonymous component of scientific knowledge. If this is so, greater service might have been rendered to science if the scholarly 'Protestantismus and Kulturwandel in Brazilien und Chile' by E. Willems and 'Religionssoziologische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Japans' by Y. Yawata had been published in appropriate journals instead of in a volume dedicated to Weber. In addition, translations of sections from R. Bendix's *Max Weber, An Intellectual Portrait* and B. Nelson's *The Idea of Usury* and an account by D. Martindale of Weber's contribution to the theory of civilization, which unaccountably failed to find a place in his recent text-book, give rise to the suspicion that the editors felt that only a book of Weberian dimensions was suitable homage to the great man. However, the editors' judgment is redeemed by the inclusion of three valuable critical essays, 'Max Webers Beitrag zum besseren Verständnis der ostkirchlichen und "ausserweltlichen" Askese' by D. Savramis, 'Max Webers musikalischer Exkurs' by A. Silbermann, and 'Max Webers Rechtssoziologie: Eine Bestandsaufnahme' by M. Rehbinder.

M. C. ALBROW

CHAIM BERMANT, *Jericho Sleep Alone*, 218 pp., Chapman and Hall, London, 1964, 18*s*.

Should a sociological journal review a novel? Certainly the thing has been done, but not usually for such a novel as Mr. Bermant's gentle *Entwicklungsroman*. This—and I am on the whole inclined to thank God—is *not* a sociological novel in the sense that a work of wooden fiction is justified by its description of a specific social problem or problem area; it is however a novel which can be read with pleasure and some interest by sociologists. It is unobtrusively but firmly rooted in Glasgow—a city socially more interesting and odd than is usually believed—and in the Jewish community of the city's south side. It is probably true that this is the least documented major section of the Jewish population in Britain.

To describe the novel justly is not easy, though there is a certain analogy in European literature with Gottfried Keller's *Der grüne Heinrich*—that honest story of an unauthentic vocation and provincial Switzerland. Keller's hero got only as far as Munich before returning to the sober reality of his native town; Mr. Bermant's Jericho, with his host of false vocations, gets as far as Israel and Stoke Newington before his return to contemplate Glasgow from the hill on which Mary of Scotland stood to watch her last army broken at Langside.

Jericho is no Rastignac, crying to Paris, *A nous deux maintenant*, for, mildly but firmly, Jericho is an anti-hero, a counter-romantic, one who at last welcomes the innocence, the pieties and the limitations of his origins. But the thing is not so simple as that: the economic sources of his comfort are never revealed, and the innocence to which, innocent, he returns, is made possible by a social fabric of great complexity of which the world of the genteel suburbs of Glasgow is but a tiny part. In a word, there is a strong sense of Glasgow here, but none of Scotland.

It was perhaps a pleonasm to refer to Keller's hero as coming from *provincial* Switzerland. Scotland is often parochial, but seldom provincial and yet provincialism is the effect Mr. Bermant produces with his Jews of all ages re-enacting the hopes and nostalgias (but not the fears) of a dead Eastern Europe. I think he has got this wrong, mistaking half-truth for truth—and I do not think I am involved in either a circular argument or in irony if I say that I never knew a Jewish student at Glasgow University some of whose best friends were not gentiles . . . And he is also a little sentimental, not about that real and amiable Glasgow of libraries and coffee-houses (and dotty politics and art), but about the Jewish family and the abominable, intermittent counter-hero, Jericho Broch's cousin Kadisch.

One could make other criticisms of not much weight—the dialogue is sometimes slack and often too extended, not all the buffooneries succeed, and so on—but this within its very decent ambitions is a good and enjoyable novel. It is also well worth the attention of the student of the sociology of British Jewry or of the culture and inter-relations of the Glasgow middle-classes. It is a very un-English book.

DONALD G. MACRAE

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

Abel-Smith, Brian: *The Hospitals 1800–1948. A Study in Social Administration in England and Wales*, Heinemann, London, 1964, xiii + 514 pp., 50*s*.

Abrams, Charles: *Man's Struggle for Shelter in an Urbanizing World*, The M.I.T. Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., 1964, xi + 307 pp., $7.95 or 60*s*.

Altmann, Alexander (ed.): *Biblical and Other Studies*, Harvard Univ. Press, Mass.; Oxford University Press, London (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis Univ.; Studies and Texts: Volume 1), 1963, viii + 266 pp., $6.00, 48*s*.

Barkai, Haim: The Falk Project for Economic Research in Israel, *Sixth Report 1961–1963*, with an essay on *The Public, Histadrut, and Private Sectors in the Israeli Economy*, Jerusalem, 1964, 130 pp.

Beattie, John: *Other Cultures: Aims, Methods and Achievements in Social Anthropology*, Cohen & West, London, 1964, xii + 283 pp., 32*s*.

Bolacchi, Giulio: *Teoria delle Classi Sociali*, Edizioni Ricerche (Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Economia e Commercio della Università di Cagliari), Rome, second edition, 1963, xi + 257 pp., L.3,000.

Borchsenius, Poul: *Behind the Wall: The Story of the Ghetto*, translated by Reginald Spink. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1964, 217 pp., 30*s*.

Borchsenius, Poul: *The Chains are Broken: The Story of Jewish Emancipation*, Trans. Michael Heron, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1964, 236 pp., 28*s*.

Brotz, Howard, *The Black Jews of Harlem* The Free Press of Glencoe and Collier-Macmillan, New York, 1964, x + 144 pp., $4.50.

Caro Baroja, Julio: *Los Judios en la España Moderna y Contemporanea*, Ediciones Arion, Cuesta de Santo Domingo, 11, Madrid, 1962, 3 volumes, 540, 462, 576 pp., n.p.

Centre National des Hautes Etudes Juives: *Séminaires d'histoire juive contemporaine*, Editions de l'Institut de Sociologie de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles, Collection du Centre National des Hautes Etudes, 107 pp; Brussels, 1964, n.p.

Dunner, Joseph (ed.): *Dictionary of Political Science*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1964, xxii + 585 pp., $10.00.

Goldberg, S. P.: *Jewish Communal Services—Programmes and Finances*, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 9th edn. 1964, 40 pp., n.p.

Goldsmith, S. J.: *Half a Million Jews in the Fog*, based on 14 broadcasts in the BBC Hebrew Services (in Hebrew), 46 pp., from the World Jewish Congress, British Section, 5*s*.

Goode, William J.: *The Family*, Prentice-Hall, Inc. (Foundations of Modern Sociology Series), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964, viii + 120 pp., 12*s*. 6*d*.

Hershlag, Z. Y.: *Introduction to the Modern Economic History of the Middle East*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1964, xiv + 419 pp., 64 guilders.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude: *Le Cru et Le Cuit*, Plon, Paris, 1964, 402 pp., F.43, 20.

Levin, Alexandra Lee: *Vision. A Biography of Harry Friedenwald*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1964, xviii + 469 pp., $5.

Livitian, Nissan: *Consumption Patterns in Israel*, Falk Project for Economic Research in Israel, Jerusalem, April 1964, x + 88 pp., n.p.

Lowi, Theodore J: *At the Pleasure of the Mayor: Patronage and Power in New York City, 1898–1958*, The Free Press of Glencoe; Collier-Macmillan Ltd., London, 1964, xvi + 272 pp., n.p.

Machotka, Otakar: *The Unconscious in Social Relations—An analysis of unconscious processes in personality, society, and culture*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1964, xxiii + 321 pp., $6.00.

Malamud, Bernard: *Idiots First*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London 1964, 190 pp., 18*s*.

Margolis, Isidor: *Jewish Teacher Training Schools in the United States*, National Council for Torah Education, New York, 1964, xvii + 349 pp., $5.

Mundlak, Yair: *An Economic Analysis of Established Family Farms in Israel 1953–1958*, with an appendix by Gershon Kaddar. The Falk project for Economic Research in Israel, Jerusalem, July 1964, xv + 172 pp., IL3.

Mundlak, Yair: *Long-term Projections of Supply and Demand for Agricultural Products in Israel, 1: General View and Summary*, with Projections of Population and Income by Nadav Halevi, Falk Project for Economic Research in Israel, The Faculty of Agriculture, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, May 1964, xv + 224 pp., n.p.

The National Institute for Social Work Training: *Introduction to a Social Worker* (National Institute for Social Work Training Series No. 2), George Allen & Unwin, London, 1964, 105 pp., 15*s*.

Nieuwenhuijze, C. A. D. van (ed.): *Markets and Marketing as Factors of Development in the Mediterranean Basin*, Publications of the Institute of Social Studies, Series Maior, vol. XI, Mouton & Co., The Hague, 1963, 153 pp., 16 Dutch guilders.

Noveck, Simon (ed.): *Contemporary Jewish Thought; a Reader*, Vision Press, London, 1964, xiv + 378 pp., 35*s*.

Noveck, Simon (ed.): *Great Jewish Personalities in Modern Times*, Vision Press, London, 1964, xiii + 366 pp.; 35*s*.

Rabinowicz, H.: *A Guide to Life, Jewish Laws and Customs of Mourning*, Jewish Chronicle Publications, London, 1964, 144 pp., 12*s*. 6*d*.

Roucek, Joseph, S. (ed.): *The Difficult Child*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1964, viii + 292 pp., $7.50.

Runes, Dagobert, D.: *The Disinherited and the Law*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1964, vii + 79 pp., $3.00.

Sharf, Andrew: *The British Press and Jews Under Nazi Rule*, issued under the auspices of The Institute of Race Relations, Oxford University Press, London, 1964, vi + 228 pp., 30*s*.

Siegel, Bernard J. (ed.): *Biennial Review of Anthropology 1963*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California; Oxford University Press, London, 1963, 315 pp., 60*s*.

Societa Rurale: Rivista di sociologia rurale, di economia e politica agraria, edited by Giuseppe Medici, anno 1—N. 1, March 1964, Bologna.

Straus, Raphael: *Die Juden in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Europaische Verlagsanstalt, Frankfurt am Main, 1964, 227 pp., bound: DM20; paper-back: DM12.

Swerdloff, Sol and Rosen, Howard: *The College and Career Plans of Jewish High School Youth*, under the editorship of S. Norman Feingold, B'nai B'rith Vocational Service, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue, North West, Washington, D.C., 1964, 64 pp., $2.00.

Williams, Robin, M. Jr., in collaboration with John P. Dean and Edward H. Suchman: *Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964, xiv + 434 pp., 72*s*.

Younghusband Eileen: *Social Work and Social Change*, George Allen & Unwin, (National Institute. for Social Work Training Series, No. 1.). London, 1964, 166 pp., 21*s*.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

BELOFF, Max, B.Litt., M.A., F.R.Hist.S., Hon. LL.D. (Pittsburgh); Gladstone Professor of Government and Public Administration, University of Oxford; Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford; his most recent books are *New Dimensions in Foreign Policy*, 1961, and *The United States and the Unity of Europe*, 1963.

ESH, Shaul, M.A., Ph.D., Senior Lecturer on Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Chief Editor, *Yad Vashem*; co-editor of *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, 1964; engaged in research on the European Jewish catstrophe.

KEDOURIE, Elie, B.Sc. (Econ.), Reader in Political Studies (with special reference to the Middle East), London School of Economics; Chief Publications: *England and the Middle East, Nationalism*.

LEVER, Henry, M.A., LL.B. (Rand), Lecturer in the Department of Sociology and Social Work, and Senior Research Assistant to the Social Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa; has contributed to the *South*

African Journal of Science and the *Journal for Social Research* (South Africa); is currently engaged in preparing a Doctoral thesis entitled 'A Comparative Study of Social Distance among various groups in the white high school population of Johannesburg'.

NATHAN, Naphtali, dealer in books in Istanbul; has contributed numerous articles to the Turkish press on Jewish writers and on the Warsaw Ghetto rising; currently engaged in the preparation of a book entitled 'Yitzhak Katznelson, Poète et martyre au ghetto de Varsovie'.

PRICE, Charles Archibald, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon), Professorial Fellow (Department of Demography), Australian National University; Publications: *German Settlers in South Australia*, Melbourne, 1945; *Malta and the Maltese*, Melbourne, 1954; *Southern Europeans in Australia*, Melbourne (O.U.P.), 1963; *Jewish Settlers in Australia*, Canberra, 1964; has also published several articles on migration and immigrant groups. Currently engaged in research on displaced persons in Australia and on the White Australia policy.

SANUA, Victor, D., See 'Notes on Contributors', Vol. IV, no. 2. Currently engaged in several studies, including one on the adjustment of Egyptian Jews in New York.

SCHMELZ, Oskar, M.A., Ph.D., Chief, Department of Demography and Social Statistics, Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel; Research Fellow, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Publications: *Jewish Demography and Statistics, Bibliography 1920–1960* (First Draft), 1961; *Criminal Statistics in Israel, 1949–1962*, vol. I, 1962; vol. II in press. Currently engaged in completing two books, one on the Jewish population of Jerusalem and the other a bibliography of Jewish Health Statistics.

VINCENT, Paul, B.Sc. (Econ.), Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow; currently engaged on a large-scale sociological study of Glasgow Jewry.

CHRONICLE

The Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel announced that at the end of August 1964 the country's population had reached two and a half million, of whom, 2,200,000 were Jews. The Government Statistician said that Arab mothers had more than twice as many children as Jewish mothers: the latter had an average of 3·4 births, while the former had an average of 7·8 births. The life expectancy of women is now 73 years, which is among the highest in the world, while that of men is 70·9 years.

In May 1964 the Deputy Prime Minister of Israel was said to have declared that the number of immigrants from English-speaking countries, Holland, and Scandinavia during the first sixteen years of the State was 18,650 or 1·6 per cent of the total immigration. Jewish Agency spokesmen are reported to have said that in 1963, 8,000 persons from Latin America came to settle in Israel, 2,000 from the U.S.A. and 800 from Great Britain.

The Demographic Year Book of the United Nations states that 62 per cent of Israel's population are foreign-born, while about 50 per cent of all Israelis were born in one of the following six countries: Algeria, Iran, Morocco, Poland, Tunisia, and the U.S.S.R.

*

The Third Research Report, 1959–63, of the Department of Sociology of the Eliezer Kaplan School of Economics and Social Sciences, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, summarizes seven study projects completed during the period under review, four still in progress, and twenty-three newly-initiated projects and 'research frameworks'. The fields of research include Rural, Industrial, and Educational Sociology, Sociology of Urban Development Areas, Role Analysis, and Modernization.

*

On 1 January 1964 the Falk Project for Economic Research in Israel changed its name and status to that of the Maurice Falk Institute for Economic Research in Israel, affiliated with the Eliezer Kaplan School of Economics and Social Sciences of The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. The Sixth Report, 1961–3, of the Falk Project reviews five studies completed and published during this period, and ten studies in press or nearing completion; notes on two other study projects are also given. The titles of the published studies are: 'The Labour Force in Israel'; 'Financial Intermediaries in Israel: 1950–54'; 'Direct Export Premiums in Israel: 1952–58'; 'Consumption Patterns in Israel'; and 'Banking Institutions in Israel'.

The Report includes a major essay by Haim Barkai on 'The Public, Histadrut, and Private Sectors in the Israel Economy'; this constitutes the first part of a broader study described in the Report.

*

There is no provision for Israeli Jews to enter into a civil marriage in Israel. Those whose unions the Rabbinate refuses for religious reasons to solemnize sometimes travel abroad for a civil wedding; on their return the Israeli Government recognizes the marriage. There has been criticism of the Rabbinate's 'monopoly' in marriage and divorce, and the League Against Religious Coercion is campaigning actively for legislative reform.

The Rabbinate objects to the marriage of a Cohen with a divorcee. A test case occurred this year, when a Cohen failed to find a rabbi willing to solemnize his marriage with a divorcee. He invited friends to his home and in their presence gave a ring to his bride and pronounced the traditional marriage vow. He then made fruitless attempts to secure the registration of the marriage at the Rabbinate. Eventually the couple approached the Minister of the Interior, who consented to the registration by the office of the Ministry.

*

The Parkes Library has been transferred on a permanent basis to the University of Southampton. The Reverend Dr. James Parkes, an Anglican who has specialized for several decades in the fields of Jewish-Christian relations, antisemitism, and Jewish history, started his library about thirty years ago. It is said to consist of about 4,000 books and 2,000 pamphlets. Dr. Parkes made it a condition of the transfer that the University recognize relations between Jews and non-Jews to be an appropriate subject for graduate study, and that the Library continue to acquire books and periodicals so that the collection might remain a live source of research material.

Another library in England specializing in Jewish matters, the Wiener Library, has announced plans to establish a research institute with resident fellows to study contemporary European history. The Library was founded in Amsterdam in 1934 by a German Jew, Dr. Alfred Wiener; it was transferred to London in 1939. It has about 50,000 volumes and a magnificent collection of newspaper cuttings; it is a primary reference source on Nazism, Fascism, and general problems of racial prejudice.

Dr. Wiener died in England in February 1964.

*

In its annual report, the Jews' Temporary Shelter in London states that during the period 1 November 1962 to 31 December 1963, it provided 11,000 night lodgings. The average length of stay of a resident was about three months; there were 128 new arrivals in the thirteen months under review. Among those given shelter were immigrants from India, Tunisia, Trinidad, and Syria, as well as 'returnees' from Israel and the United States who had left Britain as emigrants and had come back.

*

In 1961 the Spanish authorities in collaboration with the World Sephardi Federation established an Institute of Sephardi Studies in Madrid. In June 1964, with the assistance of the Spanish Higher Council of Scientific Research and of the Institute of Spanish Culture, the Institute organized a Symposium in Madrid to examine the present position of the Sephardim. Jewish and non-Jewish contributors came from ten countries. One of them spoke of Salonica's Sephardi community which before the Second World War numbered 56,000 and is now reduced to 1,300 souls. Jewish settlement in Salonica is said to date from the fourth century B.C.E., while as early as

the fourteenth century C.E. Jews from Spain migrated to the city in appreciable numbers. A French contributor stated that Jews in France now number 500,000 of whom a little over half are 'Mediterranean' Jews (Sephardi and North African).

Papers were read on the history, sociology, folklore, and literature of the Sephardim. Several speakers warned that Ladino is unlikely to survive if energetic measures are not taken to teach the language in schools and in institutions of higher learning. One of the contributors, however, said that the language and traditional customs of the Sephardim flourish to this day in Bosnia.

In March 1964 the Spanish Government issued a decree creating the old Samuel Levi synagogue (El Transito) in Toledo a National Museum of Sephardi culture, and appointed the President of the Jewish Community in Madrid one of the members of the governing body of the Museum. The synagogue was built in 1357 by Samuel Levi, treasurer to King Don Pedro.

At its concluding session the Symposium thanked the Spanish Government for this decree, and for protecting the lives of Jews who sought refuge in Spain during the war. It also passed a resolution urging the setting-up of centres of Sephardi culture in Spanish Institutes throughout the world.

On the following day, a statue of Maimonides was unveiled in his native city of Cordova.

*

According to a census taken by the Moroccan Government in June 1961, 159,806 Jews were returned in the country, nearly half of whom (72,026) were in Casablanca. In August 1964, officials of the Jewish community stated that as a result of emigration the number of Casablanca's Jews had declined to about 40,000 while the total for the whole country was approximately 70,000.

*

During the first eight months of 1964 about 5,000 Jews reached France from Tunisia, and the Paris office of the French Jewish relief organizations, the Fonds Social Juif Unifié, stated that they had received 2,500 requests for immediate assistance.

*

Official statistics published in October 1964 state that 600 Jews were returned in the Principality of Monaco, in a total population of 23,000. It is believed, however, that there are many more Jews in the Principality who do not publicly acknowledge their Jewishness. The majority of Monaco's Jews live in Monte Carlo; the main occupations of the heads of families are as follows: 70 employees; 32 businessmen; 35 retired persons; 12 professional men; and 12 craftsmen. 56 per cent of the community are Sephardim, while Ashkenazim account for the remaining 44 per cent.

The Demographic Year Book of the United Nations states that 69 per cent of Monaco's total population are foreign-born. Monaco thus shares with Israel the distinction that well over half its inhabitants were born elsewhere.

*

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York, in a Report dated April 1964, gives some details of migration services. It states that United Hias Service helped 5,194 Jews to migrate to various countries in 1963; this was only a little more than half the number of migrants the organization had assisted in 1962, when the figure was 9,277.

It is estimated that a total of 7,000 Jews entered the United States as immigrants in 1963; this number includes those who arrived independently, i.e. without assistance from agencies. More than a third (1,918) of all the Jewish migrants sponsored by Hias in 1963 went to the United States. Newcomers show so marked a preference for New York City that 'the financing of the programme of the New York Association for New Americans is considered to be a national responsibility'. The Association is therefore a direct beneficiary of the national United Jewish Appeal, and helped about 3,200 Jews to settle in New York City in 1963.

*

It has been announced that the VIth World Congress of Sociology will be held at Evian, France, 4–11 September 1966. Information can be obtained from the *International Sociological Association*, Postal Box 141, Les Acacias, Geneva 24, Switzerland.

RACE

The Journal of the Institute of Race Relations

36 Jermyn Street, London, SW1

Vol. VI, No. 2, October 1964

CONTENTS

Race and Inter-Group Relations in Sierra Leone Part I — JOHN DAWSON
Migration: Some British and European Comparisons — NADINE PEPPARD
Race and Education in New York — PETER I. ROSE and STANLEY ROTHMAN
Spanish Guinea: An Introduction — RENE PELISSIER
Aspects of Race Relations in Bradford — ERIC BUTTERWORTH
The African Worker in Southern Rhodesia: Black Aspirations in a White Economy 1927–36 — J. R. HOOKER

REVIEW ARTICLES

Two Sets of Values: A review of *Huggins of Rhodesia* — PHILIP MASON
East Africa Without the Whites — RICHARD GRAY
Maori and Pakeha Today — KEITH SINCLAIR
Shorter Reviews
Books received

Subscriptions to:

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Amen House, Warwick Square, London E.C.4.

12s. 6d. each issue; 40s. a year (in U.S.A. and Canada $6.00)