

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME X NO. 2

DECEMBER 1968

CONTENTS

Mixed Marriage in Western Jewry: Historical Background to the Jewish Response	<i>Moshe Davis</i> 177
Two Minorities: The Jews of Poland and the Chinese of the Philippines	<i>D. Stanley Eitzen</i> 221
The Tools of Legitimation—Zionism and the Hebrew Christian Movement	<i>B. Z. Sobel</i> 241
The Emergence of the Public Sector of the Israeli Economy	<i>Abraham Cohen</i> 251
The Influence of Parental Background on Jewish University Students	<i>Vera West</i> 267
Register of Social Research on the Anglo-Jewish Community	<i>Marlena Schmool</i> 281
Shaul Esh—In Memoriam	<i>Yehuda Bauer</i> 287
Book Reviews	289
Chronicle	301
List of Books Received	306
Notes on Contributors	307

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY

on behalf of the World Jewish Congress
by William Heinemann Ltd

Annual Subscription £1.8.0 (U.S. \$4) *post free*
Single copies 15s (\$2.25)

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

EDITOR Morris Ginsberg
MANAGING EDITOR Maurice Freedman
ASSISTANT EDITOR Judith Freedman

ADVISORY BOARD

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

THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS 1968

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

BOOKS REVIEWED

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	
O. J. Bartos	<i>Simple Models of Group Behavior</i>	G. Morton	291
W. A. Belson	<i>The Impact of Television. Methods and Findings in Programme Research</i>	H. T. Himmelweit	293
S. N. Eisenstadt	<i>Israeli Society</i>	G. Friedmann	298
E. Ginzberg	<i>The Middle-Class Negro in the White Man's World</i>	S. Patterson	297
S. Goldstein	<i>A Population Survey of the Greater Springfield Jewish Community</i>	S. J. Prais	294
W. W. Isajiw	<i>Causation and Functionalism in Sociology</i>	J. Gould	289
G. Marcel, E. Levinas, and A. Lacocque	<i>Martin Buber, l'homme et le Philosophe</i>	R. G. Smith	290

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Papers submitted to *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* should be addressed to the Managing Editor at 55, New Cavendish Street, London, W.1. The papers must be original and should not have been published previously. When a paper has been accepted for publication, the author may not publish it elsewhere without the written consent of the Editor of the *J.J.S.*

MSS. should be typewritten on one side only and double-spaced with ample margins. Pages, including those containing illustrations, diagrams, or tables, should be numbered consecutively. All quotations should be within single inverted commas; quotation marks within quotations should be double inverted commas.

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

Bibliographical Details:

(a) *Books*

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

(b) *Articles*

Titles of articles should be within single inverted commas.

The title of the book or journal in which the article appears must be underlined.

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

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

OFFPRINTS. Each contributor receives thirty free offprints of his article.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE JEWISH RESPONSE

Moshe Davis

JEWISH group assimilation and identity can be conceived as correlated. In different generations, their indices tended to shift, depending in large measure on the nature and impact of the surrounding culture. The contemporary phenomenon of mixed marriage has become a crucial index of Jewish collective assimilation and self-identification. Formerly a 'taboo' item on the agenda of Jewish communal life, the problem of mixed marriage is now engaging the serious attention of Jewish communities throughout the world, stimulating concerted reaction.

The object of this study concerns one people and its tradition. But the significance of mixed marriage extends beyond any single group. The problem contains important implications for the validity and acceptance of religious distinctiveness in any society. Religions are generally facing the pressures of a secularist revolution and more particularly the psycho-sociological forces of cultural and spiritual amalgamation. In the past, the marital decision represented a fairly reliable indicator of one's commitment to, or disaffiliation from, group, community, or tradition. In our times, primarily because of the weakened religious factor in the open societies, the category of withdrawal without conversion has come to the fore, running the entire gamut from passivity through neutralism, indifference, anomie, to gradual separation and, ultimately, disavowal either for oneself or one's children. In consequence, a new type of bi-religious family is being introduced into the larger religious family circle.

I am preparing an exploratory study of Jewish corporate reaction to the contemporary challenge of mixed marriage in the western world. Before probing the nature of the Jewish response to mixed marriage in those western countries where the greatest number of Jews reside and where the problem is now becoming increasingly acute, we need both to understand the basic difference between intermarriage and mixed marriage, and to trace their evolution in those countries. In

the past, as we shall see, virtually all aspects of outmarriage were conceptually conflated. In our times, although the phenomena are running separate courses, the derivative results remain common to both. In the section of the study presented here, I shall attempt to interpret the post-Emancipation communal reaction to intermarriage and mixed marriage in historical comparative context. The second part will deal with the contemporary manifestations.

In the increasing scientific and popular literature on the subject of outmarriage, the terms *intermarriage* and *mixed marriage* have generally been used interchangeably. For the purpose of this study the term *outmarriage* applies both to intermarriage and mixed marriage. But it is essential to emphasize the difference between the two. *Mixed marriage* means marriage between a Jew and a non-Jew in which neither partner renounces his religious faith. Both partners continue in their respective faiths and do not regard their religious differences as a basic obstacle to the totality of their marital aspirations. In this it differs from *intermarriage*, where one of the partners adopts the faith of the other before marriage in the attempt to achieve a religious unity in the family.

Although these definitions are now more prevalent in the literature, they have not as yet become crystallized.¹ It is worth noting that the linguistic confusion does not prevail in all cultures. In the Spanish language, for example, where the terms for 'marriage' and 'home' derive from the common verb *casar*, both concepts are included in the prevalent term *casamientos mixtos*, meaning 'mixed homes'.²

In the past the problem as it affected Jews related essentially to *intermarriage*.³ From the halakhic view a person who is converted in accordance with Jewish rites is regarded as a Jew. The problem of intermarriage, when it emerged, was principally personal and emotional with primary implications for the individual and his family. There were, of course, specific critical periods in Jewish history, as in the time of Ezra, when intermarriage became a corporate concern in which the entire character of Jewish group continuity was involved. Also there is evidence of outmarriage in various eras and climes of the Jewish experience, being more frequent in the first centuries of the Christian era, less so during the Middle Ages because of Church laws.

The current widespread phenomenon of mixed marriage has its roots in post-Emancipation Jewish history, having spread in the past three centuries to most lands of Jewish residence. Jacob Katz's studies of the Jewish-Christian encounter in the pre-modern and modern epochs are the best analytical interpretations of the historical and social factors which, in time, altered the Jewish ideational system and corporate

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

cohesiveness in the 'traditional society'.⁴ For the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and in a more statistical vein, Arthur Ruppin's works (particularly *The Jews in the Modern World*, modified in his last volume *The Jewish Fate and Future* written on the eve of the Second World War)⁵ specifically summarize the then available data on 'the increase of mixed marriages' against the backdrop of legal aspects as well as of Jewish and Christian opinion. In the chapter 'Mixed Marriages and Baptisms', Ruppin's tables deal primarily with central and eastern European statistics; but they also provide a sprinkling of information on the United States based on Julius Drachler's analysis, in *Democracy and Assimilation*, of the marriage records in New York City for 1908-12.⁶

Ruppin's insight and generalizations should be amplified with evidence from the history of such major western Jewish communities as those of the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, France, and Argentina—material to which he did not have access. In fact, in 1939, Ruppin himself urged such definitive studies as an indispensable prerequisite to comparative analyses of world Jewry. In a foreword to Louis Rosenberg's pioneer work on Canadian Jewry (*Canada's Jews: A Social and Economic Study of the Jews in Canada*),⁷ Ruppin said:

On the map of the world there are still a number of blank spots denoting territories not yet explored. In the sociology of the Jews there are likewise still many blank spots. In those countries in which the religion of the inhabitants has not been dealt with in the official statistics we have very little exact knowledge about the social conditions of the Jews. This lack of established facts is not only the soil on which many wrong conceptions of the Jews are growing; it is also a serious obstacle for the purpose of comparing the situation of the Jews in such comprehensive conclusions on the social conditions of the Jews in the whole world.

Indeed, Jewish communities have drastically altered since Ruppin's study; and in their migrations the Jews moved from centres of low assimilation to societies of high assimilation. Thus, by marking off nineteenth- and early twentieth-century developments from the period after the Second World War—corresponding in the main to the post-Emancipation and open society eras—we may more effectively delineate the qualitative changes as well as quantitative development of mixed marriage in the contemporary period.

The United States

From the very beginning of Jewish settlement, the issue of out-marriage was a frequent subject in American Jewry's historical record. As one follows the details of specific family lineages in local community studies, the trend to almost total amalgamation of the Sephardi community into American society becomes apparent. Already in the Federal period (1776-1840), as Malcolm H. Stern's researches indicate, out

of a total of 699 marriages involving Jews which took place in continental North America in those decades, 201 (or 28·7 per cent) were cases of outmarriage.⁸

As immigration increased in mid-nineteenth-century America, the rate of outmarriage decreased. Yet the phenomenon remained to disturb Jewish community equilibrium. Isaac Leeser, one of the most vigorous voices in American Jewry, often described the dilemmas of young Jews in the American environment in the pages of his *Occident*. Portraying the New Orleans of the early 1850s, Leeser wrote:⁹

. . . The reader can hardly form a conception of how great the difficulty was to organize a congregation on a proper footing in that great mart of commerce. People came thither from all parts of the world to amass a fortune. The Christian population itself was but little given to religious observances, and formerly a degree of freedom in living was indulged in but little promotive of the growth of piety. Those who are conversant with the decay of religious observance will, therefore, not wonder that the Jews in New Orleans were no better than their Christian neighbours, and that, moreover, owing to the paucity of Jewish young women, many intermarriages had taken place with other persuasions. This state of things naturally produced a great estrangement to our faith, and the children of the mixed marriages are, in many instances, entirely lost to Israel. . . .

Naturally, Leeser was disconcerted by the falling away from Judaism; and he fully recognized the social forces which influenced the Jewish mind. In a forthright analysis, 'The Danger of our Position', which calls to mind the situation in our times, Leeser recognized that 'in America there are no legal restraints upon mixed marriages, the law knows of no distinction between Jew and Christian; parents may bring up their children to a positive religion or not, as they may choose . . .'¹⁰ His argument was not sociological but theological. Jews resist intermarriage, he asserted, not because they 'wish to be unsociable or in contradiction to the world', but because they feel that there is something sacred in their calling, that they are in possession of the truth, and that they are living witnesses to the existence of God.¹¹

A more 'survivalist' expression of the period was that of Mordecai Manuel Noah, who declared, in 1845, that if marriage were permitted between Jews and Christians, Judaism and Jews would disappear in two or three generations.¹² The nature of the debilitating influence of mixed marriage on 'the common welfare of Jewish society' was forcefully argued in the pages of the *Occident* by Simeon Abrahams, a New York physician and a highly regarded member of Congregation Shearith Israel. Versed in Hebrew and Jewish lore, he complained that not only does the mixed couple 'remain in good standing in the various congregations and societies to which they formerly belonged', but 'the offspring of such marriages are generally introduced into the community of Jews, without their having become regular proselytes.'¹³

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

With the decades, virtually the entire range of personal, communal, and halakhic questions posed by mixed marriage in the United States was reported in the American and European Jewish press; there was particular emphasis on the problem of the children of mixed marriages and the question whether or not they should be admitted to Judaism.¹⁴

Hyman Grinstein suggests that the more stringent position adopted by the New York City congregations in the middle of the nineteenth century after the comparatively lenient rulings of the earlier period—to bar synagogue seats and cemetery rights of any Jew who married out of the faith—was essentially due to the lack of religious authority to admit proselytes.¹⁵ The basic cause, however, was the increase of mixed marriage to the point where it alarmed the rabbinical and lay spiritual leaders. Evidence is found in the discussions among Reform Jews. Even Samuel Hirsch of Philadelphia, who followed the radical views of S. Holdheim in Germany, did not sanction mixed marriages, for in nine cases out of ten, he said, they proved failures. Yet it was David Einhorn, a foremost radical Reformer, who articulated the view adopted (and most quoted) by the Reform group. Einhorn urged that such marriages were to be strictly prohibited even from the standpoint of Reform Judaism. 'To lend a hand to the sanctification of mixed marriage is, according to my firm conviction, to furnish a nail to the coffin of the small Jewish race, with its sublime mission.'¹⁶

In the latter decades of the past century and well into the twentieth, until the Second World War, while the absolute numbers of out-marriages increased, community concern receded. The proportions of outmarriages to homogamous marriages were fractional in the rapidly growing eastern European immigrant community; and the mainstream of Jewish life was little affected. The several important studies (Kennedy, Slotkin, Barron) which appeared in the late thirties and early forties, although based on limited samples and highly localized areas, together offer an analytical and descriptive pattern of the Jewish community in the period between the two World Wars.¹⁷

The main conclusions of these studies indicated that: (1) generalizations concerning an ever-increasing rate of Jewish outmarriage were not substantiated by a comparative analysis of the facts available in the United States and Europe; (2) while Jewish outmarriage varied according to the fluctuations of social conditions, it did not necessarily adhere to a pattern of increasing incidence; (3) the immigrant Jews cultivated a tradition, attitude, and technique of 'intermarriage resistance' long before their arrival in America; (4) in America, while different national stocks might merge, the historic traditions of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism remained as cohesive influences, and of the three groups, the Jews were the most endogamous. In sum, the consensus held that the Jewish group, particularly when compared with other groups, was supremely successful in maintaining religious homogamy.

Individual voices were raised to warn the Jewish community of the coming storm. Mordecai M. Kaplan, in his pathbreaking volume *Judaism as a Civilization*, first published in 1934, anticipating future developments in the American cultural syndrome, criticized Jewish leaders for their reluctance to face up to the inevitable problem:¹⁸

. . . Jews must be prepared to reckon frankly and intelligently with intermarriage as a growing tendency which, if left uncontrolled, is bound to prove Judaism's undoing. They must realize that the power and vitality of a civilization are put to the test whenever the members of different civilizations come into social contact with each other. When that contact results in intermarriage and children are born, the more vigorous civilization will be the one to which the children will belong.

However, such warnings were discounted. Considering familial loyalties as bulwarks to Jewish group conservation, the various rabbinical groups, in their respective deliberations and guidelines to congregations, attempted to circumscribe the problem.¹⁹ Mixed marriage was considered by Jews generally an aberration, a personal and family crisis, but not a threat to the continuity of Jewish life in America.

Great Britain

Similar trends, with highly localized modifications, evolved in British Jewry and in other countries of the Empire, such as Canada and Australia. Until recent years, Anglo-Jewry represented the most synagogue-centred community in the western world, having achieved what Lloyd Gartner terms 'a sort of Anglo-Jewish Victorian Compromise between civic freedom and moderate religiosity'. Modern social evolution accounts for the contemporary character of a community where religious commitment is diminishing. But the emphatic decline of synagogue marriages in Britain, now established by the Board of Deputies' Statistical and Demographic Research Unit, has its source in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish history.²⁰ The essential difference in British Jewish marriage patterns from the earlier periods can perhaps most succinctly be defined in the reversal of the meaning of the Yiddish phrase *shtille chuppah* or *shtille chosuna* (a quiet or silent wedding).²¹ The phrase now more aptly applies to the practice of civil marriage without Jewish religious solemnization.

The results of social emancipation as well as religious and political equality enjoyed by the Jews since their seventeenth-century return seem to correspond with those in the United States and other western countries. But the causative factors varied both in the host culture and in the historic composition of the Anglo-Jewish community.²² For example, class patterns in Britain made it relatively easy for Jews to move up into the leading strata. Social advancement did not always hinge on mixed or intermarriage. 'Religious toleration', Joseph Jacobs wrote, 'is a *sine qua non* for the British Empire, and the Jews who were

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

last to receive it on the part of the Empire, are thus the type of its pre-dominance.²³ British Jews, living in this frame of English toleration, developed a religio-communal structure which differed from continental communities and were free to observe their heritage. This was also reflected in Jewish familial 'in-group' solidarity. In his pioneer *Studies in Jewish Statistics*,²⁴ Jacobs also analysed consanguineous marriages of Jews, demonstrating that (1) cousins married one another more frequently, perhaps three times as often, (2) Jews had larger families, and (3) mixed marriage between Jews and 'persons of other races' were comparatively infertile.

Unlike the United States where the diversity of Jewish religious commitment and organization permitted varying approaches to mixed marriage, the authorized English rabbinate followed strict halakhic ruling, and could more easily exert its authority. A most interesting additional local support for this stance was the accepted English historic tradition against proselytization. Several examples point up this tradition. Cecil Roth writes: 'According to the regulations (*Ascamoto*) of the Spanish and Portuguese synagogue in London (London, 1784), paragraph XXIX, a recommendation against intermarriage (to which tradition adds proselytization) was made by Charles II as a condition of his toleration.'²⁵ A relatively unknown printing of a small Hebrew manuscript in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Barnett Elzas's *A List of Converts to Judaism in the City of London (1809-1816)* (published only in ten copies), adduces further evidence both of the vexing nature of mixed marriage and the actual practice of the Sephardi Beth Din in the early nineteenth century. The list consists of 60 proselytes, 39 women and 21 children. These conversions were arranged either in relation to marriage or after marriage, thereby regularizing in many instances irregular unions which had lasted for several years.²⁶ The need to enforce and repeat the prohibition from time to time shows that those very same social forces which permitted relatively equal participation of Jews in the social and economic life of the general population brought about an increase in outmarriage.

At the turn of the twentieth century, the original families of Spanish and Portuguese descent were almost completely absorbed in the general population or had disappeared. Even the outmarriage of second-generation children of eastern European Jews was not an unusual event. In 1907, the Chief Rabbi preached a special sermon on the subject, urging steadfastness in separateness.²⁷

The small non-orthodox group also aligned itself with this position. Claude Montefiore, reporting the view of the Jewish Religious Union, said: 'We agree with our orthodox brethren in rejecting and deprecating intermarriage, for the simple and adequate reason that only by this means can Judaism as a distinct and separate religion be preserved.'²⁸ Morris Joseph, one of the most articulate spokesmen of 'the intermediate

position' between Orthodoxy and 'extreme liberalism', formulated his stand on intermarriage in clear and unequivocal terms: 'Every Jew should feel himself bound, even though the duty involves the sacrifice of precious affections, to avoid acts calculated, however remotely, to weaken the stability of the ancestral religion. . . . Every Jew who contemplates marriage outside the pale must regard himself as paving the way to a disruption which will be the final, as it will be the culminating disaster in the history of his people.'²⁹

Almost reminding us of the recent agitation in the United States on 'The Vanishing Jew', Lewis S. Benjamin, writing in *The Nineteenth Century and After*, in 1912,³⁰ entitled his article 'The Passing of the English Jews'. The accent is placed squarely on outmarriage, once 'regarded as the most heinous crime that could be committed short of conversion to Christianity . . .', but 'what centuries of persecution had been powerless to do, has been effected in a score of years by friendly intercourse.' Benjamin emphasizes that this freedom of social movement and its consequences are in the main confined to a certain class. Yet, if this factor is coupled with the increasing growth of general religious indifference, it is likely to spread gradually through all the ranks of that community. A personal testimony to Benjamin's generalization is *Two Worlds* by David Daiches (born 1912), a biography of childhood and youth in Edinburgh. In itself, it is a document of the psychological realities forced upon many Jews who, caught in the conflict between their religious background and the non-Jewish environment, did not reject outmarriage as an answer to their individual needs.³¹

Outmarriage, as indicated, is a symptom of group assimilatory process rather than its cause. The twentieth-century British community was strengthened by eastern European immigration. The power of distinctiveness was further strengthened by the Zionist idea as British Jewry during the Mandate period rose to heights of Jewish commitment. The comparative tables of synagogue marriages from the beginning of this century until the Second World War (the rate of synagogue marriages was similar to the marriage rate of the general population) accurately reflect the determination of the British community to remain 'a separate and distinct people'.³² Neither the growing number of mixed marriages nor their disturbing effect on the community was denied. This mood is closely reflected in the London Beth Din's decision to publish and distribute a special Pronouncement on the subject (Appendix III below). Writing 'To the Jewish Communities of Great Britain and the Dominions', the Beth Din declared:

Intermarriage is unfortunately increasing. Formerly a Jew who married an unconverted non-Jewess was looked upon by his fellow-Jews as a renegade, and he, too, considered himself as such. No one classed the children of such a union as Jews, and the parents had no part or function in Jewish life. But to-day few seem to realise the confusion in family life,

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

the chaos in regard to burial, and other lamentable complications that such a union brings in its train. Even more disturbing is the fact, recently brought to our notice, that men who have married out of the Faith have in some places a hand in the control of congregational affairs. This is clearly intolerable. . . .

Despite this effort, members who had married out continued occasionally to be accepted by their synagogues. For, in England, too, during the period under discussion, while outmarriage was considered a corrosive de-Judaizing force, it was still marginal, and certainly was felt to have no long-range impact on the destiny of the British Jewish community.

Canada

By the early forties of the present century, the Jewish population of Canada, largely as the result of immigration after the First World War, had reached 170,241 (based on the 1941 census). At that time there were an estimated 4,800,000 Jews in the U.S. and about 350,000 in Britain. Canada's dual Protestant and Catholic religio-cultural complex differed substantially from the ethnic pluralism in the United States and the dominant Church of England setting in Britain. Yet despite social conditions which differed from those of the 'mother country' in England and sister community on the North American continent, the history of the mixed marriage pattern in Canadian Jewry reveals similar evolutionary lines.

In the very beginnings of the community many leading Jewish families were absorbed by the Christians. Basing his thorough studies on early Catholic Church records, Benjamin G. Sack documents the disappearance by outmarriage of the Judah, David, Salomon, and Levy families of Sephardi Portuguese descent and describes how the process of amalgamation continued during the rest of the nineteenth century.³³ Twentieth-century immigration radically transformed the quality of Jewish life in Canada. During most of the present century, for example, Jews formed the third largest ethnic group in Montreal, exceeded only by the French and Anglo-Celtic populations.³⁴ An indigenous Jewish communal structure further strengthened resistance to assimilation.

The pertinent statistics for the Canadian Jewish community since 1921 are available from the annual reports of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in Canada and, in particular, from the comprehensive analyses by Louis Rosenberg.³⁵ The evidence for the period between the two World Wars is fully documented in Rosenberg's *Canada's Jews*.³⁶ In 1926, the first year for which complete statistics of outmarriage for the whole of Canada were compiled, 53 cases of Jewish outmarriage were recorded compared with 1,087 homogamous marriages. The progression of outmarriages continued from 4.88 per hundred homogamous Jewish marriages in 1926 to 10.28 per hundred in 1942.³⁷ Despite the marked

increase, the Jewish rate of outmarriage remained at the time the lowest among all other ethnic groups in Canada with the exception of the Japanese. In the Canadian situation, primarily because of diverse cultural settings in the larger cities in which the Jews dwelled, the problem developed in different stages and with varying intensity in the local communities; and further differences arose between the cities and the small communities.³⁸

The opening to Gwethalyn Graham's *Earth and High Heaven*, one of the early crop of mixed marriage novels which appeared in North America, set the *dramatis personae* of the book almost in socio-historical rubric. It established the separateness of the French, English, and Jewish sub-groups in Montreal society, the Jewish element being the most separated, 'for although, as a last resort, French and English can be united under the heading "Gentile", such an alliance merely serves to isolate the Jews more than ever'. In addition to the racial and religious distinctions, relations between the three sub-groups of Montreal were made even more complicated, 'the French because they are a minority in Canada, the English because they are a minority in Quebec, and the Jews because they are a minority everywhere'.³⁹ It seemed improbable, the author wrote, that the children of these sub-communities could meet.

But the fact that such improbable meetings were beginning to increase was already indicated on the agenda of Jewish young people's groups which arranged lectures and discussions on the subject. In a pamphlet, *Intermarriage—An Analysis*, published in Vancouver in 1935, Julius Shore concluded that the state of mixed marriage in Canada was but 'a temporary disorder in the life of our people, and one which will diminish as soon as we are more fully adapted to our new mode of existence . . . Yet I do not believe that much has been lost to us in the intermarriages that have already taken place—at least not so much that a bit of carefully directed public resentment could not stop the breach mixed marriage has caused in our front. . . . Even if a fairly large proportion of our people have been lost to us through mixed marriage we need not despair for Judaism. It is a striking fact that none of the modern Jewish historians find it necessary in their purely historical works to discuss the problem of mixed marriage. The question is not "How many Jews?" but "What kind of Jews?"'⁴⁰ Nevertheless, elements in the community were sufficiently stirred by the problem to publish a statement declaring that mixed marriage was tantamount to apostasy.

As with Vancouver, so with the other communities: organized Canadian Jewry noted the facts and went on with its business. Discounting the basic factors which might lead to further progression, it was quite prepared to suffer the loss as an inevitable component of life 'in Canadian freedom'.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

Australia

The background review of the Australian Jewish community rounds out the historical picture in the Anglo-Saxon countries. (Despite efforts to gather authoritative data on South African Jewry, the available historical material is too sparse for an attempt at interpretative summary.) Though predominantly a community of mid-twentieth-century growth, Australian Jewry begins its history with the British settlement in 1788. Since 1841, the percentage of Jews in the general population has fluctuated but slightly. In absolute figures, however, the Jewish settlement expanded from 1,183 in 1841 to some estimated 66,000–70,000 after the 1966 census. Particularly significant is the trebling of the community in the past three decades (from some 23,000 in 1933). This was largely due to the German–Jewish migration in the Nazi period and a wider general influx since.⁴¹ There was an intensification of organized Jewish life during those decades. By its emergence on a remote continent Australian Jewry offers a distinctive source for the comparative study of the mixed marriage phenomenon.

The nineteenth-century records show that the small community was already struggling for Jewish identity. As early as 1846, the Minutes of Hobart Synagogue on the island of Tasmania—a synagogue described as being composed at the time of ‘settlers, farmers, civil servants and ex-convicts’—reflected the continuing dilemma of whether to encourage, ignore, or repudiate post-marital conversion to Judaism for the sake of Jewish family intactness.⁴²

On the mainland, too, the problem was far from resolved. An example of the attrition of Jewish community life resulting from isolation is the fact that the family name Cohen is a common *non-Jewish* name today in small towns in New South Wales. Even in the largest Jewish centre, in the city of Melbourne, where social opportunities were naturally greater, the conflict remained between the need of the young and the parents’ demands. The archives of the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, Nathan Adler, hold a number of letters to religious and lay leaders in Australia in the 1870s in which the conflict is plainly stated. The Chief Rabbi, painfully aware of family dissensions and personal tragedies, attempted to maintain a condition of total non-proselytization in the local Australian community, excepting cases which received his ‘direct sanction’.

The letter addressed to the President and Members of the Hebrew Congregation, Geelong, Victoria, 3 November 1874, reads in part as follows:⁴³

It is known to you that the local Beth Din is not allowed (not) [sic] to allow proselytes without my direct sanction and it is also known to you that in principle I am very much opposed to making Jewish proselytes and since 30 years that I hold office I have opposed with all my power

the marriages out of our pale. Still there are instances [in] which a denial of allowing parties to undergo the ceremony would deprive congregations not alone of their present members but of all their issues when for instance they are married legally by the law of the land and cannot be separated[. W]hat is to be done to keep them and their issues to Judaism[?]

Reporting in the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1904 and explaining that the situation in Australia was more acute than in England because of the greater opportunities for social contact between Jews and non-Jews, the Rev. J. H. Landau described outmarriage as the great menace to Australian Judaism.⁴⁴

It is not a question merely to be deplored; it is a question that must be met if the community is to be preserved . . . There are very few families indeed in which some member, or often members, are not to be found married beyond the pale. . . . The virus of intermarriage penetrated into almost every family. I found it necessary to preach a crusade against this evil, returning to the charge in my pulpit almost week after week. I even went so far as to threaten to resign my office if something were not done to suppress the evil. . . .

Rev. Landau indicated that most of the mixed marriages were with Roman Catholics and that 'the ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church have been especially outspoken in declaring against them'.

The situation did not improve in the early part of the twentieth century, except in so far as the spiritual and lay leaders of the community earnestly combined to resist any public sanction of the practice. Substantial losses to the Jewish community were also sustained because of premarital conversion or dissociation. According to Charles Price, between the years 1831 and 1933 these losses rose to about 25 per cent for males and 15 per cent for females.⁴⁵ The figures in the various censuses reveal that the national incidence of outmarriage involving Jews was 20.5 per cent in 1911, rose to a high point of 22.9 per cent in 1921, and decreased to 15.5 per cent in 1933. Censuses of individual States showed regional variety according to size and recency of immigration, although most States showed an outmarriage high point in 1921.⁴⁶

The lay leaders of the community were particularly alert to the problem of proselytization for marriage. They warned young men against 'marrying out of the faith under the impression that they would be able to afterwards get their wives made Jewesses'.⁴⁷ Furthermore they sought a unified practice in all Australian communities so that the standard of rejection or acceptance would be one, 'as a problem concerning the whole of Australia'.⁴⁸

From the twenties onwards the progress of assimilation seemed to be checked.⁴⁹ The community matured in its Jewish concern and

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

responsibility, its immigrant population grew, and settlement was concentrated in the cities of Sydney and Melbourne. As is characteristic of a community in growth, losses were absorbed, at least on the surface. The Jews in Australia now turned their attention to the more constructive areas of Jewish life.

Argentina

Despite the achievements of a highly organized Jewish community in Argentina, historical and sociological studies are still in a preliminary stage. Whatever the compound of reasons—geographical, linguistic, and internal—one approaches scientific analysis of the community's development with caution. Although the first strands of Jewish immigration to Argentina are found in the second half of the nineteenth century (the presence of individual Marrano Jews began with sixteenth-century Spanish colonization), we do not possess basic immigration analyses.⁵⁰ Nor do we have as yet a basic study of the Jewish Colonization Association movement started by Baron de Hirsch, which brought the Jewish population of Argentina at the turn of the century to an estimated 18,000.⁵¹

This historical lack is reflected in Maurice Fishberg's comprehensive volume *The Jews: A Study in Race and Environment*. Published in 1911, one year after Alberto Gerchunoff's literary classic on *The Jewish Gauchos of the Pampas*,⁵² Fishberg's book does not contain a single reference to the Jews of Argentina. Until the second quarter of the century, Argentinian Jewry, as a community, was virtually isolated on a continent that seemed of little interest to the Western world. The loss is even greater because the abundant archival literary and periodical sources show, in their singular Latin American Catholic ambience, a major western Jewish community struggling for creative Jewish survival.

From the first sporadic western European and North African immigrations in the 1850s and 1860s and the eastern European influx in the 1880s, the problem of mixed marriages confronted the organized Jewish community.⁵³ Gerchunoff's volume on the colonists of Entre Rios, in effect an historical document of the period, casts light on the conflicting generational perspectives of immigrants and their children tasting the freedom of a land which gave them refuge and in which they felt secure. He develops the specific theme of outmarriage not only in 'The Story of Miryam', where he sets the elopement of the Jewish daughter and the Gaucho helper on the plane of lovers 'who understood each other only in song', but in many other tales, incidental conversations, and insights. Gerchunoff underscores the impact of the enticing new society on the young and their evolving disaffiliation from Jewish traditional goals and emphases. Thus, in 'The Siesta', when Jacobo defends his friend Remigio, who went off with the daughter of Ismael Rudman, the old grandmother Doña Raquel exclaims: 'It's all

the same to this renegade. It's just as if she'd gone away with a Jew.'⁵⁴ As in sad evaluation of the entire immigration enterprise, the learned Shohet muses in 'Threshing Wheat': 'It's true, in Russia we lived badly, but there was the fear of God there and we lived according to the Law. Here, the young people are turning into Gauchos.'⁵⁵

Sociologically speaking, the learned Shohet was but half right. The young people did not turn into Gauchos, although they did remove themselves considerably from their parents' dreams of recreating Jewish life on the new soil. They abandoned the colonies of Entre Rios for the towns and cities of Argentina, primarily Buenos Aires, plying trade and commerce, and penetrated the arts and the professions. During those early decades and until the German-Jewish settlement in the thirties, the flow of immigration brought the Jewish population to some 50,000 in 1910 and about 120,000 by 1920.⁵⁶

During this period, the traditional Jewish way of life of the 'old country' was abandoned, in the main, except for retention of the Yiddish language and Jewish folkways. The essence of Gerchunoff's tales—the gradual loss of Jewish identity in the embrace of Argentina—was confirmed by the succeeding native-born generation. Actually the children of the immigrants were part of the general cultural scene. Most of them did not consciously cast away their parental or Jewish group loyalties; nor did they deny Jewish brotherhood. Living in an environment which did not stress spiritual values, Jews found it comparatively simple to maintain association with other Jews and even with the Jewish community, without accepting the burdens and precepts of Judaism.

The way in which organized Jewish society, through its rabbinical and lay authorities, attempted to cope with this contradiction at its crux is exemplified by some of the letters of Shaul David Sithon and other rabbis, in *Dibber Shaul*, written in Buenos Aires in 1927 and published in Jerusalem the following year.⁵⁷ Revolving about the anarchic growth of *casamientos mixtos*, 'mixed homes', the documents are amazing for their honest detail of the Jewish spiritual crisis of the period, as well as for the bold decision to reject proselytization in Argentina.

This prohibition is cited until this very day as the basis for the prevalent *herem* or ban on all proselytization in Argentina. Himself a young rabbi of the Sephardi community, Rabbi Sithon received full endorsement and approbation for this act by the Ashkenazi Rabbi Aharon Halevi Goldman of Moisésville. The ban was published with the written consent of both the Sephardi and Ashkenazi Chief Rabbis in Eretz Yisrael, Yaakov Meir and Avraham Yitzhak Ha-Kohen Kook—another illuminating example of Jewish extra-territorial controls with respect to proselytization and marriage laws.

In addition to the halakhic and historical support for this ban, the

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

documentation offers descriptions by Rabbis Sithon and Goldman of the contemporary situation which compelled this unprecedented restrictive measure.⁵⁸ To translate from Rabbi Sithon's letter:⁵⁹

. . . Life in this city is exceedingly unrestrained, and everyone does what he pleases; there is no rabbinical authority to be minded and respected, neither a governmentally appointed rabbi nor a rabbi maintained by the Jewish community itself. Hence, anyone who so desires takes an alien woman for his wife without her being converted; or he chooses individuals at random [to serve as witnesses] and 'converts' her in their presence. And they have children who do not qualify [as Jews], though their natural Jewish fathers claim that they were converted. If anyone asks them: in whose presence did this conversion take place? they counter brazenly: who hath appointed thee [judge over us]? . . . He keeps his alien wife, begets children whose status is like their mother's, to be absorbed by the Gentiles.

I prepared a ruling and forwarded it together with the cited opinion of Rabbi Aharon Halevi [Goldman] to Rabbi Josef Yadid Halevi, president of the Aleppo community Rabbinical Court in Jerusalem. The latter endorsed our judgement, and himself elaborated arguments in a well reasoned opinion which analyses the problem from all aspects. Because of the high cost of printing I did not include his detailed arguments, but disseminated announcements that it is forever forbidden to accept converts in Argentina, for the various reasons endorsed by the three of us. . . . Whoever wishes to be converted may travel to Jerusalem; perhaps the court there will accept the applicant.

This is the studied opinion of the shepherd of his holy flock praying for divine assistance, at Buenos Aires.

Shaul David Sithon, S[efardi] T[ahor]

Although it is impossible to gauge the actual effect of the ban, it is safe to assume that its preventive role was effective on many levels of Jewish community life. However, the practice of outmarriage was not halted thereby. Officially, the *Jevra Kedescha* (later the AMIA-Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina), which had been organized on a family membership plan rather than individual membership, did not accept 'mixed families' as members. But the Jewish member of the family was not to be denied Jewish burial privileges, although the minutes of the AMIA reflect departures from this agreement.⁶⁰

Both the ban and the AMIA acts officially helped remove the problem of mixed marriage from the public agenda. Taking individual regression in its stride, the community concentrated on its internal growth. Fresh immigrant forces came as a result of the restrictive immigration laws in the United States and Eretz Yisrael under the British Mandate. In the two decades between the World Wars, the Jewish community in Argentina virtually trebled, reaching about 230,000 in 1930 and an estimated 300,000 in 1939. The mixed marriage problem, although it did not disappear, significantly diminished

as the entire character of the Argentine Jewish community was being transformed.

France

The new pivotal position of the French Jewish community in European Jewry after the Second World War compels its inclusion in any contemporary comparative study of western Jewish life. From the historical perspective of mixed marriage, French Jewry might well have been placed at the head of the study. For the seedbed of modern Jewish assimilation rests in the civic and political Jewish emancipation which followed the French Revolution. Professor Jacob Katz has analysed the upheaval in Jewish history which began in France (a statement with important contemporary significance): '... A profound change had occurred in the alignment of Jews in the Gentile world. Instead of being faced, as before, with Christianity as such, Judaism was now confronted with the secular State, which had absorbed Christianity into its framework as a complementary factor and was similarly prepared to absorb Judaism, provided it adapted its teachings and precepts to the interests of the State.'⁶¹ In direct application to mixed marriage, Zosa Szajkowski has amply documented the assimilation of the Jews to French civil law. Before the Revolution the French courts of law recognized the integrity of Jewish marriage law, and did not insist on the application of French civil law to marriages among Jews. But in the new epoch mixed marriages (mostly between Jewish men and Christian women) became a symbol of the times, and found warm advocates among Jews and Christians.⁶²

Confrontation with the post-Revolutionary secular State soon took place in the dramatic meetings of the Assembly of Notables and Sanhedrin of 1806-7 convened by Napoleon I. In the list of twelve submitted questions, the third read: 'Can a Jewess marry a Christian, and a Jew a Christian woman? or does the law allow the Jews to intermarry only among themselves?'⁶³

The response was:⁶⁴

The law does not say that a Jewess cannot marry a Christian, nor a Jew a Christian woman nor does it state that the Jews can only intermarry among themselves . . .

. . . There has [sic] been, at several periods, intermarriages between Jews and Christians in France, in Spain, and in Germany; these marriages were sometimes tolerated, and sometimes forbidden by the laws of those sovereigns, who had received Jews into their dominions.

Unions of this kind are still found in France; but we cannot dissemble that the opinion of the Rabbies [sic] is against these marriages. According to their doctrine, although the religion of Moses has not forbidden the Jews from intermarrying with nations not of their religion, yet, as marriage, according to the Talmud, requires religious ceremonies called *Kiduschim*,

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

with the benediction used in such cases, no marriage can be *religiously* valid unless these ceremonies have been performed. This could not be done towards persons who would not both of them consider these ceremonies as sacred; and in that case the married couple could separate without the *religious* divorce; they would then be considered as married civilly but not *religiously*.

Such is the opinion of the Rabbies, members of this assembly. In general they would be no more inclined to bless the union of a Jewess with a Christian, or of a Jew with a Christian woman, than Catholic priests themselves would be disposed to sanction unions of this kind. The Rabbies acknowledge, however, that a Jew, who marries a Christian woman, does not cease on that account, to be considered a Jew by his brethren, any more than if he married a Jewess *civilly* and not *religiously*.

The response was carefully guarded, reflecting the divergent views, or as some historians prefer, ambivalences, which generally prevailed at the meetings.⁶⁵ This only added to the sustained confusion in the following decades within and without the formal rabbinical circles throughout Europe.⁶⁶ Furthermore, following the French legal recognition of mixed marriages, the movement soon extended (chiefly among the Protestant countries) to Holland, Denmark, Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries. However, not until the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was mixed marriage legally recognized in Germany, Hungary, and Russia.

As French Jewry advanced into the widened political, economic, and cultural spheres, waves of conversion tossed even religiously-committed families out of the Jewish community. Nor did internal Jewish reform adaptations and religious acculturation to Catholic forms stem the outgoing tide. The operative post-emancipation factors for social absorption in France as elsewhere were multifaceted—social, political, religious, and individual. While all social strata were affected by political emancipation, it was primarily the richer strata in France, as in the other countries, which exploited the increasing social acceptance of mixed marriage as a means to leave their own milieu and to rise thereby on the social scale, penetrating circles of the aristocracy to which they had had no previous access.⁶⁷

A limited demographic study of Strasbourg reflects the extent to which Jewish families dissolved. In the early decades, and towards the middle of the nineteenth century, the absolute figures of mixed marriage were rather low. There was a rapid increase after 1880, so that by 1909 over a third of marriages by Jews were with non-Jewish partners. If one adds the significant figures of conversion before marriage, defections can be seen to have risen to an unprecedented level.⁶⁸

In highly individualistic, cosmopolitan, and conglomerate France, in which ethnic groups were rapidly absorbed, mixed marriage provoked two opposite views, both extremes founded on the conviction that French Jewry could not possibly escape community erosion and

ultimate disappearance. Many Christians, it was noted, expressed praise of the mixed marriage tie, if only as an additional means to eradicate a hateful antisemitism. At the same time, Christian spokesmen emphasized—perhaps as a form of higher religious anti-Judaism—that the penetration of numerous Jewish elements into the Christian fold would considerably hasten the disintegration of Christianity. The counter-argument, of course, was that by the same process, Judaism, too, was gradually being eliminated.⁶⁹

Underscoring this view is a fascinating revelation by Isaac Naiditch. In his conversations with Baron Edmond de Rothschild (*Ha-nadiv ha-yaduah*, 'The Well-Known Benefactor'), he reports that the Baron came to his position when he discerned 'the rapid strides of assimilation among the Jews of France, especially the mixed marriages'.

Baron de Rothschild continued:⁷⁰

I saw great families, once the strongholds of Judaism, become estranged from us. Their children and their children's children leave the fold, and Judaism, for which we fought for thousands of years in our history, is disintegrating. I came to the conclusion that we must find a country where Judaism could develop further in the spirit of our great prophets. And I realized that the only place was Palestine, where every plot of ground, every strip of soil, in town and in country, is saturated with the memories of the great eternal works of our prophets . . .

. . . I had a fight on my hands with my own family. I was given to understand that my plans could bring a great deal of harm to the Jews. We would lay ourselves open to the accusation of seeking to regain our ancient homeland and of being unwilling to assimilate in the countries where we had been given full rights of citizenship . . .

As Baron de Rothschild stated, his views were in the minority. The basic question of creating an indigenous French Jewish community could be resolved only internally. Penetrating examples of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century argumentation against mixed marriage are to be found in two works of Lehman Kahn (pseudonym L. K. Amitai): *Série de six lettres sur le mariage mixte* and *Assimilation*.⁷¹ Directing himself to the core argument that amalgamation represented a higher patriotism—and, in his way, meeting the challenge directed to the Sanhedrin—Kahn insisted that religion and patriotism were separate entities; outmarriage can only be regarded as proof of absence of religious feelings or abnormal indifference to religion. Particularly for Jews, he maintained, '*origin and religion go together, national history and belief have the same starting point and follow the same path. Israel constitutes one family, one people . . .*'⁷²

Moving from the Religion and State debate, Kahn draws a picture of the contemporary mixed marriage family in sombre colours:⁷³

This mixture of elements not easily assimilable is a source of great unhappiness for the families; it threatens their existence. It is the cause of

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

deplorable dissensions, even in the case where a sincere affection between the mates had created the bonds. If the union is blessed and children are born, the evil becomes worse. Either the children are raised without religious training, or else they are apportioned to the faith of one or the other of the mates—like an object without value; sometimes the boys are handed over to the faith of the father and the girls to that of the mother; sometimes still they are divided alternately, as in a lottery, the first child is turned over to the father, the second to the mother, the third again to the father, the fourth to the mother and so forth. For Judaism these families are dead leaves.

The eastern European influx to France which began even before the First World War—mostly from Poland—did not influence the settled community as might have been expected. Actually, the old and the new were diametrically apart—temperamentally, culturally and economically. A reverse process took place. The power of assimilation overwhelmed the immigrant community just as it dominated the native population. The effects of mixed marriage on both communities in the first third of the century are poignantly summarized in the following quotations from the autobiographical Preface of Georges Friedmann's *The End of the Jewish People?* and from Roger Ikor's novel, *Les eaux mêlées* (which traces the assimilation of a Jewish family into French society over three generations).⁷⁴

In their different ways, both testify to the mood of Jewish absorption in French life. Friedmann speaks⁷⁵ for most of the settled community:

Hitherto I had been one of those who are called 'marginal' or 'peripheral' Jews by their religious fellows. Having been born in Paris into a family in which the traditional observances had been given up and 'mixed' marriage was no problem, and being deeply identified with France, her culture and her way of life, and with a circle of friends and colleagues in which no one asked questions about my 'racial' origins or religious beliefs, I had never suffered from anti-Semitism, though my name indicated that I was a Jew, and I had never felt discriminated against in French society, even at school. I had never attended a synagogue service, or, I believe, met a Rabbi . . .

In October 1940, it was different . . .

Expelled from his profession, and otherwise ostracized, Friedmann was compelled to create a new rationale. What did it all mean?, he asked. And he answered:

It was not France that imposed this outrage on me, excluding me from her schools, but Hitler and Goebbels. France had nothing to do with it . . . I made myself a motto for my private use—*civis gallicus sum*, I am a French citizen. No matter what happened, that was what I was and would remain.

Yankel Mykhanowitzki, Ikor's hero, fled from Russia at the turn

of the century, and raised his family in the France of which he was a determined part:⁷⁶

Sometimes Yankel takes the telephone directory and looks in it for the names of his family. He sees his patronym, Mykhanowitzki, sometimes hyphenated with a typical French name, also finds a priest by that name. He is very proud, for example, that his granddaughter has entered into the family of a general. And when he looks under the French names his descendants have married into, such as Saulnier, Cheysan, Touquet, he wonders how many Jews are included in these families. 'Ah! we are well mixed together, all of us', he muses vaguely. . . .

With respect to Jewish continuity, the secular state in France had its way. Napoleon's expressed wish that the Great Sanhedrin adopt the rule of a certain percentage of exogamous marriages, though emphatically denied in theory, was well realized in practice. By 1939, the French Jewish community, despite an existing institutional framework, was on the way to attrition. However, the Catastrophe, the North African inundation, and the vital contact with Israel were to bring a new French Jewish community into being.

As the historical comparative picture unfolded, similar patterns of Jewish life became strikingly apparent in such widely separated communities as those of Argentine, Australia and England, North America and the European continent. Notwithstanding the disparate socio-political institutions in the respective countries as well as the varied cultural and historical forces which shaped particular environments, the total historical impact of outmarriage and the Jewish response to it may be formulated as follows.

Within the past two centuries the Jews travelled an expanding road to freedom: from toleration to emancipation to the open societies. As individuals and as communities, they moved out of familial and structural enclaves to ever-broadening fields of interrelationships with their host populations. In the mould of western societies, of which the Jews are now so much a part, they have become essentially indistinguishable from the majority cultures. The cultural and psycho-sociological forces which operated in the majority society at first set up barriers before the Jewish group, thereby constricting the development of mixed marriages. In later years those same forces began to pervade Jewish life and thus promoted marital assimilation.

The ways of mixed marriage varied, but the predominant factors were social. As more and more neutral non-religious grounds of contact with the host populations opened, mixed marriage increased. From the viewpoint of the challenge to creative Jewish group survival, the state-

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

ment of Felix Theilhaber on German Jewry in *Der Untergang der Deutschen Juden*⁷⁷ sets the signpost, according to many, for all western Jewish communities:

Mixed marriage has left the stage when it was a rare occurrence. Today when it is almost a daily event, it finds no condemnation, and so opposition to it is dwindling on all sides, and with the lowering of the barriers, it becomes quite natural.

Despite their awareness of these processes the organized Jewish communities did not consider intermarriage or mixed marriage as an immediate threat to the continuity of their Jewish group life. They recognized its potential development and were disturbed by its inroads. Nevertheless, because religion played a dominant role in the mores of general society, they were able to view the problem as essentially affecting individual families. Moreover, with the continuing and reassuring reinforcement of new immigrants the communities were motivated by a mood of growth rather than loss, being on the whole quite content to let the religious authorities deal with these matters as part of Jewish law and practice.

To see the mixed marriage problem in its genesis in modern western society, even without entering into prescriptive analysis, is also to anticipate its transformation in the contemporary predicament. Yet we must understand the ecological, ideological, and emotional distinctions in the current situation. In our times mixed marriage cannot be understood without reference to the unprecedented proximity of, communication between, and fusing of, cultures, ideas, and peoples. In a world of belonging and not belonging, historic traditions are subordinated to individual choice.

It is this new character of mixed marriage, which has heightened Jewish corporate concern and reaction, that now needs to be examined.

NOTES

¹ The overwhelming difficulties in collecting authenticated data on the subject have necessarily deferred comprehensive synthetical studies. On the other hand, there has developed an extensive specialized social science and religious denominational literature, including bibliographies of the available material. Appended is a select bibliography (Appendix I), organized thematically, which can serve as background literature for this and future comparative studies.

I am grateful to Miss Francine Schnitzer, my research assistant, for her invaluable

help in the preparation of this study.

² J. Corominas, *Diccionario Crítico Etimológico de la Lengua Castellana*, Madrid, 1954, I, pp. 714-15. The verb *casar* used transitively means 'unir en matrimonio' (unite in marriage).

³ Even in modern Hebrew usage there is still no fixed term for mixed marriage, *nissuei taarovel* being the generally accepted description for both concepts. In French usage, *mariage mixte* is the single term.

⁴ Jacob Katz, *Tradition and Crisis*, New York, 1961; *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, Oxford, 1961. See also his earlier volume

Die Entstehung der Judenassimilation in Deutschland und deren Ideologie, Frankfurt a/M, 1935.

⁸ London, 1934, pp. 316-26; London, 1940, pp. 105-15.

⁶ New York, 1920. Compare the statistics and analysis of Uriah Zevi Engelman's study, 'Intermarriage among Jews in Germany, U.S.S.R. and Switzerland', *Jewish Social Studies*, II, April, 1940, pp. 157-78. See also Felix Theilhaber's classic study of the German Jewish community, *Der Untergang der Deutschen Juden*, Berlin, 1921. Comparative data and analyses are given by Jacob Lestschinsky in his many works. See particularly his discussion on intermarriage in *The National Aspect of the Jews in Diaspora* (Hebrew), Tel Aviv, 1959, pp. 214-56. Lestschinsky's conclusions will be dealt with in the second part of this study. See also Nathan Goldberg's study, 'Intermarriage from a Sociological Perspective', *Intermarriage and the Future of the American Jew* (Proceedings of a Conference Sponsored by the Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies), New York, December 1964, pp. 27-58.

⁷ *Canada's Jews: A Social and Economic Study of the Jews in Canada*, Montreal, 1939, p. xxvii.

⁸ Malcolm H. Stern, 'Jewish Marriage and Intermarriage in the Federal Period (1776-1840)', *American Jewish Archives*, XIX, November 1967, pp. 142-3, also Stern's *Americans of Jewish Descent*, Cincinnati, 1960. The files of the American Jewish Archives in Cincinnati contain an important collection of periodical and other documentary references to mixed marriage in the United States. I am beholden to Professor Jacob R. Marcus, Director of the Archives, and to Professor Stanley F. Chyet, as well as to the members of the Archives staff for their many courtesies in making these materials completely and easily available for study.

⁹ *Occident*, VIII, June 1850, p. 116. Note the conflated use of 'intermarriage' and 'mixed marriage' in the last two sentences of the quotation. See also Leeser's report on Harrisburg, Pa., *ibid.*, XVIII, 24 January 1861, p. 268.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II, January 1845, p. 461.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, III, February 1846, p. 530:

It is precisely what we testify to the world that constitutes us Jews; take away this testimony, and we cease to be distinguished from other portions of

men. It is not that we wish to be unsociable, or in contradiction to the world, that we are believers in the UNITY; that we practise circumcision; that we observe the peculiar Seventh Day Sabbath; that we do not intermarry with other nations; that we deem it sinful to partake of food not prepared according to our customs; but simply because we feel that there is something sacred in our vocation, that we are in possession of the truth, and that, but for these peculiarities of opinion and conduct, the world would be without the living witnesses to prove that there exists a God who is powerful to save, and whose words are true and faithful.

¹² *Ibid.*, III, April 1845, p. 34.

¹³ See *ibid.*, II, March 1845, pp. 585-591.

¹⁴ For interesting examples of nineteenth-century transatlantic *responsa*, see the 'Ritual Questions discussed in the Correspondence between Rabbi Solomon Hirschell, Chief Rabbi of the Ashkenazim in England, and Congregation B'nai Jeshurun of New York', Israel Goldstein, *A Century of Judaism in New York*, New York, 1930; Appendix A, pp. 328-29; and the question posed by Rabbi Illovy of New Orleans about circumcision of children born of mixed marriage and the response in *Der Israelit*, V, 28 December 1864, pp. 683-84. An elaboration of the discussion can be found in *Archives Israélites*, XXVI, 15 March 1865, pp. 276-77.

¹⁵ Hyman B. Grinstein, *The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York, 1654-1860*, Philadelphia, 1945, pp. 372-87. See Isaac Leeser's reaction to this ruling, *Occident*, V, May 1847, pp. 118-19.

¹⁶ See Einhorn's article, 'Noch ein Wort über gemischte Ehen', *Jewish Times*, I, 28 January 1870, p. 10. See also M. Mielziner, *The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce in Ancient and Modern Times and its Relation to the Law of the State*, New York, 1901, p. 52; also the lead article 'Ueber das Judenthum in der Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika', *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, XLIV, 13 July 1880, pp. 433-36; and the report in *Israélitische Wochenschrift*, II, 4 August 1880, pp. 277-78.

¹⁷ Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, 'Single or Triple Melting-pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940', *American Journal of Sociology*, XLIX,

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

January 1944, pp. 331-39; J. S. Slotkin, 'Jewish-Gentile Intermarriage in Chicago', *American Sociological Review*, 7, February 1942, pp. 34-39; Milton L. Barron, 'The Incidence of Jewish Intermarriage in Europe and America', *ibid.*, 11, February 1946, pp. 6-13. Compare the summary analysis of some of these studies and others by Herschel Shanks, 'Intermarriage: Facts and Trends', *Commentary*, 16, October 1953, pp. 370-75.

¹⁸ Enlarged edn., New York, 1957, p. 418.

¹⁹ Approaches to the problem varied among the Jewish religious movements, stemming from their ideological interpretations of Judaism. The Orthodox, while sensitive to family and community implications, attempted strictly to enforce *Shulhan Arukh* rulings. Appendix II includes Conservative and Reform documents reflecting the attempt to establish uniform practice among all the congregations within their respective movements. For the Conservative position, while the document is dated 1958, going beyond the chronological limits of this paper, it is included here because it described prevailing practice in the earlier decades. I am grateful to the Rabbinical Assembly for permission to study its files on the subject. See also the Report of the Law and Standards Committee in the *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly*, XVI, 1952, pp. 48-49.

For a succinct statement explaining Reform Jewish opinion, see Kaufmann Kohler, *Jewish Theology*, New York, 1918, pp. 445-46; also Solomon Freehof, *Reform Jewish Practice*, Cincinnati, 1944, pp. 60-70; and discussions in the *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, XIX, 1909, pp. 174-84 and LVII, 1947, pp. 158-84.

²⁰ See S. J. Prais and Marlana Schmool, 'Statistics of Jewish Marriages in Great Britain: 1901-1965', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, IX, No. 2, December 1967. I express my thanks to Mrs. Schmool, Research Officer at the Board of Deputies, for her help with the English archival material and other courtesies.

²¹ Originally *shtille chuppah* applied to those cases where Jews contracted marriage according to Jewish law without appropriate civil registration. See the sub-section 'Jewish Irregular Marriages', H. S. Q. Henriques, *Jewish Marriages and the English Law*, Oxford, 1909, pp. 53-54. See also Israel Finestein, 'An Aspect of

the Jews and English Marriage Law during the Emancipation: the Prohibited Degrees', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. VII, No. 1, June 1965.

²² For an authoritative historical summary, see Cecil Roth, 'The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Context of World Jewry', Julius Gould and Shaul Esh, eds., *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, London, 1964, pp. 83-110; a sociological analysis is to be found in Julius Gould, 'Changing Patterns in British Society: Their Impact on the Jewish Community', Moshe Davis, ed., *Publications of the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry* (Hebrew), First Series, Jerusalem, 1966-67.

²³ Joseph Jacobs, 'The Typical Character of Anglo-Jewish History', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, III, 1896-98, p. 141.

²⁴ London, 1891, especially pp. 3, 5, 7, 21, 53-54, and his Appendices I and IV.

²⁵ *A History of the Jews of England*, 3rd edn., Oxford, 1964, p. 171, note 2; and *A Life of Menasseh Ben Israel*, Philadelphia, 1934, pp. 236-45, and note 24, pp. 345-346. The legislation of the Mahamad and Elders of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation in London followed this policy steadfastly. In the earliest code of laws proselytization was emphatically forbidden, and several laws, involving strict penalties for transgressors, were passed to that effect over the years. These prohibitions were not confined to the Sephardi Jews. In December 1751, a new formal prohibition was passed, the contents of which were communicated to the governing bodies of the two Ashkenazi synagogues in the city. The latter responded immediately and concurred fully with their Sephardi brethren. See Albert M. Hyamson, *The Sephardim of England*, London, 1951, pp. 65-66, 173-175; also James Picciotto, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*, revised and ed. Israel Finestein, London, 1956, pp. 73-74, 179. Despite such stringent prohibitions, licence was taken by many individuals. For a traveller's report of a prevalent practice regarding children of mixed marriages in mid-eighteenth-century London, see Richard Barnett, 'The Travels of Moses Cassuto', John M. Shaftesley, ed., *Remember the Days: Essays in Honour of Cecil Roth*, Oxford, 1966, pp. 104-105; and cf. Jacob R. Marcus, *American Jewry: Documents Eighteenth Century*, Cincinnati, 1959, pp. 140-41. As background to this discussion it must be

borne in mind that in England civil marriage was established in 1837. Before that date any Jew who married a Christian could do so only in Church.

²⁶ New York, 1911, 4 pages with 4 photographs. The booklet also includes a rather curious divorce instruction in English written in Hebrew characters.

²⁷ *Jewish Chronicle*, 27 September 1907, pp. 16-17.

²⁸ Quoted in Maurice Fishberg, *The Jews: A Study in Race and Environment*, New York and Melbourne, 1911, p. 223.

²⁹ Morris Joseph, *Judaism as Creed and Life*, 4th edn., London, 1956, p. 186. Joseph's arguments on behalf of separateness are advanced as follows:

In the inevitable struggle between the diverse religions of the parents it is all but certain that the religion of the Jewish parent, since for various reasons it is the harder one to practise, will go to the wall. Let this conflict become general—in other words, let intermarriage become general—and Judaism must disappear. To forbid a union, then, between a Jew and a Gentile, when the latter has not made a solemn profession of the Jewish faith, is clearly a justifiable course, seeing that it is dictated by the most elementary instinct of self-preservation.

Particularly enlightening is Joseph's argument with H. G. Wells (ibid., note 1, pp. 184-85):

Mr. H. G. Wells, in an interesting forecast of the state of human society a century hence, says (*Anticipations*, p. 317): 'The Jew will probably lose much of his particularism, intermarry with Gentiles, and cease to be a physically distinct element in human affairs. But much of his moral tradition will, I hope, never die.' . . . But it would be interesting to learn how Jewish morality is to survive when the Jew has perished. Even Mr. Wells does not believe that the millennium will arrive with the end of the present century. So that the extinction of the Jew by intermarriage, and by other contrivances for destroying his particularism, can only be a menace to the world's higher well-being.

³⁰ Vol. LXII, September 1912, pp. 494-504.

³¹ David Daiches, *Two Worlds*, London, 1957, pp. 140-47.

³² S. J. Prais and Marlena Schmool, op. cit., p. 151:

Table 1: Jewish (synagogue) marriage rates and marriage rates of the general population

	Jewish	General
1901-10	9.9	7.8
1911-20	8.2	8.3
1921-30	8.0	7.8
1931-40	8.4	8.8

³³ Benjamin G. Sack, 'Intermarriage in Canada', *The Canadian Jewish Chronicle*, 26 March 1937. For the historical background of the period, see Sack's pioneer study *History of the Jews in Canada*, Montreal, 1965.

³⁴ *Inter-Office Information*, No. 530, 23 December 1966.

³⁵ I wish to record my debt to Mr. Louis Rosenberg not only for his many published materials but also for his generosity in making available copies of his file material for the purpose of this study. Since the statistics on the Jews in Canada are essentially those prepared by Mr. Rosenberg, it is important to emphasize that for him the terms 'intermarriage' and 'mixed marriage' are equivalent, both terms referring to marriage between a Jew and one who is a non-Jew by religion.

³⁶ Op. cit., Chapter X, 'Intermarriage', pp. 100-11, and Tables 226-31, pp. 347-50. See also David M. Heer, 'The Trend of Interfaith Marriages in Canada: 1922-1957', *American Sociological Review*, 27, April 1962, pp. 224-50; C. E. Silcox and G. M. Fisher, *Catholics, Jews and Protestants*, New York, 1934, pp. 265-71; and the two articles by Nissan [Nathan] Goldberg in *Bitzaron*, 31, pp. 126-35, 175-84.

³⁷ Information Sheet, *Canadian Jewish Congress*, I, November 1945.

³⁸ Nissan Goldberg, op. cit., p. 132.

³⁹ Philadelphia and New York, 1944, p. 11.

⁴⁰ Reprinted from *The Jewish Western Bulletin* by Congregation Shaarai Tzedek and The Vancouver Mount Scopus Group, p. 14.

⁴¹ Walter M. Lippmann, 'The Demography of Australian Jewry', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, VIII, No. 2, December 1966. See also Charles A. Price, *Jewish Settlers in Australia*, Canberra,

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

1964, p. 9. The broad statistics of Jewish population growth are summarized by Price as follows (p. 13): 'Between 1831 and 1933, some 10,500 Jewish males and 8,500 females settled in Australia (one-third being British), while the native Jewish population rose from almost nothing to slightly over 13,000. By 1954 over 12,000 males and about 12,000 females (about nine-tenths non-British) came to settle while the native population rose to some 18,500.' The 1966 census figures have not yet been published but according to a preliminary report to the Executive Council of Australian Jewry of November 1967, the 'declared' numbers are 63,271 and Lippmann's 'adjusted' figures are 69,481.

I am grateful to Mr. Lippmann for sharing with me his own findings and for his gracious help in keeping me in touch with the most recent documentation in Australia.

⁴² Max Gordon, *Jews in Van Diemen's Land*, Victoria, 1965, pp. 86-94, 117-19.

⁴³ This unclear copy from Chief Rabbi Adler's correspondence file with Australian colonies for the period 1871-1875, as well as those appearing in Appendix IV, is in the archives of the Chief Rabbinate. The records do not include the letters written to Rabbi Adler. Their significance is underscored by the fact that there is little comparable correspondence with other British colonies.

The reference (letter to Revd. A. B. Davis of Sydney in Appendix IV), to sending prospective proselytes to Holland, is an unexplored problem in English Jewish history. Whether its origin is in the non-conversion tradition, discussed above in the section on Great Britain, or in the wish to deter mixed marriage by imposing complex procedures on proselytization—or both, as seems likely—is a moot question. There are other evidences of this practice, e.g., the case of Luis de Costa cited by Picciotto (op. cit., p. 179). An illuminating reference to the relationship between Amsterdam and London is to be found in H. J. Zimmels, 'Some Decisions and Respona culled from the Minute-Book of Chief Rabbi Solomon Hirschell's Beth-Din', H. J. Zimmels, J. Rabinowitz and I. Finestein, eds., *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie*, Hebrew volume, London, 1967, p. 221. The American record offers an interesting example in the Mikveh Israel letter of 1785, published

by Jacob R. Marcus (see reference in note 25 above).

⁴⁴ *Jewish Chronicle*, 26 February 1904, p. 24.

⁴⁵ Charles Price, op. cit., p. 13. See particularly his Appendix XI, 'Jewish-Gentile Inter-marriage in Australia 1891-1933'.

⁴⁶ See the analysis of Israel Porush, 'Some Statistical Data on Australian Jewry', *The Journal and Proceedings of the Australian Jewish Historical Society*, IV, 1954, pp. 3-6.

⁴⁷ 'The President's Address', *The Hebrew Standard*, 30 August 1907, p. 5. See also *ibid.*, 27 May 1910, p. 6.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 21 September 1917, p. 8.

⁴⁹ P. Y. Medding summarizes the historical shift in the Melbourne community after 1920 in his study *From Assimilation to Group Survival*, Melbourne, 1968, pp. 1-2, 18-20, 77-80; also Walter Lippmann, op. cit. See also the latter's 'Inter-marriage in Australia', *The Bridge*, February 1966, pp. 26-27. Mr. Lippmann's comment in the subsequent issue (July, pp. 2-3) on the use of these figures is, of course, correct: 'Inter-marriage is virtually completely absent among the first generation immigrants. Consequently the gross rate hides the process of assimilation that is at work among subsequent generations.' His comment, it should be noted, was directed against possible optimistic reading of these figures for the present generation.

⁵⁰ The three best available statistical analyses are: Jewish Colonization Association, *Rapport de l'Administration Centrale au Conseil d'Administration pour l'année 1909*, Paris, 1910; Simon Weill, *Población Israelita en la República Argentina*, Buenos Aires, 1936; Ira Rosenswaik, 'The Jewish Population of Argentina: Census and Estimate, 1887-1947', *Jewish Social Studies*, XXII, October 1960, pp. 195-214.

⁵¹ Such a study is now being written by Haim Avni as a doctoral dissertation at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 'The Baron de Hirsch Colonization Project in Argentina'. I am grateful to Mr. Avni, Director of the Division for Jews in Latin America at the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, for his various suggestions and assistance with this section.

⁵² Alberto Gerchunoff, trans. Prudencia de Pereda, *The Jewish Gauchos of the Pampas*, New York, 1955. The first English

translation appeared only in 1955 after some twenty-one editions in Spanish.

⁵³ A strange situation developed in the early western European community. Henry Joseph, of English origin, served as 'rabbi' of the congregation even while being married to an observant Catholic who reared their children in her faith. For a contemporary description, see Mikhal Hacohen Sinai, 'Der Oyfikum fun Higen Yidishen Yishuv', *Argentiner YIVO-Schriften*, 5, 1952, pp. 39-44.

⁵⁴ Gerchunoff, op. cit., p. 45.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁵⁶ Ira Rosenswaike, op. cit., pp. 200-204. Compare the figures given in the JCA *Rapport* for 1909: 74,361 (19,361 in the agricultural settlements and about 55,000 in the various cities of Argentina), pp. 13, 50, 307. Simon Weill suggests 68,676 for 1909, and 130,901 for 1920, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

⁵⁷ Shaul David Sithon, *Sefer Sheelot u-Teshuvot Dibber Shaul*, Jerusalem, 1928.

⁵⁸ See Appendix V for extracts from the correspondence of Rabbi Goldman of Moisesville and Chief Rabbis Meir and Kook of Jerusalem.

⁵⁹ Sithon, op. cit., section 3, p. 11.

⁶⁰ See Israel Makaranski 'Fun Unserer Kehila-Leben', *Yarbukh fun der Yidisher Kehila in Buenos Aires 5714*, pp. 98-100, and compare the following selected sections in translation from the *Libro de Actas de la AMIA Jevra Kedescha Ashkenazi*:

29 January 1922, Folios 415-416—

W.A. . . . is married to a Catholic . . . A discussion ensues and it is resolved to call in the collector Tcach to explain personally why he went to collect dues until this date . . . and the reason he stopped collecting . . .

2 February 1922, Folio 417—

Mr. Tcach presents himself in order to declare the reason he collected from Mr. W. A., dealt with in the previous session. Mr. Tcach declares that he did not know that the person mentioned is married to a Catholic and the moment he learned of the situation he stopped collecting from him. Mr. Rubin declares that Mr. A. cannot be a member of the institution, taking into account the Statutes which allow a subsidy to the widow and children and because the Cemetery is designed for Jewish members. Mr. Kopiloff observes that there was a previous occasion on which

a Jewess married to someone of Christian origin was buried. Mr. Rubin answers that according to the documents presented he was a freethinker. Some speak in support of Mr. Rubin's view. Upon an order of the President it is resolved by a majority of members to designate two members who will meet with Mr. A. . . .

28 June 1925, Folio 202—

Letter 3058—I.S. declares that even though he has married a Christian he is a Jew and will die as such. Therefore he asks to be accepted as a member.

Mr. Besimsky confirms this declaration and quotes the decision of the Religious Commission which states: that whoever marries a Christian woman cannot be a member, but in case of death, burial must be granted him.

He is answered again that in accordance with our religious rites he cannot be accepted as a member.

29 August 1926, Folio 372—

Case of Persons Married to Christians

The President brings this case up for discussion and stresses the importance of the question on the feeling of responsibility devolving upon the Directing Committee when dealing with the death of a person who married a Christian; in this connexion he believes that it would be prudent to set up regulations in order to conform to them when such cases arise.

The next speaker is Mr. Horischnik who recalls that such cases have already been taken up for discussion on many occasions and that it has not been possible to establish regulations in view of the fact that not all the cases come up in the same form and in the same social spheres, and in the light of the correlation which they have with certain and specific families in our Society. He concluded by declaring that it would be wisest to treat each case separately, after prior consultation with some member of the Directing Committee.

Mr. Tabakman speaks, quoting in this regard biblical precepts which apply to these cases and concludes by supporting the above proposition.

A vote is taken, and the compromise proposed by Mr. Horischnik is approved.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

⁶¹ Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, op. cit., p. 187.

⁶² Zosa Szajkowski, 'Marriages, Mixed Marriages and Conversions among French Jews during the Revolution of 1789', *Historia Judaica*, XIX, April 1957, pp. 33-44.

⁶³ Diogène Tama, *Transactions of the Parisian Sanhedrim*, translated by F. D. Kirwan, London, 1807, p. 154.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 154-56. An account of the discussions is on pp. 142-48. See also Robert Anchel, *Napoléon et les Juifs*, Paris, 1928, pp. 171-72.

⁶⁵ Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, op. cit., chapter XV, 'The Political Application of Tolerance'. The author demonstrates that the seeming inconsistencies of the responses were not due to evasiveness, but 'rather the result of internal Jewish problems, and of the clash of opinions arising from them' (p. 184). Cf. Georges Wormser, *Français israélites*, Paris, 1963, p. 42.

A compact volume of edited sources with introductions has been recently published in Hebrew by Baruch Mevorach (*Napoleon u-Tekufato*, Jerusalem, 1968). There is in preparation a large collection of testimonies which reflect this revised historical view that while the assembly recognized the need for compromise in the formulation of its responses, it did not compromise fundamental Jewish practice. See Part II, pp. 77-132, particularly pp. 81-83. See also Jacob Katz's incisive quotation of Moses (Hatam) Sofer in his essay 'Contributions towards a Biography of R. Moses Sofer' (Hebrew), *Studies in Mysticism and Religion* (Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on his Seventieth Birthday), Jerusalem, 1967, p. 143.

⁶⁶ The decisions passed at the various

conferences of rabbis in Europe in the nineteenth century are quoted in *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, I, 1890-91, pp. 80-125.

⁶⁷ E. Schnurmann, *La population juive en Alsace*, Paris, 1936, p. 87. The literature often includes names of families who intermarried. See N. Samter, *Judentaufen im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1906, pp. 86-88, 90, 93; M. Fishberg, op. cit., pp. 201-202, and Szajkowski, op. cit., p. 44, note 30.

⁶⁸ E. Schnurmann, *La statistique de la population juive de Strasbourg*, Strasbourg, 1933, pp. 5-6. It is to be noted that for parts of this period Strasbourg was under German sovereignty.

⁶⁹ Cf. Samter, op. cit., p. 86.

⁷⁰ Isaac Naiditch, *Edmond de Rothschild*, trans. M. Z. Frank, Washington, D.C., 1945, pp. 22-24.

⁷¹ Brussels, 1877 and 1900, respectively. Lehman Kahn, a Belgian educator and writer, taught in Jewish schools in Germany, Alsace, and Brussels. His *Série de six lettres sur le mariage mixte* was translated into Dutch, English, and German. The brochure *Assimilation* was followed by *Conciliation* (Brussels, 1901) as a statement on the duties of Jews as religious people and citizens.

⁷² *Série de six lettres . . .*, op. cit., pp. 20, 38.

⁷³ *Assimilation*, op. cit., pp. 91-93.

⁷⁴ Georges Friedmann, *The End of the Jewish People?* Trans. Eric Mosbacher, New York, 1967; Roger Ikor, *Les eaux mêlées* (vol. II of *Les fils d'Avrom*), Paris, 1955.

⁷⁵ Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 9-11.

⁷⁶ Ikor, op. cit., pp. 312-13.

⁷⁷ Op. cit., p. 130; also pp. 127, 134, 137.

APPENDIX I

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Background studies*

- Julius Drachler, *Democracy and Assimilation: The Blending of the Immigrant Heritage*, New York, 1920.
- Maurice Fishberg, *The Jews: A Study in Race and Environment*, New York and Melbourne, 1911.
- Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, Cambridge, Mass., 1963.
- Nathan Goldberg, 'Demographic Characteristics of American Jews', Jacob Freid, ed., *Jews in the Modern World*, Vol. 2, New York, 1962, pp. 676-88.
- Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, New York, 1964.
- Oscar Janowsky, ed., *The American Jew: A Reappraisal*, Philadelphia, 1964.
- Mordecai M. Kaplan, *The Greater Judaism in the Making: A Study of the Modern Evolution of Judaism*, New York, 1957.
- Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance, Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times*, London, 1961.
- *Tradition and Crisis, Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages*, New York, 1961.
- Gerhard Lenski, *The Religious Factor*, New York, 1961.
- Jacob Lestschinsky, *The National Aspect of the Jews in Diaspora* (Hebrew), Tel Aviv, 1959.
- *Ha-pezurah ha-yehudit*, Jerusalem, 1961.
- Jacob R. Marcus, *Early American Jewry*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1951, 1953.
- Louis Rosenberg, *Canada's Jews*, Montreal, 1939.
- Arthur Rupp, *The Jews in the Modern World*, London, 1934.
- *The Jewish Fate and Future*. Trans. W. E. Dickes, London, 1940.
- C. E. Silcox and G. M. Fisher, *Catholics, Jews and Protestants*, New York, 1934.
- Diogène Tama, *Transactions of the Parisian Sanhedrim*. Trans. F. D. Kirwan, London, 1807.
- Felix A. Theilhaber, *Der Untergang der Deutschen Juden*, Munich, 1911, and Berlin, 1921.

2. *Specialized books and articles, Jewish and general*

- Milton L. Barron, *People who Intermarry; Intermarriage in a New England Industrial Community*, Syracuse, N.Y., 1946.
- Werner J. Cahnman, ed., *Intermarriage and Jewish Life, A Symposium*, New York, 1960.
- Ephraim Feldman, 'Intermarriage, Historically Considered', *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, XIX, 1909, Appendix G, pp. 271-307.
- Solomon B. Freehof and others, 'Report on Mixed Marriage and Intermarriage', *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, LVII, 1947, pp. 158-72.
- Albert I. Gordon, *Intermarriage: Interfaith, Interracial, Interethnic*, Boston, 1964.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

- Jerold S. Heiss, *Interfaith Marriage in an Urban Area*, Indiana University, Ph.D. Thesis, 1958.
- Intermarriage and the Future of the American Jew*. Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, 1965.
- Lehman Kahn, *Série de six lettres sur le mariage mixte*, Brussels, 1877.
- (L. K. Amitai, pseud.) *Assimilation*, Brussels, 1900.
- David Kirshenbaum, *Mixed Marriage and the Jewish Future*, New York, 1958.
- J. E. Mayer, *Jewish-Gentile Courtship: An Exploratory Study of a Social Process*, New York, 1961.
- Hugh O'Rourke, *Gentile-Jewish Intermarriage*, Fordham University, M.A. Thesis, 1955.
- Benjamin M. Parker, *Contemporary Intermarriage*, J.I.R. Rabbinical Thesis, 1926.
- David de Sola Pool, *Intermarriage*, New York, National Jewish Welfare Board, n.d.
- Samuel Schulman, 'Mixed Marriages in their Relation to the Jewish Religion', *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, XIX, 1909, Appendix D, pp. 308-28. Discussion, *ibid.*, pp. 328-35.
- Julius Shore 'Intermarriage—An Analysis', reprinted from *The Jewish Western Bulletin* by Congregation Shaarai Tzedek and the Vancouver Mount Scopus Group, Vancouver, Canada, 1935.
- Mendel Silber, 'Intermarriage', *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, XVIII, 1908, Appendix G, pp. 269-76.
- Zosa Sjakowski, 'Marriages, Mixed Marriages and Conversions among French Jews during the Revolution of 1789', *Historia Judaica*, XIX, April 1957, pp. 33-54.
- James Sidney Slotkin, *Jewish Intermarriage in Chicago*, University of Chicago, June 1940 (typescript).
- Malcolm Stern, 'Jewish Marriage and Intermarriage in the Federal Period (1776-1840)', *American Jewish Archives*, XIX, November, 1967, pp. 142-43.
- Leo J. Stillpass, *The Attitude of Reform Judaism toward Intermarriage*, Hebrew Union College, Rabbinical Thesis, 1943.
3. *Social science papers, Jewish and general*
- Ray Baber, 'A Study of 325 Mixed Marriages', *American Sociological Review*, 2, 1937, pp. 705-16.
- Larry D. Barnett, 'Research in Interreligious Dating and Marriage', *Marriage and Family Living*, XXIV, 1962, pp. 191-94.
- Milton L. Barron, 'The Incidence of Jewish Intermarriage in Europe and America', *American Sociological Review*, 11, February 1946, pp. 6-13.
- 'Research on Intermarriage: A Survey of Accomplishments and Prospects', *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII, November 1951, pp. 249-55.
- Stanley Brav, 'Sampling Jewish Marriage Data', *Jewish Social Studies*, X, January 1948, pp. 71-72.
- Uriah Z. Engelman, 'Intermarriage among Jews in Germany, USSR and Switzerland', *Jewish Social Studies*, II, April 1940, pp. 157-78.
- Howard E. Freedman and Gene G. Kassenbaum, 'Exogamous Dating in a Southern City', *Jewish Social Studies*, XVIII, January 1956, pp. 55-60.

- M. Ginzburg, 'Nissuei taarovet be-kanadah', *Bitfutsot ha-golah*, 6, Jerusalem, Spring 1965, pp. 34-37.
- Paul C. Glick, 'Intermarriage and Fertility Patterns among Persons in Major Religious Groups', *Eugenics Quarterly*, 7, March 1960, pp. 31-38.
- Nissan [Nathan] Goldberg, 'Nissuei taarovet be-kanadah bishnot 1926-1952', *Bitzaron*, 31, Kislev 5726, pp. 126-35.
- 'Kivvunim u-megamot be-nissuei taarovet be-kanadah', *Bitzaron*, 31, Tevet 5726, pp. 174-84.
- Sidney Goldstein, 'Mixed Marriages in the Deep South', *Reconstructionist*, 6 March 1964, pp. 15-18.
- and Calvin Goldscheider, 'Social and Demographic Aspects of Jewish Intermarriages', *Social Problems*, 13, Spring 1966, pp. 386-99.
- David Heer, 'The Trend of Interfaith Marriages in Canada: 1922-1957', *American Sociological Review*, 27, April 1962, pp. 245-50.
- Jerold S. Heiss, 'Premarital Characteristics of the Religiously Intermarried in an Urban Area', *American Sociological Review*, 25, February 1960, pp. 47-55.
- August B. Hollingshead, 'Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates', *American Sociological Review*, 15, October 1950, pp. 619-27.
- Nathan Hurwitz, 'Sixteen Jews who Intermarried', *YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science*, XIII, 1965, pp. 153-79.
- Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, 'Single or Triple Melting-pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940', *American Journal of Sociology*, XLIX, January 1944, pp. 331-39.
- 'Single or Triple Melting-pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1950', *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII, July 1952, pp. 56-59.
- Judson T. Landis, 'Marriages of Mixed and Non-Mixed Religious Faith', *American Sociological Review*, 14, June 1949, pp. 401-407.
- Maria H. and Daniel J. Levinson, 'Jews who Intermarry. Sociopsychological Bases of Ethnic Identity and Change', *YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science*, XII, 1958-59, pp. 103-30.
- Simon Marcson, 'A Theory of Intermarriage and Assimilation', *Social Forces*, 1950, pp. 75-78.
- John E. Mayer, 'Jewish-Gentile Intermarriage Patterns: A Hypothesis', *Sociology and Social Research*, 45, January 1961, pp. 188-95.
- Robert K. Merton, 'Intermarriage and the Social Structure: Fact and Theory', *Psychiatry*, 4, August 1941, pp. 361-74.
- Th. P. Monahan and W. M. Kephart, 'Divorce and Desertion by Religious and Mixed Religious Groups', *American Journal of Sociology*, LXIX, 1954, pp. 454-65.
- A. Price and J. Zubrzycki, 'The Use of Intermarriage Statistics as an Index of Assimilation', *Population Studies*, 16, 1962, pp. 58-69.
- Erich Rosenthal, 'Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States', *American Jewish Year Book*, 64, 1963, pp. 3-53.
- 'Jewish Intermarriage in Indiana', *American Jewish Year Book*, 68, 1967, pp. 243-64.
- Hershel Shanks, 'Jewish-Gentile Intermarriage: Facts and Trends; A Sociologist Summarizes Recent Studies', *Commentary*, 16, October 1953, pp. 370-75.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

- Marshall Sklare, 'Intermarriage and the Jewish Future', *Commentary*, 37, April 1964, pp. 46-52.
- J. S. Slotkin, 'Jewish-Gentile Intermarriage in Chicago', *American Sociological Review*, 7, February 1942, pp. 34-39.
- 'Adjustment in Jewish-Gentile Intermarriages', *Social Forces*, 21, December 1942, pp. 226-30.
- Clark E. Vincent, 'Interfaith Marriage', in Earl Raab, ed., *Religious Conflict in America*, Garden City, N.Y., 1964, pp. 50-59.

4. Community studies and demographic surveys

- Morris Axelrod, Floyd J. Fowler, Jr., and Arnold Gurin, *A Community Survey for Long Range Planning—A Study of the Jewish Population of Greater Boston*, Boston, 1967.
- Stanley K. Bigman, *The Jewish Population of Greater Washington in 1956*, Washington, D.C., May 1957.
- Maurice Freedman, 'The Jewish Population of Great Britain', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, IV, June 1962, pp. 92-100.
- ed., *A Minority in Britain: Social Studies of the Anglo-Jewish Community*, London, 1955.
- Sidney Goldstein, *The Greater Providence Jewish Community*, Providence, R.I., 1961.
- *A Population Survey of the Greater Springfield Jewish Community*, Springfield, Mass., 1968.
- Albert I. Gordon, *Jews in Transition*, Minneapolis, 1950.
- Julius Gould and Shaul Esh, eds., *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, London, 1964.
- Irving Louis Horowitz, 'The Jewish Community of Buenos Aires', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, IV, December 1962, pp. 147-71.
- Ernest Krausz, *Leeds Jewry*, Cambridge, 1964.
- The Lakeville Studies, 2 vols., New York and London, 1967. Vol. I, Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier*; vol. II, Benjamin B. Ringer, *The Edge of Friendliness*.
- Walter M. Lippmann, 'The Demography of Australian Jewry', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, VIII, December, 1966, pp. 213-39.
- Arnold Mandel, 'The Jews in Western Europe Today', *American Jewish Year Book*, 68, 1967, pp. 3-28.
- Fred Massarik, *A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles 1959*, Los Angeles, November 1959.
- *A Report on the Jewish Population of San Francisco, Marin County and the Peninsula, 1959*, San Francisco, November 1959.
- P. Y. Medding, *From Assimilation to Group Survival, A Political and Sociological Study of an Australian Jewish Community*, Melbourne, 1968.
- Charles A. Price, *Jewish Settlers in Australia*, Canberra, 1964.
- Rabi, *Anatomie du judaïsme français*, Paris, 1962.
- E. Schnurmann, *La statistique de la population juive de Strasbourg*, Strasbourg, 1933.
- *La population juive en Alsace*, Paris, 1936.
- Charles F. Westoff, *Population and Social Characteristics of the Jewish Community of the Camden Area 1964*, Camden, 1965.

5. *Public discussion*

- Charles Angoff, 'Intermarriage', *Jewish Spectator*, September 1959, pp. 21-24.
- Bernard J. Bamberger, 'Plain Talk about Intermarriage', *Reconstructionist*, 16 December 1949, pp. 10-14.
- 'Mixed Marriages: Some Reflections on a Debate', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, Tenth Anniversary Issue, April 1963, pp. 19-22.
- Judah Cahn, 'Intermarriage: a Threat or a Challenge to Jewish Life', *Jewish Heritage*, Summer 1963, pp. 9-11.
- 'The Rabbi, Mixed Marriages and Jewish Education', *Reconstructionist*, 19 February 1965, pp. 11-15.
- Daniel L. Davis, *Intermarriage? Some Answers to the Problem of those who may be Contemplating Intermarriage and for their Parents* (mimeographed), New York, 1965.
- Ira Eisenstein, *Intermarriage: For Jewish Parents*, Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, December 1965-January 1966.
- Abraham N. Franzblau, 'The Dynamics of Mixed Marriage', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, I, October 1954, pp. 21-25, 38.
- Edwin H. Friedman, 'New Thoughts on Mixed Marriage', *Reconstructionist*, 22 March 1963, pp. 8-13.
- N. E. Frimer, 'Chances for American Survival: Hazards of the Future', *Jewish Heritage*, Winter 1963-64, pp. 16-20.
- Albert S. Goldstein, 'The Magnetic Attraction of Mixed Mating', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, April 1964, pp. 14-20, 32.
- Albert I. Gordon, 'Intermarriage', *Rabbinical Assembly Proceedings*, XXVIII, 1964, pp. 163-72.
- Monford Harris, 'On Marrying Outside One's Existence', *Conservative Judaism*, XX, Winter 1966, pp. 61-64.
- Jacob J. Hecht, *Intermarriage*, Brooklyn, N.Y., National Committee for Furtherance of Jewish Education and Shmad Division, n.d.
- Abraham Mayer Heller, 'Mixed Marriages and the Rabbi', *Congress Bi-Weekly*, 32, 15 March 1965, pp. 7-9.
- Arthur Hertzberg, 'Answer to Intermarriage: Education', *Jewish Heritage*, Fall 1963, pp. 21-23.
- 'Chances for American Survival', *Jewish Heritage*, Winter 1963-64, pp. 12-15.
- Milton Himmelfarb, 'The Vanishing Jews', *Commentary*, 36, September 1963, pp. 249-50.
- 'Intermarriage isn't the Problem', editorial, *Jewish Life*, 31, January-February 1964, pp. 3-5.
- Richard J. Israel, 'A Note on Counseling Young People Contemplating Intermarriage', *Campus 1966: Change and Challenge*, Washington D.C., 1966, pp. 47-54.
- Immanuel Jakobovits, *The Problem of Intermarriage*. Edited transcript of the Annual Lecture of the Jewish Marriage Educational Council, 18 September 1967, London, 1968.
- Alfred Jospe, 'Intermarriage and the Jewish College Student', *Jewish Heritage*, Spring 1965, pp. 5-13.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

- 'Intermarriage and Conversion: Issues Confronting the Hillel Director', *Campus* 1966: *Change and Challenge*, Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 28-46.
- Robert L. Katz, 'A Rabbi Asks Concerning Intermarriage', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, I, April 1955, pp. 31-35 plus bibliography.
- Shmuel Koenig, 'Di Problem fun Gemishte Chosunos', *YIVO Bleter*, 33, 1949, pp. 211-16.
- Arnold Mandel, 'Marches nuptiales sur musique discordante', *L'Arche*, 118, Dec. 1966, pp. 32-35.
- Benjamin W. Melhman, 'Who is a Jew? Report on a Survey', *Reconstructionist*, 26 January 1968, pp. 7-15.
- Albert Memmi, *The Liberation of the Jew*, trans. Judy Hyun, New York, 1966, Chapters 4-7.
- Robert Misrahi and Léon Askenazi, 'Dialogue: les mariages mixtes', *L'Arche*, 118, Dec. 1966, pp. 16-31, 71, 73.
- Louis I. Newman, 'Marriage without Judaism?' *Opinion*, September-October 1951, pp. 14-16.
- Charles Plotkin, 'The Trend to Intermarriage and the Implications for the Jewish Center Movement', *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, XLI, Winter 1964, pp. 168-74.
- David Polish, 'The Problem of Intermarriage—Will Moderation Help?' *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, IX, January 1964, pp. 33-37.
- 'Reform and Intermarriage', *Liberal Judaism*, March 1947, pp. 14-17.
- Trude Weiss-Rosmarin, 'Intermarriage and Jewish Survival', *Jewish Spectator*, May 1964, pp. 3-6.

6. Works on Jewish marriage, containing sections on mixed marriage

- Stanley R. Brav, *Marriage and the Jewish Tradition*, New York, 1965.
- Roland Gittelsohn, *Consecrated unto Me*, New York, 1965.
- Sidney E. Goldstein, *The Meaning of Marriage and the Foundations of the Family*, New York, 1942.
- K. Kahana, *The Theory of Marriage in Jewish Law*, Leiden, 1966.
- Norman Lamm, *A Hedge of Roses, Jewish Insights into Marriage and Married Life*, New York, 1966.
- Morris Max, *The Jewish Concept of Marriage*, New York, 1941.
- Moses Mielziner, *The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce in Ancient and Modern Times, and its Relation to the Law of the State*, 2nd revised edn., New York, 1901.
- Rabbi's Manual*, ed. and published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, revised edn., New York, 1961.

7. Conversion literature

- P. Daykan, 'Nissuei taarovet ve-gerut', *Gesher*, 5, 1959, pp. 50-66.
- Avraham Dover Kahana-Shapira, 'Gerut ve-nissuim ezrahiim', *Talpiot*, 2, Sivan 5718, pp. 6-15.
- David Max Eichhorn, 'Conversions to Judaism by Reform and Conservative Rabbis', *Jewish Social Studies*, XVI, October 1954, pp. 299-318.
- 'A New Look at Conversion and Marriage', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, I, January 1957, pp. 10-17.

- David Max Eichhorn, ed., *Conversion to Judaism: A History and Analysis*, New York, 1966.
- Gershon Fisher, 'Toward the Creation of a Course of Study for Conversion to Reform Judaism' (Hebrew Union College, microfilm).
- Albert I. Gordon, *The Nature of Conversion*, Boston, 1967.
- Earl A. Grollman, 'Some Psychological Aspects of Conversion to Judaism', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, Tenth Anniversary Issue, April 1963, pp. 67, 80.
- Nathan Grossman, 'Should Jews Seek Proselytes?', *Jewish Information*, 4, 5724, pp. 167-72.
- Jewish Information*—Publication of the Jewish Information Society, 1960- .
- Judaism: A Manual for the Instruction of Proselytes*. Revised, Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1946.
- Sol Landau, 'Call to Conversion', *Jewish Information*, 5, 5725, pp. 209-13.
- Richard L. Rubenstein, 'Intermarriage and Conversion', *Reconstructionist*, 20 April 1962, pp. 11-21.
- Melech Schachter, 'The Problem of Conversion Today', *Jewish Life*, May-June 1965, pp. 7-18.
- Charles E. Shulman, 'Mixed Marriage, Conversion and Reality', *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, IX, January 1964, pp. 27-32.

8. *Personal documents*

- Eleanor K. Felder, 'My Child: Jew or Christian? A Mother Struggles with a Dilemma', *Commentary*, 14, September 1952, pp. 231-36.
- Richard Goldhurst, 'Growing up Between Two Worlds. Reflections of the Child of a Mixed Marriage', *Commentary*, 16, July 1953, pp. 30-35.
- Albert I. Gordon, 'Negro Jewish Marriages—Three Interviews', *Judaism*, 13, Spring 1964, pp. 164-84.
- Dan Jacobson, 'A Matter of Faith: A Memoir', *Commentary*, 37, January 1964, pp. 38-42.
- Evelyn Lauter, 'Some "Mixed Marrieds" Speak for Themselves', *National Jewish Monthly*, December 1964, pp. 14-15, and February 1965, pp. 7-8, 14.
- Emanuel Litvinoff, 'Children of Two Inheritances', *Commentary*, 15, March 1953, pp. 272-79.

9. *Fiction*

- Sholem Asch, *East River*, New York, 1946.
- Hanan J. Ayalti, *No Escape from Brooklyn*, New York, 1966.
- Herz Bergner, *Light and Shadow*, trans. from the Yiddish by Alex Braizblatt, New York, 1963.
- Myron Brinig, *Footsteps on the Stair*, New York, 1950.
- Alberto Gerchunoff, 'The Story of Miryam', in *The Jewish Gauchos of the Pampas*, trans. by Prudencio de Pereda, London and New York, 1959, pp. 69-73.
- Gwethalyn Graham, *Earth and High Heaven*, Philadelphia and New York, 1944.
- Roger Ikor, *Les eaux mêlées* (vol. 2 of *Les fils d'Avrom*), Paris, 1955.
- Dan Jacobson, *The Beginners*, London, 1966.
- Norman Katkov, *Eagle at My Eyes*, New York, 1948.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

- Ludwig Lewisohn, *The Island Within*, New York, 1928; Philadelphia, 1968.
Albert Memmi, *Strangers*, trans. Brian Rhys, London, 1958.
Philip Roth, *Letting Go*, New York, 1962.
Isaac Bashevis Singer, 'A Wedding in Brownsville', *Short Friday and Other Stories*, Philadelphia, 1965, pp. 190-206.
C. P. Snow, *The Conscience of the Rich*, London, 1958.
Muriel Spark, *The Mandelbaum Gate*, London, 1965.
Abram Stilman, *Mariette*, Toronto, 1961.
Judah Waten, *Distant Land*, London, 1965.
Jerome Weidman, *The Enemy Camp*, New York, 1958.

10. Christian views

- Bishops' Committee on Mixed Marriages, *A Factual Study of Mixed Marriages*, Washington, D.C., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943.
James H. S. Bossard and Eleanor S. Boll, *One Marriage, Two Faiths, Guidance on Interfaith Marriage*, New York, 1957.
James A. Pike, *If You Marry Outside Your Faith: Counsel on Mixed Marriages*, New York, 1954.

11. Bibliographies on mixed marriage

- Bibliography on Intermarriage—compiled by Joseph Kaplan, *In the Dispersion*, 7, Jerusalem, 1967, pp. 172-78.
Paul Glikson, 'Intermarriage: A Bibliographical Indicator', Jerusalem, January 1965 (typescript).
— 'Data on Intermarriage in Official Statistical Publications', Jerusalem, February 1965 (typescript).
Bernard Kligfeld, 'Intermarriage: A Review of the Social Science Literature on the Subject', *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, LXX, 1960, pp. 135-36.

APPENDIX IIA

INTERMARRIAGE AND MEMBERSHIP IN A CONGREGATION AS INTERPRETED BY THE LAW COMMITTEE OF THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY OF AMERICA

(Revised Version—7 February 1958)

1. A Jew who has intermarried does not cease to be a Jew. He may continue to attend synagogue services and perform other commandments of Judaism although he has violated one of the most important of all Jewish prohibitions. (Exodus 34:16; Deuteronomy 7:3.)
2. He does not cease to be a Jew, and, if his non-Jewish marriage is brought to an end he does not require a Jewish divorce.
3. It should be clearly understood that in frowning upon intermarriage and in voicing opposition to the choice of a non-Jewish mate, neither Judaism at large, nor Conservative Judaism in particular, expresses any judgment about the morality or character of these non-Jewish men and women.

4. These individuals may be fine, exceptional people. However, unless they are converted to Judaism they cannot wholeheartedly and sincerely help to preserve the Jewish religion, foster its development, and raise their children to be Jews. Children of a non-Jewish mother are not Jews.
5. Judaism is not alone in objecting to intermarriage; so does Catholicism and Protestantism. It should be noted that we feel sympathy for those Christian families whose members have intermarried with Jews and whose family unity has, consequently, been disrupted and, often, destroyed.
6. A person who has married outside of the Jewish community should not be considered a candidate for membership in a Conservative Congregation that is affiliated with the United Synagogue of America even though he applies for membership without his non-Jewish partner.

The reasons are as follows:

7. A congregation constitutes a community of Jews who band together to promote their interests and loyalties as Jews. The purposes of the congregation and these interests and loyalties are stated in its constitution, and must always be kept in mind.
8. By the very act of joining a congregation, a Jew agrees to live up to the purposes of the synagogue. He either tacitly, or, publicly declares his desire to follow the laws and regulations of the Jewish religion. Even if he does not adhere to all of the rules and traditions of our religion, by becoming a member, he, at least, recognizes their worthwhileness and importance, and wants them passed on to his children.
9. By joining a congregation he expresses a desire to strengthen Jewish family life and to raise his children in accordance with Jewish teaching. His congregation membership helps to enrich his family life as the head of a Jewish household.
10. In Judaism, the synagogue always leads back to the home, the central institution of Judaism. Husband and wife strive to create the conditions for a beautiful and harmonious relationship based upon the time-honored principles of Jewish practice which they must try to live out together to the best of their ability.
11. Unless both husband and wife are Jewish the purposes of the synagogue, and the reasons for the existence of a congregation, are defeated and destroyed from the outset.
12. Therefore, a person who has intermarried should not be admitted to membership in a congregation, even if he applies for membership singly, without his non-Jewish mate. Husband and wife, since the very beginning of time, are considered 'one flesh' and, therefore, 'one member'.
13. In refusing to accept such a person for membership, the synagogue can help him resolve the problem of his intermarriage by facing the issue squarely, and not avoiding it.
14. If the matter of affiliation is so urgent and important, the non-Jewish partner can convert to Judaism, and, become an active and honored

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

member of the congregation. The Rabbi is prepared to spend time with the non-Jewish person and convert him in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Conservative Movement's Committee On Law.

Now follow the specific cases covering this subject as interpreted by the Law Committee of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, that body that decides on matters of Jewish Law for the congregations of the Conservative Movement.

A. *The Leading Case:*

- a. If a Jew intermarries (the other party not converting) after becoming a member of the congregation—
 1. he may retain membership in the congregation.
 2. the members of his family who are not converted may not be buried in a Jewish cemetery.
 3. he should be discouraged from holding office in the congregation or be singled out for honors in the congregation.
- b. If a Jew intermarries (the other party not converting) and then or thereafter applies for membership—
 4. he should not be admitted to membership.
 5. but, he is permitted to worship with the congregation.
- c. Children of such intermarriages (a, or, b above)—
 6. who are not Jewish (if the mother remains a non-Jew) may be admitted to instruction in the congregational school, with the understanding that they will undergo the ceremony of conversion later.
 7. Such children, before conversion, may not be admitted to Bar Mitzvah, or, Bas Mitzvah, or, confirmation.
 8. Such children, before conversion, may participate in other religious functions and ceremonies with the understanding that they will undergo the ceremony of conversion later.
 9. Such children may not be married in the Jewish faith without formal conversion to Judaism.

B. *Addenda:*

10. An intermarried Jew, as defined above, may be counted to a minyan.
11. He may recite Kaddish, attend synagogue and maintain his identity with the Jewish people and religion.
12. If married by a minister or priest, and agrees to have his children brought up as Jews, he may still not be admitted to membership—(b) above being applicable—
13. Admission of a non-Jewish spouse to membership, or any non-Jew, is disapproved as contrary to public policy, although such a person may be, and may continue to be, a contributor.
14. A Jew, though married outside the faith, may be interred in a Jewish cemetery. His non-Jewish wife, and/or non-Jewish children, however, may not be interred in a Jewish cemetery.

15. While a member of the congregation, though married outside the faith, may not be deprived the opportunity of fulfilling Mitzvoth or any religious, obligation, he is not entitled to hold a position of leadership in a congregation. It is the duty of all concerned to withhold positions of leadership and honor from those who have married outside the faith.
16. It would be a mistake to permit the unconverted, non-Jewish wife to be a member of the women's organization of the congregation.

APPENDIX IIB

CCAR RESOLUTIONS ON INTERMARRIAGE

Resolved, that it is the sentiment of this Conference that a rabbi ought not to officiate at a marriage between a Jew or Jewess and a person professing a religion other than Judaism, inasmuch as such mixed marriage is prohibited by the Jewish religion and would tend to disintegrate the religion of Israel.

Anent the resolution regarding mixed marriages, your committee after mature deliberation, recommends the following expression of the sentiment of the Conference: The Central Conference of American Rabbis declares that mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should therefore be discouraged by the American Rabbinate.^a

WHEREAS, The action of the Central Conference of American Rabbis taken in 1909 to the effect that intermarriages should not be performed without conversion, is disregarded to such a degree as to lessen the authority of the Conference and of Judaism as a whole, as well as to prove embarrassing to those rabbis who abide by the Conference decision: and

WHEREAS, Varying attitudes in regard to the matter of intermarriage have arisen in recent years; therefore,

Be it Resolved, That the next Conference devote a portion of its program to a consideration of the matter of intermarriage and conversion.

Resolved, That the Executive Board be instructed to arrange a discussion, as part of the program of the next Convention, upon the problem of Reform Rabbis officiating at intermarriages, looking toward a reconsideration of our past attitude.^b

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in Convention assembled in Montreal in the year 1947, strongly reaffirmed its stand on the subject of mixed marriages adopted in 1909, as follows:

The Central Conference of American Rabbis declares that mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should therefore be discouraged by the American Rabbinate.^c

^a *Yearbook Conference of American Rabbis*, XIX, 1909, p. 170.

^b *Ibid.*, XLV, 1935, pp. 105-106.

^c *Ibid.*, LVII, 1947, p. 161.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

APPENDIX III

BETH DIN, LONDON COURT OF THE CHIEF RABBI

TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF Rosh Chodesh Nisan 5705 [1945]
GREAT BRITAIN AND THE DOMINIONS

Intermarriage is unfortunately increasing. Formerly a Jew who married an unconverted non-Jewess was looked upon by his fellow Jews as a renegade, and he, too, considered himself as such. No one classed the children of such a union as Jews, and the parents had no part or function in Jewish life. But to-day few seem to realize the confusion in family life, the chaos in regard to burial, and other lamentable complications that such a union brings in its train. Even more disturbing is the fact, recently brought to our notice, that men who have married out of the Faith have in some places a hand in the control of congregational affairs. This is clearly intolerable.

Therefore, the Chief Rabbi and his Beth Din issue the following Pronouncement:

- i. The children of a non-Jewish mother who has not been previously received into the Jewish Faith by a recognized rabbinical authority are non-Jews in every respect. In regard to a male child of such a union, circumcision alone does not alter his religious status which is still that of his mother. Accordingly, a Mohel shall not perform circumcision in such a case, so that simple folks be not led to believe that merely by that act the child becomes Jewish.
- ii. A Jew who is married to a non-Jewish woman that has not been duly admitted into the Jewish Faith is not thereby debarred from joining Jews in prayer, nor is he to be denied Jewish burial (though it cannot be granted to his non-Jewish wife and children). Such a Jew, however, shall not henceforth be eligible to membership in a congregation. If he acquired membership prior to the date of promulgation of this Pronouncement, that membership stands; but he shall not be given office. One whose wife and children are not part of the Jewish community shall have no voice or influence in the direct or indirect administration of the religious life of that community.

In the days of old, when men who had intermarried held positions of power in Jewry, and Ezra the Scribe resolved to take strong action in regard to the evil, the following was the response of the people to his appeal:

KUM KI ALEIKHA HA-DAVAR VE-ANAHNU IMKHA
HAZAK VE-ASEH

'Arise; for the matter belongeth unto thee, and we are with thee: be of good courage, and do it'. (Ezra, x, 4).

(Signed) H. H. Hertz
CHIEF RABBI
Harris M. Lazarus
I. Abramsky
I. Grunfeld
DAYANIM

MOSHE DAVIS
APPENDIX IV

Letters from Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler to the Communities in Australia

A. February 11 (Colonial) [1873]
In reply Revd. A. B. Davis, Sydney (N.S.W.)

... I beg to state that my long experience has taught me that in general these mixed marriages, even if the woman becomes a *giyyoret*, prove unhappy. It is not whether in Cromwell's time a condition had been made that we must admit no proselytes into our faith, but this I must say, that even were such not the case we ought ourselves to act as if it were and do all in our power to prevent them. For this reason, we postpone them 6 months, & afterwards, as you know we send all these cases if unpreventible [sic] to Holland. Under these circumstances I must call your attention that you must not regard having a Beth Din in Sydney a boon but quite the reverse as it will only induce young men to such marriages having every facility in their way & you would afterwards reproach yourself having asked for it. The gentlemen you mention I do not know, but I doubt very much their capacity to become Dayanim. I have therefore written today to you through [?] the B. of Management that I cannot consent to this formation of a Beth Din as they wish only to have one of the local Beth Din in Melbourne to act conjointly with you & a third to be selected by the members of such Beth Din & yourself.

B. October 7 [1874]
To the Chairman and Board of Management of the Sydney Hebrew Congregation (N.S.W. Via Southampton, Singapore, Brisbane).

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letters and thank you for having acquiesced in my views concerning the Beth Din. With reference to *giyyoret* I deeply regret that for the reasons I have mentioned in my former letters I cannot fully enter into your views to have another Beth Din in Sydney as even the one in Melbourne has been to me a source of annoyance and unpleasantness and has [sic] from its beginning would never have been established had not at that time in Melbourne been cases, where refusal to admit them in our pale was almost a crime and their reception was a positive good. Out of regard to the importance of your Congregation I have exceptionally allowed Rev. Mr. Davis and Mr. Goldreich whom you designated in your letter to be one of the Dayanim, provided that one of the Dayanim of the Victoria Beth Din viz. Mr. Hermann, Mr. Ornstein, Mr. Blaubaum of St. Kilda (and if he will not Rev. Rintel) to be the third, but only to admit *gerim* or *giyyoret* belonging to your Community, with your and my special consent. There is no doubt, that as you have the selection of these four gentlemen, that those difficulties will not be so great as you imagine them. I must repeat that I have not given such privilege to any of the congregations under my charge.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

APPENDIX V

DIBBER SHAUL*

Responsum 2

(Said the author: I sent my decision to Rabbi Aharon Halevi Goldman and kept no copy of it for myself; my opinion, however, was restated in his responsum to me, and thus he wrote to me:)

To the most worthy and learned Rabbi etc., my beloved and esteemed friend . . . our master and teacher Rabbi Shaul Sithon . . .

I received your fervent and impassioned words, reflecting the glow of the fiery law. I was stunned and shocked by the dreadful report on the state of affairs in the land, the shameful situation of those men who have thrown off the yoke of Heaven. They have taken to themselves foreign wives and have begotten with them children. Then, to cover up their hasty actions, they wish to have them accepted by the community as converts to Judaism that they may be included in the Congregation of Israel. Reading your description I became excited and frightened. I was previously consulted on a similar state of affairs in Paraguay, Entre Rios and elsewhere. I responded to them at length. Heaven forbid we do such things which are prohibited by the teachings of our holy Torah.

From the references to the halakhic sources which we presented on the question in point it will be evident that . . . in consequence of their trespasses they put themselves outside of the community and attach themselves to something akin to idolatry . . . Who will be so gullible as to trust their motives, since all their gestures and demands of conversion are nothing but an attempt of whitewashing and irresponsibility, in order to obtain religious sanction. . . .

In summing up all the arguments we issue a strict warning to these uncontrolled persons lest they think that by simply pronouncing the marriage formula 'Be thou betrothed unto me in keeping with the traditions of Moses and Israel', over an alien woman, or by just removing the preputial stigma from their alien children they have introduced and initiated them into the covenant of Israel . . .

However, if the gentile adult or these children, when they grow up, will come before us, and in complete sincerity and out of their own free will seek admission to Judaism without any ulterior motive, and only after each case has been properly investigated by a duly qualified rabbinical court, we shall not reject them.

These unprincipled offenders, however, call for stern measures; we are impelled to restrict them all around, to reinforce the fence within and without, to keep them at a distance from us and from our sacred institutions. Neither they nor their like shall constitute the Congregation of Jacob.

We have learned a bitter lesson from our history. See what happened to the brood of such misalliances in the days of our expulsion from Spain: it was these alien children who were the first to turn against their natural fathers, to torture them and to spill their blood, as is recorded in the gory annals of the Jews in Spain.

May the Almighty raise our fortune; may He cleanse and refine our

* See p. 190 above and note 57.

MOSHE DAVIS

communities, as promised in the prophetic vision (Zechariah 13, 9): I will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried.

Looking forward to the raising of the Torah standard, I remain your admirer and friend,

Aharon Halevi Goldman
of Moisesville.

After all the truth and justice stated above, I herewith appeal to my dear friends of the Sephardi Community, may the good graces of the Lord abide with them:

Harken to the word of the Almighty all of you who care for His message, the elite whom the divine appeal reaches. Be worthy of the nobility which is the essence of your Sephardi patrimony; you are the scions of the brightest Torah luminaries, splendour is your pride and fame throughout the generations: Solomon ibn Gabirol, Abraham ibn Ezra, Yehuda Halevi, Maimonides, Don Isaac Abarbanel, Hizkiah di Silva, Hayim Yoseph, David Azulai, and many, many others whom I could list, names which make our heart rejoice, which brighten our eyes in the sombre gloom of our Diaspora—to them we owe to a large extent the brilliant authority of the Torah. In keeping with this glorious tradition I appeal to you: be strong and of good courage, remain steadfast to maintain the authority of your most respected and honoured rabbi, the learned and wise *Rabbi Shaul Sithon*, may he enjoy a good long life. Support unreservedly his noble efforts to stem the disastrous tide of assimilation threatening to engulf our people, particularly his endeavours to keep out the alien women who are being introduced into the community under the guise of pious modesty without any sincere intention to become truly Jewish . . . You know, my dear brethren, that family purity is the true emblem of Judaism, that the observance of the traditional discipline in matters of sex has always distinguished the daughters of Israel. The maintenance of this tradition ensured our survival throughout the lands of our dispersion. But for our dedication to these sacred institutions we should have perished long ago as a distinct people, we should have been absorbed by the gentiles, and the name of Israel would, God forbid, have been blotted out and forgotten. All who have strayed from the Jewish way of life, venturing into alien fields, and thus betraying original responsibility, have faded out of Jewish life and have been lost, little by little, in the alien world of the gentiles, without leaving a trace. Anyone who cares to study Jewish history can convince himself of this tragic truth. This holds not only for our own nation, but for greater and mightier nations who have lost their identity by assimilation, whereas we have stood up against this trend, and therefore stand upright.

Hence I appeal to you, people chosen by God, to steel yourselves; be strong for the sake of Israel and for the sake of our holy Torah; guard the foundations of our religion and you will be assured of divine assistance. I bless you in the hope and trust that you will take my words to heart, for the honour of the holy Torah, and for the honour of Israel, and pray for your peace and welfare.

Aharon Halevi Goldman
Teacher of Righteousness
at Moisesville.

MIXED MARRIAGE IN WESTERN JEWRY

Approbations of Rabbi Sithon's Injunction by the Chief Rabbis of the Holy Land

Blessings of Peace from the Holy Land upon the well-learned and God-fearing guardian of the divine vineyard, the esteemed Rabbi Shaul Sithon, Shepherd of our Sephardi brethren in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Approbation I

Of Rabbi Yaakov Meir
Chief Rabbi of Eretz Israel,
the Rishon Letzion, and
President of the Chief Rabbinate, Jerusalem
Addar 2, 5688 (1928).

To the Hon. Mr. Moshe Ha-Kohen,
Director, Benai Emmeth Society and the
Hon. Mr. Joseph Tufik, Secretary.

Peace upon you, my dear brethren.

In reply to your letter of Shevat 4, I should like respectfully to respond, on the basis of the authority of the esteemed local rabbi in his enlightening volume *Dibber Shaul*. He found ample warrant—in that permissive environment—to prohibit the admission of converts and the circumcision of children born of a gentile. His own resolution is not reported there, but I can clearly infer it from the approbations of the rabbis cited there.

In the light of this situation he has instituted the restriction, and who will presume to doubt the wisdom of his decision? On the contrary; his enactment warrants the acceptance and binding force of any traditional enactment, like any *Halakhah* related to Moses from Sinai. He deserves all the support and encouragement due to all who promote the cause of the Torah . . .

Respectfully yours,
Ha-Tsevi Yaakov Meir S.T.

Approbation II

Rabbi Avraham Yitzhak Ha-kohen Kook,
Chief Rabbi of Eretz Israel
President, Rabbinical Court of Jerusalem
Nissan 9, 5688 (1928).

Blessings of Peace with abundant Love.

I acknowledge the receipt of your letter accompanying your book *Dibber Shaul*, which make manifest the responsible deliberations of wise counsellors for devising a truthful enactment bound to remove a stumbling block from the right path of our people. It concerns the problem of unwarranted admission of converts . . . If the applicants seek admission in a sustained effort, we would, of course, accept them, provided that we know them well enough to determine if their motive is pure and pious. Those, however, who admit converts whose ulterior motive is material gain or personal gratification, will only bring misfortune unto themselves and to others. Their rash admission . . . will cause the growth of thorns and thistles in the vineyard of Israel . . .

MOSHE DAVIS

You and your worthy colleagues have done well in enacting this restriction against the danger of sham conversions by outlawing the admission of converts in your country . . . Anyone who seeks truly to be converted to Judaism, may apply to the rabbinical courts of Holy Jerusalem, where a thorough investigation will be conducted in each case . . . Thus we shall ensure the admissibility of genuine converts who seek in all sincerity and with committed conviction to come under the wings of the *Shekhinah* and to enter the covenant.

May you all be granted the blessing which you deserve for standing vigilantly on guard to maintain our sacred institutions and to fend off any destructive intrusion and desecration.

I herewith join all who have approved of your enactment in Argentina and bless you from the Holy Mount of Jerusalem.

Avraham Yitzhak Ha-kohen Kook.

○

TWO MINORITIES: THE JEWS OF POLAND AND THE CHINESE OF THE PHILIPPINES

D. Stanley Eitzen

THE universal problem of majority-minority group relations has been the focus of much research. Most studies of this phenomenon have dealt with the groups within a particular society or with a particular group that faces prejudice and discrimination in many societies. The literature comparing different minorities cross-culturally is generally lacking. Since, as Schermerhorn has pointed out, there are underlying features of the minority situation which can be universally found,¹ cross-cultural comparison of different minorities must be used to find them. The problem for this study is to compare two different minorities in two *diverse* cultural settings. Such a comparison is necessary if we are eventually to develop generalizations about majority-minority relations which hold up cross-culturally.

Several writers have pointed to the many parallels between the Jews in Europe and the Chinese in Southeast Asia.² Wertheim in his essay on the trading minorities of Southeast Asia, for example, finds similarities between these two minorities in their refusal to assimilate into the dominant culture, their similar occupational interests, their being objects of commercial jealousy, and the similarity in the stereotypes of each group held by members of the majority.³ It would seem appropriate, then, to compare these two minorities to ascertain whether similarities in majority-minority relations can be found in diverse cultural settings. With this in mind, the countries selected for this study are Poland and the Philippines. These two countries have three basic things in common: (1) a history of outside domination; (2) a predominantly Catholic population; and (3) a minority 'problem'—the Jews in Poland and the Chinese in the Philippines.⁴

The basic questions I seek to answer in this study are as follows. In what ways are the historical factors parallel? To what degree has each minority responded similarly to acts of cruelty and repression? Are there common reasons for the anti-minority phenomenon in these two countries?

It is *not* assumed that the two cases to be examined are alike in all

respects. The prejudice and discrimination against any group can only be explained by the combination of social, cultural, historical, and economic factors unique to that group in its particular setting. There are, however, striking similarities between the Jews of Poland and the Chinese of the Philippines. It is hoped that the examination of these parallel groups—their economic and social situation, the configuration of historical forces, their group reactions to the discrimination of the majority, and the common reasons for their being victims of discrimination—will have broader implications for the understanding of majority-minority group relations everywhere.

I. THE CHINESE IN THE PHILIPPINES

Archaeological research has produced evidence of 'Chinese' inhabiting the Philippines as early as 5,000 years ago, but little information is available about the early Chinese settlements even as late as 1200 C.E. It has been established that during the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) a rather large trade was carried on between the Philippines and China. During this period the eastern route of the Chinese junk trading system was established; this meant that Chinese junks passed periodically through the western side of the Philippine Archipelago. Thus, several areas in the Philippines enjoyed regular commercial and cultural contact with the Chinese. In connexion with this trade some Chinese merchants and craftsmen settled in the Philippines. According to Edgar Wickberg, nothing is known about how these early Chinese settlers may have fitted into the economic and social life of their host culture.⁵

The Spanish era (1571-1898)

When the Spanish took control of the Philippines, the few Chinese residents were not considered a problem. The Spanish initially welcomed Chinese immigration because of the skills, energy, and capital resources of the newcomers. Most importantly, the Chinese provided needed commercial enterprises and services; they became the country's commercial and skilled artisan classes, filling the void between the Spanish and the mass of Filipino natives.

The Spanish soon, however, became fearful and suspicious of the potential economic power and the increasing numbers of the Chinese. This distrust led them in 1581 to force the Chinese to live in a segregated settlement (Parian) outside the walls of Manila; a strict curfew was enforced to keep all Chinese out of Manila after 8 p.m.⁶

The Chinese posed a special dilemma to the Spanish which is faced even today by the Philippine Government. On the one hand, the Chinese were considered a menace because of their control of trade and credit, control of certain products and services, and the drain of Spanish gold. On the other hand, the Spanish desperately needed the many

TWO MINORITIES

services provided by the immigrants and their trading ties with other Chinese throughout Asia. Consequently, their policy towards the Chinese vacillated between encouragement and repression, with the stress on the latter. Examples of repressive actions by the Spanish were:

1. the deportation of 12,000 Chinese in 1596;
2. the killing of 23,000 in the revolt of 1603;
3. the killing of another 23,000 in the revolt of 1639; this revolt happened when the Chinese were required to pay a special tribute to the King for the privilege of living in the Islands;
4. the killing of 20,000 in the revolt of 1662;
5. the expulsion of all non-Christian Chinese in 1755; this resulted in many Chinese being quickly baptized as Catholics;⁷
6. the killing of 6,000 Chinese in 1764 for siding with the English;
7. the levying of special taxes in 1823 which caused 800 Chinese to return to China, 1,083 to flee to the mountains, and the jailing of 453.

According to Edgar Wickberg, it is especially important to examine the later part of the Spanish era (1850–1898) for the economic and social origins of the present-day anti-Chinese policies.⁸ Wickberg argues that before 1850 the Chinese were a problem for the Spanish, not for the Filipinos. This is because there were few Chinese, and in the activities they engaged in they competed with the Spanish, not the Filipinos. Furthermore, the Chinese were segregated and few Filipinos had actual contact with them. After 1850, however, the Spanish liberalized immigration policies which resulted in the number of Chinese growing from 8,000 in 1850 to 100,000 in 1885. This period also found the Chinese scattering into all the provinces instead of concentrating in the large cities as before. During this period the Chinese

1. acted as wholesalers and retailers of imported goods in all the provinces;
2. became processors of Philippine agricultural products;
3. gained virtual control of hemp, tobacco, and rice;
4. established import-export firms with agents in all the provinces.

Thus, for the first time, the Chinese came into contact with virtually everyone in the Islands. Furthermore, they competed so successfully that great numbers of native Filipinos were driven out of business and into agriculture or other economic pursuits. This resulted in an anti-Chinese movement which was an expression not of Spanish fears alone but also of Filipino economic interest.

The American era (1898–1946)

The Chinese exclusion policy of the United States was extended to the Philippines when that country came under American control. This

policy did not deter Chinese immigration, however, since dependants of the local Chinese were allowed to enter the country. In addition, there were numbers of Chinese who entered illegally. The Chinese benefited during this period from lowered taxes and the privilege of being in business. By 1932 they conducted 70 to 80 per cent of all the retail trade and a large percentage of internal commerce. Furthermore, Chinese commercial and credit systems covered virtually every business and reached from Manila to all parts of the Philippines.

During this period there was a widespread feeling of hostility towards the Chinese. It was manifested in sporadic Filipino risings against them and in repressive measures taken by the Philippine legislature. An example of such a measure was the Bookkeeping Act of 1921, which required every merchant in the country to keep accounts of his business in English, Spanish, and a local language. The Chinese community fought the measure and took its appeal to the United States Supreme Court, which declared the act unconstitutional. But the Philippine Legislature passed amended laws to a similar effect. The net effect of this and other repressive measures was an increase in the Filipino participation in retail trade from 20 to 37 per cent from 1935 to 1939.

By the end of the American era there was widespread hatred and hostility directed towards the Chinese. The Filipinos generally believed the Chinese to be guilty of unethical business practices, charging exorbitant interest rates, monopolizing trade, controlling politicians through bribery, drawing off capital from the country by contributing to Nationalist China or sending money to relatives elsewhere, and circumventing the law at every opportunity.

Repressive measures since Independence

Since Independence in 1946, the Philippine Government, with nationalistic fervour, has adopted a policy of legislating the Chinese out of the retail trade. Since 1946 many laws have been passed directed at aliens (Chinese). The following are examples of these legislative curbs.

1. It is now most difficult to become a citizen of the Philippines. Some of the requirements are 10 years' residence; clearance from the National Bureau of Investigation and police and health authorities; ability to read and write fluent English or Spanish and a native language; a favourable court hearing; and an additional waiting period of two years without leaving the country. The cost of the citizenship process is 5,000 pesos and additional money for bribes if the applicant is known to have wealth.⁹
2. There are special taxes on aliens.
3. Professional opportunities are closed off to aliens (except doctors and nurses).

TWO MINORITIES

4. Aliens are not allowed to acquire, except through inheritance, forest, mineral, and agricultural lands.
5. Filipinos in certain businesses are exempt from taxes.
6. The Nationalization of Retail Trade Act of 1954 provided that:¹⁰
 - a. All present alien proprietors may retain their holdings.
 - b. Businesses cannot be passed to heirs if they are also aliens, with a proviso that the property must be liquidated within six months of the original proprietor's death.
 - c. No new licences for retail establishments may be issued to aliens.
 - d. Any violation of any law governing trade, industry, and commerce will result in immediate revocation of the alien's licence to engage in retail trade.
 - e. Corporations will be allowed ten years from the bill's enactment to liquidate, unless they are 100 per cent Filipino-owned.
7. The Rice and Corn Nationalization Act of 1960 required that aliens in the cereal industry must pull out of that business within three years. This would place all parts of the industry (planting, milling, warehousing, marketing, etc.) in the hands of native-born Filipinos.
8. Other measures prevent Chinese from buying land, eliminate them from city-owned markets, and hamper import-export activity.

II. THE JEWS IN POLAND

Polish Jewry from the tenth century to 1795

In the tenth century Jews began residing in the area now known as Poland. The stream of Jewish migration to this area increased following the persecutions of the First Crusade (1098). At first the Jews were welcomed in Poland, for there was a need for a commercial class. The population of Poland previously consisted of two classes—the nobles, who owned the soil, and the serfs, who tilled it. The Jews migrating to Poland brought their skills as craftsmen, middlemen, innkeepers, moneylenders, and merchants. Such enterprise was needed to develop the country and its natural resources, and the nobles therefore encouraged the coming of the Jews.

Before the fourteenth century the chief disseminator of antisemitism in Poland was the Catholic Church, which was fearful of the possible influence by Jews on Christians. The Church fought for segregation of the Jews and incited the faithful to hate and abuse them for desecration of holy objects. The following are instances of the overt persecution of the Jews by the Church.¹¹

1. In 1399 the Rabbi and 13 elders of a Jewish community were roasted alive for allegedly desecrating three hosts from the Dominican Church.

2. 'In 1407, at Easter time, a priest at Cracow made a public announcement of a rumor that the Jews had slain a Christian child. The Jewish quarter was immediately attacked, many Jews were killed and their children baptized, property was looted and dwellings were set on fire.'¹²
3. In 1556 a rumour spread that Jews of Sochaczew had procured a sacred wafer and desecrated it by stabbing it until it bled. Three Jews were burned at the stake for this crime.

By 1350 the Polish merchant class became strong enough to struggle against their Jewish competitors, but the Polish merchants found it difficult to compete with the Jews. Jewish merchants were quick to seize economic opportunities and to find loopholes in the restrictive laws; they could practise usury which was forbidden to Catholics; they had contacts with Jewish merchants in other cities, they engaged in practices frowned upon by the other town business men (e.g., Jews went to the homes of customers to solicit orders); and in trades where there were no restrictions, such as the garment industry, the Jews developed virtual monopolies.

Another area in which Jewish competition caused resentment was that of handicrafts. The Jews were in direct competition with Christian tailors, furriers, hatmakers, and goldsmiths. Since the Jews were excluded from the craft guilds, they '... started the production of standard articles for sale and thus they became the promoters of the capitalistic commercialization process of industry in Poland.'¹³ The Polish artisans also had reason for their hostility to the Jewish merchants: they had monopoly control over the trade in raw materials needed by artisans (e.g., skins and furs) and they imported commodities from the outside which undersold the articles produced by Polish artisans.

Restrictive legislation against the Jews was encouraged by Polish merchants and artisans.

1. The Piotrkov Diet of 1521 passed a law confining the trade of the Jews in Lemberg to wax, furs, cloth, and horned cattle.
2. In 1556 at Posen, '... the limits of the ghetto were strictly defined; only 49 houses were allowed to the Jews, so that it became necessary to raise the height of many dwellings by additional stories. The magistracy of Warsaw refused to admit Jewish settlers, and Jewish merchants, visiting the city on business, could only tarry not longer than two or three days.'¹⁴
3. In 1643 the Diet fixed the rate of profit at 7 per cent for native Christian traders, 5 per cent for foreigners, and only 3 per cent for Jews.
4. Generally, the Jews were not allowed to own agricultural lands, were excluded from certain occupations and all guilds, were forced to

TWO MINORITIES

live in segregated areas of the city, and were required to wear a distinctive headdress.

The Jews were further disliked because of the work they did for the nobles and princes. They served as financial agents for the princes, leased and administered crown domains and estates of the gentry, and often worked as tax collectors.

In summary, the Jews became the objects of discrimination by most elements of Polish society during this early period.

The Church, of course, was always inimical to the presence of the Jews in the country; the burghers saw in them undesirable competitors; the overburdened peasantry had no love for the exploiting nobles or their Jewish agents. The kings and the gentry, in conflict with one another, found the Jews useful as sources of revenue or as creators of their wealth.¹⁵

The extent of antisemitic feeling in Poland was evidenced when, following the Black Death, about 10,000 Jews were slain there for supposedly being connected with that disaster.¹⁶

The period from Polish Partition (1795) to the First World War

When Poland was partitioned, Polish Jewry came under the rule of three separate powers—Russia, Austria, and Prussia. The policies towards the Jews were generally the same under these three different political systems and were a continuation of the earlier antisemitic policies in Poland. There were restrictions on marriage, special taxes for the Jews, some expulsion, curtailment of business, and attempts to limit the power and rights of Jewish self-government.

In 1817 the Czar's representative to Poland proposed that the Jews be granted civil rights if they became farmers, discontinued their communal separateness, and changed their system of education. The Polish members of the Council answered: 'Let them first become Poles.'¹⁷ This cry points to a frequent criticism of the Jews (which we shall explore later in this paper)—their refusal to assimilate.

Poland between the World Wars

Following the First World War, Poland became independent. By 1921 the Jewish population of Poland was 2,854,364 (10.5 per cent of the total population). Again, as in the past, there were pogroms, mob outrages, and restrictive legislation directed against the Jews. They were forbidden to acquire land and forced to pay special taxes; many Jews were refused citizenship; Jews were eliminated from the match, tobacco, and salt productives, and the Sunday Rest Law (1920) caused serious economic hardship to the Jews who closed their stores and workshops on Saturday. As a result, the ratio of Jews employed in trade fell from 61.8 per cent in 1921 to 52.7 per cent in 1937.¹⁸ However, Jews continued to play an important role in the crafts: 'Eighty per cent of

the tailors, 40 per cent of the shoemakers, 25 per cent of the butchers and bakers, and 75 per cent of the barbers in Poland were Jews.¹⁹

As was customary with the Jews throughout their settlement in Poland, they insisted upon minority rights, and this was regarded by the Poles as proof of their lack of patriotism.²⁰

The Second World War

The story of the German treatment of the Jews is infamous. Weinryb divides German policy towards the Jews into three stages:²¹

1. The early period of anti-Jewish decrees, looting, pogroms, etc. (1939-1940).
2. The ghetto period, ending with the outbreak of the German-Russian War (1940-1941).
3. The period of planned extermination (1941-1945).

Most of the nearly three million Polish Jews and approximately one million other Jews brought to Poland from elsewhere were killed in the Polish death camps. At the time of liberation only 50,000 had survived.²²

Communist Poland

The Jews returning from the concentration camps did not receive a pleasant welcome from their non-Jewish neighbours. In many places there was an immediate wave of terror. 'In March, 1945, alone, 150 Jews were killed.'²³ This was a consequence of the fear of competition in an already impoverished land as well as of the rise of Polish nationalism.

Despite their hardships the Jews made a remarkable recovery. Since they found it dangerous to compete with Polish pedlars and shopkeepers, and the Communist ideology scarcely favoured private enterprise, they formed Jewish co-operatives, particularly in the tailoring, shoemaking, and other traditional Jewish crafts. From 1946 to 1948 the number of Jewish co-operatives increased from 13 to 203.²⁴

The Jewish population in Poland has fluctuated widely since the War. Many Jews migrated to Poland and many more left. 'Between 1948 and 1958 approximately 140,500 Jews left Poland for Israel.'²⁵ In 1945 the Jewish population was 50,000, by 1955 it had grown to 75,000, and now it has stabilized at about 35,000.

Currently, the formal policy of the government is to halt antisemitic practices,* but this has been ineffective for the most part. According to Lucjan Blit there are elements in the government that use antisemitism to their advantage. '... antisemitism is being deliberately exploited by the pro-Moscow minority in the Polish Party . . .'²⁶

Leon Shapiro for the last several years has summarized the Jewish

* This paper does not take account of recent developments in Poland.

TWO MINORITIES

community activities and antisemitic practices in Poland in the *American Jewish Year Book*. He stated that in 1958 antisemitism manifested itself in many ways.

... in a number of instances Jews were eliminated from their jobs in government and industry, and there were many cases of physical attacks on individual Jews; Jewish children were abused and attacked in schools and on the streets.²⁷

Again in 1963, Shapiro writes,

... there was no overt antisemitism, but widespread prejudices among all classes of the Polish population created considerable difficulties for Jews, particularly those residing in small towns and looking for jobs or other economic opportunities.²⁸

THE MINORITY RESPONSE TO MAJORITY HOSTILITY

I. *The Chinese in the Philippines*

Various social distance scales have demonstrated the anti-Chinese attitudes held by most Filipinos.²⁹ Antipathy towards the Chinese is based on the belief that this minority controls the economy, engages in illegal activities (e.g., bribery and circumventing the law), is clannish, and owes its allegiance elsewhere. While these charges are true to a certain extent,³⁰ the characteristics of the Chinese in the Philippines can be attributed, at least in part, to the effects of discriminatory acts directed against them by the dominant group.

The effects of restrictive legislation. The Filipinos as a group resent the economic role of the Chinese. Yet Philippine law has had the effect of actually forcing the Chinese into trade since the Chinese have been barred from owning land, controlling natural resources, and joining the professions.³¹

After forcing virtually all the Chinese into trade, the government has imposed heavy restrictions which will eventually wrest this means of livelihood from them. Hartendorp suggests that from 1948 to 1957 Chinese control of the import trade has decreased by 25 per cent and their participation in export trade has decreased by 4 per cent.³²

Legislation against the Chinese compels them to resort to illegal measures. One common technique used to offset the Nationalization of Retail Trade Act was for Chinese men to marry Filipinas and put the business in their wife's name. Bateria suggests that different groups of Chinese financially support different political parties and candidates in order to ensure that their economic investments will be protected regardless of the election's outcome.³³ Furthermore, in order to stay in business, the Chinese must bribe officials who issue licences, assess taxes, give citizenship, and make the laws. Bribery, of course, is a 'two-way street'—an offer and an acceptance of favours; both parties must

share the guilt. Several authors have suggested that legislators often introduce discriminatory bills only to get the bribes which the Chinese then offer for killing the measures.³⁴

The Chinese, to survive, must be ingenious and devious. They must use illegal methods to bypass discriminatory legislation.

In the Philippines, Christian Filipinos have made the Chinese what they are, the objects of Christian complaints, the object of Christian acts of repression. If Chinese businessmen hurt Filipino businessmen, that is not right—but who hurt whom first? Who is the villain? The reconciliation of the two peoples should be the aim of legislation, not their further alienation.³⁵

Organization of the Chinese community. Two common complaints against the Chinese are about their clannishness and lack of loyalty to the Philippine Government. The discriminatory actions of the government and individual Filipinos have forced segregation of the Chinese and caused them to seek stability and protection from their own group and institutions. Chinese business organizations are an especially good example.

Perhaps the most important single group to a Chinese business man is the local Chinese Chamber of Commerce. Each Chamber of Commerce provides a forum for discussion, collects and disseminates information about trade conditions, investigates and guarantees the credentials of Chinese business men, settles disputes, conducts research, provides machinery for group action, and acts as a lobby and pressure group to promote the interests of the Chinese in their dealings with the Philippine government officials. Money is collected through the local Chamber for charity work, hospitals, cemeteries, social clubs, and especially the financing of Chinese schools. Chinese business men also seek protection through such trade organizations as the Philippine Chinese Hardware Association, Chinese Groceries Association, and the Philippine Manila Chinese Sari Sari Store Association. At present the larger trade associations and 120 Chambers of Commerce are united in the Federation of Chinese Chambers of Commerce to present a single cohesive front and facilitate business contacts in all the provinces.

In order to perpetuate strong in-group ties, the Chinese have placed strong emphasis on educating their children in Chinese schools. At present there are in the country about 160 Chinese elementary and secondary schools with 52,400 pupils. There are two curricula in these schools: one based on the standard course found in Philippine public schools and the second stressing Chinese language and culture. The real function of the Chinese school system is to keep the child Chinese and thus to reduce the assimilation process. 'The admitted ideal of the schools maintained by the Chinese communities for its own children is to form good Chinese *citizens* and good Philippine *residents*.'³⁶

TWO MINORITIES

Through business organizations, family ties, fraternal associations, and the educational system, the Chinese remain a tightly knit group resistant to the pressures of assimilation into the dominant culture.³⁷

While he maintains relationships with these groups, the Chinese man is assured both comradeship and economic aid; if he separates from them, he is on his own in an area which is rather unfriendly to members of his ethnic group.³⁸

We see a common phenomenon in intergroup relations where the minority group is the target of discriminatory acts. These acts have the effect of forcing the minority group to take defensive attitudes and measures, which in turn draw increased criticism by reinforcing the stereotypes of that group. Thus, further discrimination appears justified.

II. *The Jews in Poland*

Generally, the Jews of Poland have experienced the same type of discriminatory acts as the Chinese in the Philippines: they were prohibited from owning land, forced into urban ghettos, excluded from certain occupations, and restricted in their activities.

The response of the Jews to these acts was also similar to that of the Chinese. They gravitated to certain occupations left open to them (eventually gaining monopolies in many of them), found loopholes in restrictive laws, used bribery and other illegal acts, and bound themselves into a tightly knit community for defence and welfare.

Community organization. From the beginning, Polish Jews were voluntarily organized into communities which centred on the synagogue and cemetery. In 1264 a charter was drawn up giving the Jews the right of local self-government. Although advantageous to the Jewish community, this served to separate them further from local citizens and foster more hostility.³⁹

In time, a system of strong community organization developed. By the sixteenth century each Jewish community in Poland was organized in an association called the *Kehilla*. This association of all Jews within the city limits maintained the local synagogue, set regulations, provided for education, gave economic assistance, and acted as judges in disputes. The underlying reason for a separate Jewish community organization was the necessity of group solidarity for defence against aggression from without, as well as for the improvement of the moral and religious life of the community within.⁴⁰

By 1600, the local *Kehillot* were joined into regional organizations and a national organization, The Council of Four Lands. This Council was the supreme legislative, judicial, and executive body of Polish Jewry. It defended Jews in court, watched over Jewish interests in the Polish Diet, provided rules and curricula for Jewish schools, and sought to

prevent friction between the government and the Jewish population. In addition, the organization wanted to ensure proper conduct by Jews so as not to raise the ire of others.⁴¹

In 1764 the Council of Four Lands was dissolved by the Polish Diet. The Jewish communities under the local synagogue councils continued to fulfil the functions carried out earlier by the *Kehilla* system. By this time, more and more emphasis was placed on the welfare functions of the community organization (e.g., free loans, public health, and credit co-operatives).

After the First World War another type of organization was formed. Jewish economic associations for merchants and artisans and trade unions were organized to consolidate the power of the Jews in a particular occupation.

After the Second World War Polish Jews again found it essential to organize. The Central Committee for Polish Jews was formed to carry on relief and welfare work and to reconstruct the Jewish community councils. The central Jewish organization is the Union of Religious Communities which supervises the network of schools, children's homes, and welfare institutions. A third contemporary national organization is the Cultural and Social Union of Polish Jews which attempts to revitalize Jewish cultural activities. In 1965, for example, this organization had over 100 projects (choral groups, dance groups, dramatic groups, etc.), the purpose of which was to stress Jewish tradition.⁴²

Thus, throughout the history of Polish Jewry, this minority has banded together for protection and welfare. To ensure the continued solidarity of the group, the young must be taught the importance and uniqueness of their heritage, religion, language, and way of life. Consequently, formal education in Jewish schools has always been stressed. The avowed purpose of these schools is to preserve the Jewish cultural and linguistic heritage, thereby preventing assimilation.

Traditionally, scholarship has been highly prized among the Jews. This emphasis has been a unique feature of Jewish reaction to prejudice and discrimination. The result has been a disproportionately large number of Jewish scholars, scientists, and academicians.

The cultural traditions of Judaism, the community solidarity (in important measure a result of discrimination), a high individual desire for achievement (again, in part a result of discrimination), the intellectual alertness which come from the marginal position of membership in two cultures—these and other factors have encouraged high achievement.⁴³

In summary, throughout the history of Polish Jewry the typical reaction of the group to the unfriendly environment was to close ranks and become more conscious of internal ties. Hence, the criticism arises that the Jews are Jews first and Poles second. In one sense the Jews separated themselves from the dominant culture voluntarily—they

TWO MINORITIES

desired to cling to their traditional ways. In another sense the Jews were physically separated by ecological, occupational, and social restrictions.

The separateness of the Jewish community, then, is a consequence of the actions of the majority and the response to these actions by the minority. ' . . . the positive pull of Jewish culture and the negative push of discrimination (leading to group solidarity and strong efforts to overcome discrimination) are indissolubly linked.'⁴⁴ The solidarity of the minority and the resulting distinctiveness of the group are, then, a cause for further discrimination by the dominant group.

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN POLISH JEWS AND PHILIPPINE CHINESE

Majority-minority relations in every society are a configuration of historical, social, and cultural forces unique to the particular setting. With this qualification in mind, we can still find striking similarities between the Jews of Poland and the Chinese of the Philippines. We find common historical forces at work, common patterns of discrimination by the majority, common minority group traits, and common responses to discrimination. Generally, the differences found are of degree rather than kind. It is reasonable to suppose then, that if such commonalities are to be found, there are common bases for these similarities.

Common patterns of discrimination. Discrimination takes many forms. Peter I. Rose lists the three distinctive modes as:⁴⁵

1. Derogation
2. Denial (establishing and maintaining some measure of physical and social distance from minorities)
 - a. Avoidance
 - b. Restriction
 - c. Segregation
3. Violence
 - a. Mob aggression
 - b. Genocide

In their respective countries the Jews and Chinese have been victims of *each* of these types of discrimination. The particular form used by the majority varied with the time and place.

Individual and group traits due to victimization. Gordon Allport in *The Nature of Prejudice* discusses the various ego-defence mechanisms which victims of prejudice and discrimination characteristically employ to protect themselves and advance their interests. These mechanisms are grouped by Allport into two types. The first response is aggressiveness directed against others; this is the mechanism typical of individuals who are extropunitive (i.e., they blame the outer cause of their handicap rather than themselves). The second type of response is withdrawal; this is the mechanism of those who take some responsibility for adjusting

to the situation. Examples of the intropunitive individual's response to prejudice and discrimination are self-hate, in-group aggression, symbolic status striving, and neuroticism.⁴⁶

While Allport is concerned with the response of the individual, these traits are also characteristic responses of the minority group as a whole. Both the Chinese in the Philippines and the Jews in Poland are basically extropunitive. Both groups have particularly responded with strong in-group ties, competitiveness, slyness and cunning, and enhanced striving. It should be noted that individuals within the minorities as well as minority groups themselves differ in their responses to discrimination and in the exact way in which they compete, strengthen in-group ties, etc. The mode of enhanced striving is a good example. Characteristically, the Jews have stressed scholarship and intellectual pursuits, as well as being good business men, as ways to get ahead, while the Chinese in the Philippines have stressed the quality of hard work and self-denial (e.g., long hours, living under meagre conditions) to outdo their competitors from the dominant group.

Because of their common reactions to discrimination, the Jews of Poland and the Chinese of the Philippines are viewed in similar stereotypical terms by the dominant groups in these countries. The stereotypes which these groups share are: clannishness, refusal to assimilate, disloyalty to the government, unethical business practices, cleverness, adaptability, ambition, industriousness, and mercenariness.

The common bases for anti-Chinese and antisemitic attitudes. One factor alone is never sufficient to explain the cause of anti-minority feelings. A particular group is singled out for a number of interacting reasons.

It is especially important to keep in mind that these forces are interactive, mutually reinforcing, and to an important degree self-perpetuating. Once a group has been set apart as a target of hostility, it is chosen more readily for that role the next time because tradition suggests it, guilt feelings demand it, and perhaps the responses of the minority group, having differentiated the group more sharply, encourage it.⁴⁷

In addition, as was pointed out earlier, each group singled out by the majority in a particular complex of historical, social, and cultural forces, is unique. Therefore, our comparison of the common factors leading to discrimination against the Jews and Chinese in different societies is to be regarded as incomplete. Our concern is with the complex interaction of causes which are common to both situations.

Common historical factors. An important element affecting the subsequent relations between two groups is the degree of congruency between their value systems prior to contact. Conflict between these groups will tend to be greater to the extent that the values of the two groups are incongruent.⁴⁸

TWO MINORITIES

The Chinese before contact with the native Filipinos (and the Spanish) and the Jews before entering Poland had value systems quite different from those of their respective host cultures (e.g., they had a different religion, were tradition-oriented, and were 'capitalistic'). Thus, both groups entered an alien culture. This helps to explain, in part, the separation of both minorities from the majority and the conflict between the dominant group and the minority in each instance.

The Jews and the Chinese came to their respective countries under similar circumstances. Both Poland and the Philippines needed and encouraged the skills and capital brought by the immigrants. Thus, members of both minorities came originally as business men, money-lenders, and skilled craftsmen. The principle of cumulative directionality applies here: since the Jews and Chinese were allowed in these positions originally, they have tended to persist throughout the centuries in these occupations.⁴⁹ The stratification pattern that has resulted in both countries is one in which 'Cultural subordinates are accorded a special selective status which is an addendum or supplement to the wider societal stratification.'⁵⁰ Although victims of discriminatory practices, both minorities have had an intermediary status in their respective countries by virtue of their specialized occupations.

It is important to note that the two confrontations differ radically in one respect. The Chinese in the Philippines held religious views very much different from the religion of the majority in that country. The Jews in Europe, on the other hand, have a religious link with Christianity (e.g., belief in and worship of the same God, acceptance of the Old Testament). The common descent of Judaism and Christianity helps to explain partially the anti-Jewish attitudes in Europe. Norman Cohn gives several of the reasons for this situation: (1) the refusal of the Jews to accept the divinity of Christ; (2) the belief that the Jews were responsible for the murder of Christ; (3) the Jews' belief that they are God's chosen people; and (4) the Christian belief, dating from the second and third centuries, that the Antichrist would be a Jew and that his most faithful followers would be Jews.⁵¹ Cohn summarizes the role of the Catholic Church in fostering antisemitic prejudice by saying that the Church '... had always tended to regard the synagogue as a dangerous influence and even as a potential rival and had never ceased to carry on a vigorous polemic against Judaism'.⁵²

Thus, while the tie between Christianity and Judaism has led to overt hostility between the two groups, the radical differences in the religious beliefs of the Chinese and the Filipinos led only indirectly to anti-Chinese feeling.

The following historical factors help to reveal the traditional sources of prejudice, and the force for its continuation, which are common to both the Jews and the Chinese.

D. STANLEY EITZEN

1. The basic conflict between Christianity and non-Christian religions. The Catholic Church, historically, has restricted contact with other religions for fear that aliens' beliefs would weaken the faith of their members.
2. The long and continued history of persecution, violence, and discrimination directed towards the alien minority. Violence creates an ever more intense need for anti-minority feeling to justify it. 'It is very difficult not to hate someone whom you have harmed.'⁵³ This does not explain the source of the prejudice—only its continuation.
3. Intense group cohesion on the part of each minority. This separateness was proof to the members of the dominant group of the minority's lack of loyalty to the adopted homeland.
4. Both groups have been very successful against business competitors from the dominant group. 'It always hurts to be outclassed by foreigners in one's own land.'⁵⁴ In addition, they were believed to use illegal or fringe methods which gave them unfair advantage.
5. Various groups have used anti-minority propaganda to consolidate their own positions in the power structure.
6. Both nations have at various times in their history undergone periods of nationalistic fervour. This led to a revulsion against anyone or anything thought to be alien.
7. Once a group has been selected as an object of prejudice, it continues to be so because the young are socialized to think of the minority in derogatory terms and to respond to them in a prejudicial manner. This is possible because these acts have the sanction of tradition.
8. The wide dispersion of Jews and Chinese helps to reinforce prejudice against them. Because each group is a minority throughout much of the world, '... the apprehensions regarding them as a minority are transferable, interchangeable, and even cumulative to a degree'.⁵⁵

The common accusations against Jews and Chinese (e.g., of clannishness, sharp business practices, and lack of patriotism) are in part true. Where does the blame lie? Gunnar Myrdal's 'vicious circle hypothesis' helps to explain this. This hypothesis assumes a general interdependence between all the factors in the minority problem. Majority group prejudice and discrimination force the minority to segregate itself for defence and welfare. To survive, they must circumvent laws directed at eliminating them from their means of livelihood. This in turn gives support to the prejudice of the majority—it justifies further discrimination. Thus, dominant prejudice and the minority's response to it mutually cause each other and the process is self-perpetuating.⁵⁶ However, the principle demonstrates how prejudice is maintained, not how it came into being.

TWO MINORITIES

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study has been to discover similarities and parallels between two minority groups. The following table lists these similarities:

*Similarities between the Jews of Poland
and the Chinese of the Philippines*

	Jews	Chinese
<i>Historical factors:</i>		
Values different from majority	x	x
Common occupational patterns	x	x
Located in urban areas	x	x
Segregation (compulsory)	x	x
Victims of common patterns of discrimination	x	x
<i>Minority reactions to discrimination:</i>		
Internal solidarity	x	x
Formation of business and community organizations for defence and welfare	x	x
Schools to promote cultural identity	x	x
Emphasis on intellectual pursuits	x	little
Competitiveness	x	x
Circumvention of restrictive laws	x	x
<i>Stereotypes of the minority:</i>		
Clannish	x	x
Control of business	x	x
Lack of loyalty to the government	x	x
Refusal to assimilate	x	x
Unethical in business	x	x
Clever	x	x
Adaptable	x	x
Ambitious	x	x
Industrious	x	x
Mercenary	x	x
<i>Reasons for persecution:</i>		
Economic	x	x
Nationalistic	x	x
Religious	x	not overt
The sanction of tradition	x	x

One should not infer from this comparison that these groups are identical. The many ways in which they differ (e.g., religion, customs, and forms of organization) have not been the focus of our enquiry. Nor should one conclude that the similarities noted in the table are applicable to all minority groups. What we have demonstrated is the following.

'A' equals the dominant group in country A and 'a' equals the minority in that country.

'B' equals the dominant group in country B and 'b' equals the minority in that country.

If 'a' and 'b' enter A and B respectively, to fill similar needs of that society, then 'a' will be similar to 'b' in certain respects (e.g., occupations and place in the stratification system).

Then, if 'A' and 'B' persecute 'a' and 'b' for similar reasons, 'a' and 'b' will be similar in their response to this discrimination.

Once this has been set in motion, the principle of cumulative directionality applies—'A' and 'B' will continue their harassment of 'a' and 'b' respectively, justified by the responses of 'a' and 'b' which continue to be somewhat similar.

The above scheme suffers from its simplicity. First, because the social conditions in which groups come in contact are so varied and the number of variables that affect their interaction is so great, our comparison of the Jews and Chinese in two different countries may either be atypical (in that there are so many parallels which would not be found in other cross-cultural comparisons) or these apparently similar characteristics may be only superficially so. Second, our sample is too small. It would be instructive to compare a number of minorities which had initial contact with majority groups under analogous social conditions to determine the extent of subsequent similarities. It would then be possible to make generalizations and to develop interrelated propositions which could be applied cross-culturally.

NOTES

¹ R. A. Schermerhorn, 'Toward a General Theory of Minority Groups', *Phylon*, XXV, Fall, 1964, p. 238.

² Cf. W. F. Wertheim, 'The Trading Minorities in Southeast Asia' in *East-West Parallels: Sociological Approaches to Modern Asia*, The Hague, 1964, pp. 39-82; Maurice Freedman, 'Jews, Chinese, and Some Others', *The British Journal of Sociology*, X, March, 1959, pp. 61-70; Asavabahu (King Rama IV), 'The Jews of the East', cited in Kenneth Perry Landon, *The Chinese in Thailand*, New York, 1941, pp. 34-43.

³ Wertheim, op. cit.

⁴ The Jews of Poland and the Chinese of the Philippines were selected as the focus of this study because they represent certain common features in antisemitism in Europe and anti-Chinese feeling in Southeast Asia. The cases selected, however, are not truly representative of the majority-minority problems in other European and Asian countries, because each nation and its minorities are unique in many ways. Some excellent sources on the Jews in other European countries are: Lucy S. Daividowicz, *The Golden Tradition: Jewish Life and Thought in Eastern Europe*, New York, 1967; Ilse R. Wolff, ed., *German Jewry: Its History, Life, and Culture*, London, 1958; Cecil Roth, *A*

History of the Jews in England, 3rd edn., Oxford, 1964; Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx, *A History of the Jewish People*, Philadelphia, 1945. Some representative sources on the Chinese in other Southeast Asian countries are: George William Skinner, *Chinese Society in Thailand: An Analytical History*, Ithaca, New York, 1957; George William Skinner, *Leadership and Power in the Chinese Community of Thailand*, Ithaca, New York, 1958; Victor Purcell, *The Chinese in Southeast Asia*, 2nd edn., London, 1965; Maurice Freedman, *The Chinese in South-East Asia: A Longer View*, London, 1965; Donald Earl Willmott, *The National Status of the Chinese in Indonesia, 1900-1958*, Ithaca, New York, 1961; Ju-k'ang T'ien, *The Chinese of Sarawak: A Study of Social Structure*, London, 1953; and Richard J. Coughlin, *Double Identity: The Chinese in Modern Thailand*, Hong Kong, 1960.

⁵ Edgar Wickberg, *The Chinese in Philippine Life: 1850-1898*, New Haven, 1965, p. 4.

⁶ Jose A. Quirino, 'The Parian: Circa 1581', *Manila Times: Sunday Times Magazine*, 15 March 1964, p. 54.

⁷ T. M. Locsin, 'The Chinese Problem', *Philippines Free Press*, 8 December 1956, p. 35.

⁸ Wickberg, op. cit., and Edgar Wick-

berg, 'Early Chinese Economic Influence in the Philippines, 1850-1898', *Pacific Affairs*, XXXV, Fall, 1962, pp. 275-85.

⁹ Albert Ravenholt, *Chinese in the Philippines*, New York, American Universities Field Staff, 1955, pp. 13-14.

¹⁰ Robert S. Elegant, *The Dragon's Seed*, New York, 1959, p. 87.

¹¹ Raphael Mahler, 'Antisemitism in Poland', in Koppel D. Pinson, ed., *Essays on Antisemitism*, New York, 1946, p. 146; and Margolis and Marx, op. cit., pp. 529-41.

¹² Margolis and Marx, op. cit., p. 529.

¹³ Mahler, op. cit., p. 149.

¹⁴ Margolis and Marx, op. cit., p. 541.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 532.

¹⁶ Maurice H. Harris, *History of the Medieval Jew*, New York, 1916, p. 324.

¹⁷ Margolis and Marx, op. cit., p. 665.

¹⁸ Bernard D. Weinryb, 'Poland', in Peter Meyer et al., eds., *The Jews in the Soviet Satellites*, Syracuse, New York, 1953, pp. 207-11.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

²⁰ Solomon Grayzel, *A History of the Jews*, Philadelphia, 1947, p. 769.

²¹ Weinryb, op. cit., p. 229.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 252.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

²⁵ 'Poland', in Cecil Roth, ed., *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*, Garden City, New York, 1959, p. 1524.

²⁶ Lucjan Blit, 'Poland and the Jewish Remnant', *Commentary*, XXIII, March, 1957, pp. 216-17.

²⁷ Leon Shapiro, 'Poland', in Morris Fine and Milton Himmelfarb, eds., *American Jewish Year Book*, Volume 59, New York, 1958, p. 326.

²⁸ *American Jewish Year Book*, New York, 1963, pp. 359-60.

²⁹ Cf. Chester L. Hunt, 'Comments on "Patterns of Social Relationships in the Philippines"', *Philippine Social Science and Humanities Review*, XIX, March, 1954, p. 11; and Benicio T. Catapusan, 'Social Distance in the Philippines', *Sociology and Social Research*, XXXVIII, May-June, 1954, pp. 309-12.

³⁰ There is one instance where the stereotype is false: currently the Chinese control only a small proportion (although it is disproportionate to the size of the Chinese group) of trade and commerce. Interestingly enough, Americans, although much less numerous in the Philippines than the Chinese, control over twice as much foreign trade as do

the Chinese, yet they are not objects of prejudice and discrimination. Cf. Socorro E. Espiritu and Chester L. Hunt, eds., *Social Foundations of Community Development*, Manila, 1964, p. 11.

³¹ Robert B. Fox and Frank Lynch, eds., *Area Handbook on the Philippines*, Volume I, Chicago, 1965, p. 311.

³² A. V. H. Hartendorp, *History of Industry and Trade of the Philippines*, Manila, 1961, pp. 207-71.

³³ Virginia F. Bateria, 'A Study of Money in Philippine Elections', *Philippine Social Science and Humanities Review*, XX, March, 1955, p. 74.

³⁴ Ravenholt, op. cit., p. 15; and Elegant, op. cit., p. 86.

³⁵ Locsin, op. cit., p. 147.

³⁶ Fox and Lynch, op. cit., pp. 312-313.

³⁷ Although this statement is true for the majority of Chinese in the Philippines, it should be noted that many Chinese have assimilated. Cf. Freedman (1965), op. cit.

³⁸ Chester L. Hunt, 'Ethnic Stratification and Integration in Cotabata', in Socorro E. Espiritu and Chester L. Hunt, op. cit., p. 226.

³⁹ Harris, op. cit., p. 322.

⁴⁰ Israel Halpern, 'The Jews in Eastern Europe', in Louis Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews*, Volume I, London, 1949, p. 309; and Margolis and Marx, op. cit., p. 534.

⁴¹ Margolis and Marx, op. cit., pp. 538-39.

⁴² Shapiro (1965), op. cit., p. 435.

⁴³ George E. Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities: An Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination*, New York, 1965, p. 228.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁴⁵ Peter I. Rose, *They and We: Racial and Ethnic Relations in the United States*, New York, 1964, pp. 100-19.

⁴⁶ Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Garden City, New York, 1958, pp. 138-58.

⁴⁷ Simpson and Yinger, op. cit., p. 233.

⁴⁸ Schermerhorn, op. cit., p. 244.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 242-43.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

⁵¹ Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, London, 1957, pp. 61-62.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁵³ Simpson and Yinger, op. cit., p. 200.

⁵⁴ Fox and Lynch, op. cit., p. 315.

⁵⁵ Simpson and Yinger, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

⁵⁶ Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*, New York, 1944, pp. 75-78 and 1065-1970; cf. Robert M.

MacIver, *The More Perfect Union: A Program for the Control of Intergroup Discrimination in the United States*, New York, 1948, pp. 61-81; Simpson and Yinger, *op. cit.*, p. 122; and Schermerhorn, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

MIDDLE EASTERN STUDIES

Volume 4

July 1968

No. 4

S. Moreh

Poetry in Prose (*al-Shi'r al-Manthur*) in Modern Arabic Literature

R. H. Dekmejian

The U.A.R. National Assembly—A Pioneering Experiment

Joseph L. Wieczynski

The Myth of Kuchuk-Kainardja in American Histories of Russia

Book Reviews

Published Quarterly

Annual Subscription 80s.

Single Copies 28s.

Frank Cass & Co Ltd

67 Great Russell Street,

London WC1.

THE TOOLS OF LEGITIMATION— ZIONISM AND THE HEBREW CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

B. Z. Sobel

THE relationship between Judaism and Christianity has always been marked by the attempt on the part of the latter to bring about the absorption of the former or at least the conversion of as many individual Jews as could be convinced. The nature of these conversionary forays and their intensity have varied from epoch to epoch and from place to place, but only rarely in the history of this encounter between the two forces have the number of conversions to Christianity been numerically significant in the absence of some form of coercion. In seeking reasons for this relative lack of success, Christian missionaries and divines have variously attributed it to lack of zeal on the part of Christendom, to the absence of love as an ingredient of the missionary approach, and, from time to time, to an insufficiency of fibre in the Jewish soul and mind. During the nineteenth century, however, an additional factor was adduced suggesting that the basic cause for the failure of the missionary enterprise among the Jews was to be found in the peculiar nature of Judaism itself, in which a bifurcation of faith and ethnicity, religion and peoplehood, such as is suggested in the very nature of Christianity, was foreign and totally unpalatable. The Jew, it was averred, could be convinced of the essential truth of Christianity, the faith, but was reluctant to subject himself to the baptismal font in so far as this meant a break with community, family, and basic reference group. If the Jews could be assured that the assumption of Christian faith in no way compromised a continued relatedness to Jewish ethnicity, then the major barrier to large-scale conversion (which is assertedly sociological rather than religious) would be removed and the Church could expect a commensurate return on its investment. This in essence was the major platform developed by the Hebrew Christian movement, a group which had its roots in the missionary failures of the nineteenth century, but experienced its major development as a significant force during the first few decades of the twentieth century.¹

Hebrew Christianity was born in England at the beginning of the nineteenth century through the efforts of a group of converts calling themselves the *Beni Abraham*, or Sons of Abraham. It was on 9 September 1813 that a group of forty-one Jewish converts to Christianity met in London setting forth their purposes as being 'to attend divine worship at the chapel and to visit daily two by two in rotation any sick member, to pray with him and read the Bible to him; and on Sunday all who could were to visit the sick one'.² This group was followed by a number of others variously known as The Episcopal Jew's Chapel Abrahamic Society (1835), the Hebrew Christian Union (1865), and the Hebrew Christian Prayer Union (1882).

In 1893, David Baron and C. A. Schonberger organized a mission to the Jews in the teeming Jewish East End of London, calling it the Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel. Here were planted the actual seeds that were to blossom forth in the modern movement. Basing themselves upon the early efforts of the *Beni Abraham*, the Prayer Union, and the largely dormant but nonetheless seminal Hebrew Christian Alliance of 1865, Baron and Schonberger were actually the first missionaries to see the pregnant possibilities of 'a work' from *within* the Jewish fold. They attempted, as the name of the organization attests, to impress upon the Jews that they came not as outsiders to draw Jews to an alien faith or an alien community, but on the contrary as Jews who have discovered the lost fork in the road of their ancient faith, and who wanted to redirect their confused brethren rather than to divert them. They very wisely insisted that they represented no particular church and no foreign sect, but were Jews, bearing a Jewish message to fellow Jews. They averred that their goal was not to convert Jews, 'but to bring as many as possible into a living relationship with God, in Christ, and to testify to both Jews and Gentile Christians that Christ and Israel are inseparable. . .'.³ Baron and Schonberger are thus to be seen as the first and most important proponents of what has come to be known as the Hebrew Christian approach to the Jews. Their efforts sparked the first real departure from the archaic and ossified approach from without, and turned attention to the need for an indigenous approach which would recognize the integrity of Jewish peoplehood emphasizing an autonomous religious growth from *within*.⁴

The basic contention put forward by the Hebrew Christian movement was that the only legitimate expression of Jewishness was in fact Christianity, in that it constituted the fulfilment of the promise vouchsafed in the Old Testament faith of Israel. What Hebrew Christianity attempted to do was to create a system within which the Jew could and would view Christianity as a binding or legitimate religious expression of the Jew's Jewishness. But before this could be accomplished the various factors acting as a basis for the legitimacy of normative Judaism had, of necessity, to be recast so that they might

serve to ascribe legitimacy not to Judaism but to Christianity.⁶ Everything which in the past militated against the acceptance of Christ would now be utilized to legitimize the embracing of Christianity. As Weber notes, 'in times of strict traditionalism a new order, that is one which was *regarded* as new could, without being revealed in this way, only become legitimized by the claim that it had actually always been valid though not yet rightly known, or that it had been obscured for a time and was now being restored to its rightful place'.⁶

The assertion is in fact made by Hebrew Christianity that the true tradition has been destroyed or obscured by a fraudulent development, and that modern Judaism is, as it were, living a lie.⁷

We have no objection to Jews 'strengthening their allegiance to their own religion' provided they do so by the way of their prophetic writings. We distinguish between *the religion of ancient Israel* and *modern Judaism*. The first leads direct to Him whom God has made Lord and Christ at His right hand. The second is the invention of Pharisaic rabbis and lawyers intended to keep Israel in ignorance of Him. The New Testament and not the Talmud is the true continuation of Moses and the Prophets.⁸

So old, it is insisted, is this tradition of faith in Christ, that it is believed to have antedated the actual establishment of Jewish peoplehood, for even

. . . Old Testament saints might be called Hebrew Christians in the sense that by faith they looked forward to the great sacrifice in their daily sacrifices. 'Abraham saw My day and was Glad.' We look back to the sacrifice of Christ and receive assurance and comfort.⁹

In assuming that the simple most unyielding block to the conversion of great numbers of Jews was to be found in a fear (among Jews) of destroying the tradition, of becoming renegades to family, faith, and culture, Hebrew Christianity sought to provide assurance of the contrary. Should the prospective convert enquire what effect his conversion would have upon his previous loyalties, he could be assured that ' . . . upon accepting Christ he does not give up anything *vital* [my emphasis] in Judaism, but rather has light and meaning and vitality shed upon his ancient faith'.¹⁰ Should the Jew ask why it is that a national conversion has not occurred, or at least why there are not many more Jewish believers in Christ, he will be told that the fault lies not in the unacceptability of Christianity, and that the ' . . . reason the mass of Jews are not in harmony with Christianity is *that they are not fully Jews*'.¹¹ How is this possible? Simply because 'Judaism is Christianity in bud. Christianity is Judaism in fruitage'.¹² Those who refuse to take note of this incontrovertible fact are in essence rejecting the very viability of what they assert to be their faith. It is those who insist upon retaining the hollow shell that is called Judaism who are least justified in calling themselves Jews, because ' . . . it is in us Hebrew

Christians that the line of faith is continued during the period of our nation's unbelief, that we are the link between the true and faithful in Israel in the past, and the converted and saved Israel in the future.¹³

The use of Scripture is, as one might expect, extensive and points not only to the continuity of the 'tradition' but to the emotional buttressing as well. No matter how strong the appeal to the continuity with tradition, affective attitudes must play a supportive role. The convert must be able not only to trace his spiritual journey with an intellectually acceptable traditional pattern, but also to believe that he personally and in some fashion has had meaningful contact with, and involvement in, the whole. Especially in matters of faith, there is probably something very basic within the individual that rejects being placed on the receiving end of religious truths, and particularly as in the case of the Jew, truths of which he considers himself the fountain-head. This is illustrated in the following comment which carries with it a ring of authenticity and sincerity:

The writer was by his acceptance of Christ Jesus not gone through a delusion of the mind and heart, but by the guidance of God into the inheritance of his fathers, his own Jewish fathers. What a glory to see this, not to be on foreign ground, but on his own, his father's ground. There is nothing more glorious for a Jew than to discover this harmony of being on his own Biblical fathers' ground. This gives joy and firmness. Indeed he can say: 'Jesus is mine.'¹⁴

Once it becomes possible to identify oneself existentially with a phenomenon as well as with a relatively impersonal and somewhat abstract tradition, the underlying supports of the legitimating process become correspondingly stronger. The combination of an appeal based on scriptural 'legality' and an unbroken tradition lead to a strengthening of the all-important affective involvement. The relative positioning of Jews and Gentiles so that the Jews are the good olive tree and the Gentiles the 'wild branches grafted on contrary to nature' provides a comforting cushion against the possibility of guilty usurpation of a destiny not inherently the Israelites', making it possible to *reclaim* rather than *lay claim*. That this is an extremely old approach is attested to by Hort in noting that Paul's praying in the synagogues meant for the early Jewish believers in Christ '. . . virtually a claim on their behalf to be the truest Israelites'.¹⁵ They were not only heirs to the tradition in terms of their unbreakable involvement with it, but its legal inheritors as well.

When we deal with the phenomenon of faith it is difficult, if not impossible, to see clear lines of separation between affectivity and rationality. This would be possible in discussing a theology but not in analysing the content of faith, where it is impossible to trace logical sequence or to untangle that which is felt or internally experienced

THE HEBREW CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

from that which is 'rationally believed'. 'Submission to an order', as Weber has noted, 'is almost always determined by a variety of motives; by a wide variety of interests and by a mixture of adherence to tradition and belief in legality . . .'¹⁶ Weber goes on to aver that 'in a very large proportion of cases the actors subject to the order are of course not even aware how far it is a matter of custom, of convention, or of law'.¹⁷ It is the sociologist in the final analysis who 'must attempt to formulate the typical basis of validity';¹⁸ and in this context there exists little doubt that the primary basis for ascription of legitimacy to Christianity is an appeal to its continuity and legal and traditional connexion with the true and original faith of Israel. Affective attitudes and any emphasis on rationality are sub-themes serving an ancillary role in the overall phenomenon; they are considerably more elusive and much less subject to documentation than is the traditional-legal typology. What does lend itself fairly well to documentation and objective analysis is what I would call the tools of legitimation, or the devices utilized by Hebrew Christians to underscore the traditional acceptability and legal basis for the avowal of Christianity as the *bona fide* religious expression of the Jews. This estimation of Christian faith is to be accomplished in a number of ways, foremost among which is an embracing of political Zionism in order to indicate continuing and intensified commitment to a Jewish ethnic-national destiny.

Hebrew Christianity began to achieve some stability and organizational sophistication at about the same period in history that witnessed the emergence and phenomenal growth of political Zionism as a force among the Jews of the Western world. The ghettos of Europe which had begun to disintegrate with the enlightenment breathed their last with the end of the First World War, and with this collapse new forces were set rolling in Jewish life presaging radical change in the religious, cultural, economic, and social patterns of the Jews. Perhaps the most significant of these forces was Zionism, not in its simplest definition as a political expedient for the oppressed among the Jews, but in its larger context as an all-embracing response to the question 'Whither the Jews?'. Baron is no doubt correct in asserting:

Despite its outward secularization, therefore, its professed attempt at 'normalizing' Jewish existence on the level of other nations and its endeavor to unite the whole people from the extreme orthodox to the extreme agnostics, the Zionist movement was but an offshoot of the traditional Jewish messianic idea.¹⁹

Zionism like Judaism did not in its early formulation lend itself to one-dimensional analysis; like Judaism itself it constituted an anomalous and highly complex response to an elusive reality. It is no doubt partly for this reason that large segments of world Jewry reacted vigorously to make the movement an expression often willy-nilly of this

or of that position or outlook, and it is thus that Zionism, in lacking definitiveness and allowing for diverse and variegated interpretations of its nature and purposes, could be readily assimilated by Hebrew Christianity as a legitimating tool.

How was this so? It was partly because Hebrew Christian ideologues saw in the polar appeal of Zionism a three-fold opportunity for evangelistic gain. First, in so far as Zionism based its appeal on the entire spectrum of Jewish life from the orthodox to the rabid anti-religionists, an avowal of the movement's ends afforded an opportunity to separate Judaism the religion from Jews the people in a perfectly consistent fashion. In this manner, it was hoped that the Hebrew Christian would appear as just another Jew, with, however, a different faith, much as both the religionist and anti-religionist considered themselves Zionists and Jews. Second, the embracing of Zionism could serve to indicate that Christianity in no wise need upset the Jews' pattern of ethnic-national loyalty, but quite the contrary: in that Christian eschatology left ample room for the prophetic doctrine of national restoration, it could serve to enhance this loyalty. And, finally, Zionism was 'courted' on a pragmatic organizational level, in that it afforded entry to an area that had captured the imagination of so many Jews, thus obviating the necessity for moving against the tide in this as well as in the area of religious faith. In other words, it was entirely possible to go 'all out' on this one aspect of Jewish life, without necessitating any compromise with Christian belief in the process.

The messianic nature of Zionism appears to have been tailor-made for use as a strut in the legitimation of Christianity among the Jews. If the claim of the Hebrew Christian to being part of the Jewish reality could be denied in terms of his rejection or unauthorized reconstruction of Judaism the faith, this claim could not (he felt) be so cavalierly rejected in terms of his birthright as a physical (i.e. racial) member of the *Klal Yisroel*, the people of Israel. In so far as Hebrew Christianity needed a 'handle' for its claim to being Jewish, it had to be along national rather than religious lines. But because of the nature of Zionism as a religio-political movement, it provided an unparalleled opportunity for, on the one hand, displaying solidarity with the 'secular' aspiration of the Jewish people, while on the other crediting the motivation for this expression of unity to religious desiderata best expressed within a *Christian* framework. Political Zionism was explained by Hebrew Christians in terms of prophetic fulfilment in noting that 'it is itself a beginning; and in the light of prophecy it is thus shown at its outset to be a movement likely to have an important outcome'.²⁰ What is this outcome to be? Nothing less than this:

... the crowning event, that which is outside of Jewish expectation, will be the coming of the Messiah in glory whom they will recognize as none other than Jesus, the crucified. After a representative portion of the

THE HEBREW CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

nations will have been restored to the promised land, the Son of man shall come in the clouds of heaven and manifest Himself to Israel as the Son of David whose right is to reign in Zion. Filled with remorse and contrition as they 'look upon Him whom they have pierced', they shall repent and exclaim 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord'.²¹

Zionism is viewed in terms of Jewish eschatology but through Christian spectacles, so that while Judaism is indeed 'fast ripening for its last tribulation',²² the final result will not be the restoration of national sovereignty alone nor the reinstatement of the temple sacrifice, but the Christian dispensationalist fulfilment in the reign of Christ over Judah and the world. In that Zionism is accepted as being essentially a religious movement, the Hebrew Christian avers not that this closes the door to participation, but on the contrary, that it provides him with greater rationale and motivation than non-believing Jews.

If any class of Jews are really prepared for Zionism it is the Christian Jew, for he thoroughly believes in Zionism for Israel and Zion's sake according to the divine program and purposes of God for them. We Hebrew Christians are by the grace of God the advance guard in the movement . . .²³

The long-term objective of Hebrew Christianity's adoption of Zionism is the legitimization of Christianity as a valid mode of Jewish existence, but its shorter or tactical goal is the acceptance (by Jews) of Jewish believers in Christ as *bona fide* Jews who differ from their fellows only in regard to their interpretation of the faith of Israel. Before Christianity could be demonstrated as constituting a legitimate, indeed *the* legitimate religious expression of 'Jewishness', it had to be shown that Jews who espoused this doctrine could and would continue to identify with and operate within a 'Jewish framework'. Thus, Hebrew Christians since the first Zionist Congress in 1897 have sought to prove this 'identity' by supporting the goals and aspirations of political Zionism with unmatched zeal and fervour.

Hebrew Christians in my judgment owe a duty to generations yet unborn to vindicate manfully and persistently their inalienable right to be considered a part of their people. They must make it manifest by word and deed that they feel themselves one with them, both in their sufferings and in their present struggles for national reconstruction.²⁴

According to Reich, 'Jews must be taught to recognize that faith in Jesus as the Messiah leaves the national bond, with its accompanying citizen rights, unbroken'.²⁵ To substantiate this claim numerous plans for colonies in Palestine were formulated 'to get young Hebrew Christian pioneers who will go out and work on the land'²⁶ so that they 'may be second to none among Jews in zeal and devotion'.²⁷

But as indicated above, the affirmation of Zionism promised additional rewards. First, to be sure, it was important once for all to stake

a claim to being Jewish, which no deviation, be it to Christianity, communism or agnosticism, could set aside. If one identified oneself as a Jew (and could there be a firmer affirmation of one's Jewishness than a desire to see the people reconstituted a whole nation in their own land?), if one was born a Jew, then one *was* a Jew. Furthermore, if it could be demonstrated that in becoming a Christian one not only remained within the fold, but did so with zeal, dedication, and scriptural enrapturement, a part of the nation in all respects not only in terms of aspirations but sharing as well in the sufferings that mark the life of the Jew, then how could the Jews continue to stigmatize the believer as an apostate, traitor, assimilationist, or worse? Not only was the embracing of Zionism intended to give the lie to these assertions, thus legitimating the believer as a Jew and Christianity as an assimilable expression of Jewish belief, but it was also seen as a tool of evangelization with manifold possibilities.

Hebrew Christians, as is so often the case with fundamentalists of every stripe and faith, tend to view all phenomena in monistic terms. Everything is explained from within the most limited and limiting frame of reference, and always in terms of a somewhat static core structure, unmoving and unmovable for all time. It is thus that the various Hebrew Christian thinkers and leaders saw in the collapse of the ghetto and in the movement of east European Jewry to the western world with all its unbridled freedom to threaten the old orthodoxy, two possible and distinctive courses emerging. Either the Jews would turn to secular movements such as communism, socialism, and Zionism, or they would at last open their hearts to the Gospels and surrender to their own Jesus of Nazareth. Everything falling on the continuum between these extremes would prove transitory and ultimately unsatisfactory. Of the 'isms' bedevilling the emancipated Jews, it was believed that only Zionism promised evangelistic success (in addition to its being scriptural) by finally broadening the limited intellectual and spiritual scope of the Jew. The parallel emergence of Hebrew Christianity and Zionism pointed to a joint destiny of the two. As if all other developments, trends, disputes, and forces within Jewish life did not exist, it could with perfect faith and equanimity be asserted that 'the Jews are electing a congress for their political end; we are forming an alliance for their spiritual awakening . . .'²⁸ And the two were considered inextricable events in history.²⁹ It was naively thought that if Jewish life was in flux and movement, if through enthusiasm for Zionism 'the Jews . . . have acquired a new interest in their Jewishness',³⁰ then this interest would of necessity flow towards Christianity, so long as Hebrew Christianity was 'within', so as better to cultivate this trend.³¹

THE HEBREW CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

NOTES

¹ For a fuller discussion of these points see my article 'Protestant Evangelists and the Formulation of a Jewish Racial Mystique: The Missionary Discovery of Sociology', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. V, No. 3, Fall 1966, pp. 343-56.

² Hugh J. Schonfield, *The History of Jewish Christianity: From the First to the Twentieth Century*, London, 1936, p. 219.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

⁴ Although the modern movement has branch units in Great Britain, the United States, Holland, Scandinavia, Canada, Australia and Israel, its membership remains sparse, and the best estimate that I can arrive at for its world-wide membership at any given time is about 2,000 souls. One caveat must be added, however, and that is the probability that while the organization was never larger than the above figure would indicate at any one time, many more than this were at some time members who subsequently faded into the 'Gentile' churches utilizing the Hebrew Christian movement as a sort of 'half-way house' to full inclusion and assimilation within Christendom.

⁵ Weber says that 'legitimacy may be ascribed to an order by those acting subject to it in the following ways: (a) by tradition; (b) by virtue of affectual attitudes, especially emotion, legitimizing the validity of what is newly revealed or a model to imitate; (c) by virtue of a rational belief in its absolute value, thus, lending it the validity of an absolute and final commitment; (d) because it has been established in a manner which is recognized to be legal.' Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, ed. and trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, New York, 1947, p. 130.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 131. I would contend that not only is this so in times of 'strict traditionalism', but also during periods when the actual strength of tradition is weak, where, however, respect for the tradition (nostalgic or otherwise) is still operative.

⁷ Sobel, op. cit., p. 356.

⁸ 'Jewish Opposition to the Message of Christ', Editor's notes, *Hebrew Christian Alliance Quarterly*, V, No. 2 (April 1921), p. 44.

⁹ M. Malbert, 'The Influence of Hebrew Christians on the Destinies of

Mankind', *ibid.*, II, No. 4 (Oct. 1918), p. 142.

¹⁰ Jacob Peltz, 'Christian Approach to the Jews', *ibid.*, XVI, No. 1 (Jan. & March 1931), p. 1.

¹¹ Max Reich, 'The Relations between Church and Synagogue', *ibid.*, XVI, Nos. 1 & 2 (Jan. & March 1931), p. 1.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹³ D. Baron, 'Message to the Sixth Conference', *ibid.*, IV, No. 3 (Oct. 1920), p. 99.

¹⁴ Moses Klerekoper, 'Why a Christian and That a Constant Christian', *ibid.*, XX, No. 2 (Summer 1935), p. 4.

¹⁵ Fenton John Anthony Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, London, 1898, p. 93.

¹⁶ Weber, op. cit., p. 132.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

¹⁹ S. W. Baron, *Modern Nationalism and Religion*, New York, 1960, p. 237.

²⁰ William Bell Dawson, 'The Present Fulfilment of Prophecy', *Hebrew Christian Alliance Quarterly*, XV, No. 4 (Oct. & Dec. 1930), pp. 3-4. Zionism is seen as having been predicted in scripture, even to the year in which it would appear as a political force, in the following manner: 'In 623 B.C. the Babylonian Empire was founded; the first of the four great empires in Daniel's prophecy. When Ezekiel dates the beginning of his book (which opens in 593 B.C.) as the 'thirtieth year' he is therefore counting in the years of the Babylonian Empires. From 623 B.C. 1260 years run to the winter of 637-638 A.D. the Saracen capture of Jerusalem. Again from 637-638 A.D. 1260 years run to 1897, the first Zionist congress.' *Ibid.*, p. 34.

²¹ Joel Levy, 'Modern Jewish Leadership', *ibid.*, IV, No. 3 (Oct. 1920), p. 117.

²² *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

²³ M. Ruben, 'The Zionist Convention at Pittsburgh', *ibid.*, II, No. 4 (Oct. 1918), p. 136.

²⁴ Max Reich, 'The Jewish Congress', *ibid.*, III, No. 1 (Jan. 1919), p. 12.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁶ Jacob Peltz, 'Annual Report of the General Secretary', *ibid.*, XVIII, No. 2 (July & Sept. 1933), p. 22.

²⁷ Loc. cit. It should be noted, however, that no Hebrew Christian colony was ever successfully launched in Palestine.

²⁸ M. Malbert, 'Hebrew Christian Unity', *ibid.*, I, Nos. 3 and 4 (July & Oct. 1917), p. 135.

²⁹ Thompson, too, though of course not a Hebrew Christian, saw only one possible meaning to Zionism—the emancipation of the Jewish body and soul and the resulting inevitable movement towards Christianity. 'The bearing of this movement upon the evangelization of the Jews is of paramount importance . . . making them more ready to consider the claims of Christianity as indisputable.' A. Thompson, *A Century of Jewish Missions*, Chicago, 1902, p. 58. He adds: ' . . . when the heart turns homeward, the question must arise, "why have I been an outcast?" The Jew who knows anything of history and of the New Testament must feel that there may be a connection between the rejection of Christ and the scattering of his nation. In these and

many other ways there is a direct effect of Zionism upon the relation of the Jew to the Gospel.'

³⁰ N. Levison, 'Are Jews becoming more Jewish?' *American Hebrew Christian*, XXXIX, No. 2 (Fall, 1953), p. 5.

³¹ But while this was and continues to be the dominant approach to Zionism within Hebrew Christianity, there was also something of a counter-trend that was in nature anything but naive. The proponents of this point of view surmised that revived Jewish interest on one level might lead to a revival on another (i.e. religion), or that Zionism would fill a void that would otherwise possibly be filled by Christian faith, or finally that the alleviation of Jewish suffering would lead to the false but comforting notion that the nation's sin had been forgiven *sans* true repentance.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE ISRAELI ECONOMY

Abraham Cohen

Introduction

UP to 1918 there were no clear signs of sectoral differentiation within the Jewish economy of Palestine. The Workers' Sector was in its first stages of experimentation and the State Sector almost non-existent. Nevertheless, the preconditions of future differentiation already existed in the shape of 'the Workers' problem' and in a distinct drive towards some form of Jewish statehood.

In the decisive period between 1918 and 1948 the Workers' Sector of the economy developed much more than the Private Sector; by the end of that period, it accounted for about 20 per cent of the Jewish economy.¹ In close co-operation with the National Institutions (the World Zionist Organization; the Jewish Agency; the *Va'ad Leumi*; the *Keren Kayemet le Israel*; and the *Keren Hayessod*) the Workers' Sector entered even the fields of water supply, navigation, defence, etc.—all of which normally belong to the State Sector of any economy.

The Government Sector was large enough, but it did not act as a coherent entity. It was split into separate units: the Government Sector proper, the 'foreign' sub-sector, the Jewish National Institutions, various non-profit organizations, etc. By the end of the period, the Government Sector of the Jewish economy was estimated to account for about 7 per cent of the Jewish Net Domestic Product, but its impact would probably be seen to be much more forcible if all the 'supporting' sub-sectors were included.

The establishment of the State of Israel led to the consolidation of all these semi-state services into one coherent State Sector that comprised about 15 per cent of the Net National Product. Incidentally, by that time British capital had withdrawn from Israel and left behind a whole sector of 'abandoned concessions' such as the Electricity Corporation, the Potash Company, the Oil Refineries, as well as shipping and other interests. Economic circumstances compelled

the State to take over this 'Foreign Domain', thus increasing the State Sector to about 20–22 per cent of the Net Domestic Product.² The State became inevitably involved in many economic activities that are normally, in other countries, financed by private capital, foreign or local.

The situation seems to have been more or less stable for the last fifteen years or so. The proportions of the various sectors of the economy have not changed much in their general aspects, nor have they changed even in the major branches. Thus a specific Israeli sectoral structure of the economy has been established, with a balanced, almost equal growth of the Private Sector, of the Workers' Sector, and of the State Sector. It is clearly not a simple capitalist mixed economy, because of the strong Workers' Sector. It is not State Capitalism because of the expressed intention of the State to 'sell out' its enterprises to private capital as soon as possible. It is neither a socialist nor a semi-socialist structure, because of the prospering and well-developed private economy to which more than half of the Net Domestic Product accrues.

This specific structure calls for a close investigation of the factors which have brought it about and have continued to mould it during the last two decades. It seems to be a mixture of economic forces and ideological attitudes evolved in the 'formative stage' of the Jewish economy in Israel.

THE WORKERS' SECTOR OF THE ECONOMY

1. *Agriculture*

a. *The problem*

It was clear from the outset that the great challenge of Zionism consisted in creating an independent agricultural basis for the undisturbed development of a modern economy. And this was necessary not only for purely economic reasons, but rather out of political and security considerations. Without a large enough rural population able to secure food supplies and safe communication between the cities, an urban society, engaged in industry and services, would—sooner or later—be doomed to extinction. The hostility of the indigenous rural inhabitants would soon create 'just another Carthage'—or so it was alleged.

The agricultural techniques which were, in some measure, familiar to the eastern European settlers could not be implemented successfully in Palestine. These techniques were suited to large open fields, extensive pasture areas, and a different climate. Dry farming crops proved to be of relatively low yield, and the resulting standard of living was not acceptable to the settlers. Jewish agriculture therefore became concentrated mainly in plantations: in this branch of agriculture it was

possible to get a relatively high income from small plots of land, and from time to time there were even prospects of profit. Moreover, this branch of farming seemed more suited to the urban type of settler. Up to 1918, the main line of development had been viticulture, but later citriculture became dominant. Plantation farming was directed towards a world market, free from the pressure of the needs of home requirements. The problem of food supplies for the urban population thus remained unsolved.

The plantation type of agriculture (when it is not run in conjunction with other branches of mixed farming) does not require a large permanent labour force. There is a great need for workers at peak periods: in the vintage or orange-picking season. The demand could be met by hiring casual unskilled labourers, with the planter himself only supervising his 'farm'.

The Workers' Problem or the Jewish Labour Problem in agriculture resulted from the inevitable clash of two different socio-economic structures: the eastern European (the Jewish worker-pioneers) and the Near Eastern (the agricultural labourers from the surrounding Arab villages).

The Jewish workers had 'brought' with them certain notions about a 'normal' or 'just' standard of living, derived from the actual level achieved in the countries they had left. The minimum wage-rate of an unskilled worker in eastern Europe was considered the lowest possible for subsistence. No worker was expected to accept less than this minimum wage, even if the alternative was a threat of unemployment. The wage then represented the equivalent of four to five shillings a day in Palestine.

On the other hand, the corresponding notion of a 'just' minimum wage in the rural areas of the Near East was about half this amount, and sometimes even less. Moreover, the seasonal work on the vines, and later the orange-picking, occurred during the off-season among the grain-producing fellaheen; it was an additional occupation they could engage in without prejudice to their own farms. Finally, there were many landless under-employed people in the Arab villages.

The Jewish farmers were fully aware of their economic interests. They tried to 'maximize their profits' by employing cheap unorganized Arab labour. It was impossible to compel them to change their attitude, since they produced for the world market, and were insulated from internal public pressure. In any case, the Jewish urban population had a similar attitude: it enjoyed cheap fruit and vegetables grown by Arab peasants.

No doubt the economic pressure of cheap Arab labour was felt in almost all branches of the economy, especially in the mixed Arab-Jewish cities. But the result of this competition in agriculture seemed to threaten the very existence of the Jewish population. One of the most

prominent publicists of that period, Ahad ha'Am, drew the conclusion that 'economic' Zionism had proved a failure.³

A Jew can be a diligent farmer and a country landlord. . . . Every morning he can go out to his field or vineyard . . . not hesitating to work along with his workers when he finds it necessary to do so. But of what use is all this for the establishment of a safe refuge? A 'superior' class of such gentlemen-farmers dependent upon the work of others cannot serve as the basis of such a structure. The basis of any state are the rural masses, the workers and the poor farmers . . . The rural masses of Eretz Israel are not our own at present. . . . It is well known that at present the work in the settlements is done mostly by the Arabs of the neighbouring villages . . .

The private economic interests of the farmers were in striking conflict with the major national interests of a balanced economy as well as with the urgent demands of security. No solution of the problem appeared possible along the lines of 'normal' rational and economic behaviour. New immigrants could not be absorbed and no growth was possible unless some 'unconventional' way out of this dilemma could be found and unusual measures to implement it could be adopted.

b. The response

The Zionist Organization started its 'practical' operations in Palestine about 1904. A plan was to be carried out aiming at the creation of a new type of agriculture, a National Sector that would be entirely free from private profit considerations and impelled by the sole aim of response to the dangerous situation that had developed. This was a real break-through that seemed to 'suspend' the normal rules of capitalistic economic behaviour in a certain sector of the economy.

The first step was to mobilize National Capital mainly by donations from World Jewry. The investment of this capital had to serve the main national interests, and was therefore free from profit-making considerations. The next step was the acquisition of land that would remain national property for ever. This land could not be sold or owned privately. The only form of grants to settlers were long leases (49 years) at a token rent. In this way, the National Institutions could be sure that the settlers would never be tempted to 'realize' the appreciating value of their plots. On the other hand, they had to make no real rent payments to landlords and could enjoy all the income they earned.

The decisive step was taken when settlers were obliged by the terms of their leases to cultivate their holdings themselves, and not to hire labour. In this way the National Sector of agriculture was insulated from the danger of 'real alienation' by cheap Arab labour.

After long discussions and experimentation ('administrative farms'—such as Hulda, Ben Shemen, Kinneret, and Um G'uni—, the Oppenheimer Co-operative Farm, etc.) which resulted in failures, it was decided that group farming seemed to be the most suited to the needs

THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE ISRAELI ECONOMY

of this sector. At the beginning (1911–18) these groups were few and small, and in an experimental stage. The initial investment provided by the National Institutions doubtless helped to consolidate them into autonomous economic entities.

From the point of view of the National Institutions, this system of colonization was the most expedient, economic, and efficient. There was no need for administration, supervision, and the like.⁴ The 'groups' developed on their own initiative and tried to do their best; they introduced mixed farming, modern techniques, and the most advanced methods of production. Moreover, they managed even to supplement the meagre 'investment budgets' provided by the National Institutions by bank credits, short-term loans, etc. In the course of time they became fully independent of the Institutions themselves.

The ideology of the 'groups', which developed later into countrywide organizations, englobed a wide range of social and personal relations. But as far as major economic problems were concerned, there were three most important goals to be achieved:

- a. The establishment of modern Jewish food production, along with colonization, aspects of security, etc. (Zionism).
- b. The building of a Workers' Economy in contrast to the private sector. This implied activity in all other branches of the economy—industry, services, etc. In fact, they considered themselves to be the 'spearhead' of this new economy (Socialism).
- c. Establishing collective patterns of production as opposed to 'administrative' or 'hierarchic' ones. In this way they launched a pattern distinctive even in a socialist economy (Collectivism).

It seems that the co-operation of the collective movement with the National Institutions, due especially to the common interest in the agricultural settlement itself, helped to establish this unique socio-economic formation in Jewish Palestine. The share of both the collective and co-operative sectors in agriculture (*Kibbutzim* and *Moshavim*) during the last 25 years has amounted to 60–66 per cent in terms of gross output.⁵ This stability seems to reflect their technological achievements even in the face of free competition from the private sector of agriculture.

2. *Public works and construction*

a. *The quest for employment*

The socio-economic structure of the Jewish population in Palestine led to a dangerous situation not only in agriculture but in other fields as well. It was a petit bourgeois economy consisting mainly of self-employed people with a remarkably small proportion of hired workers. By 1897 Jewish workers were less than 1,000 out of a population of

about 48,000. By 1913, the proportion was more or less the same: 2,000 out of 85,000.⁶ And even these were not steadily employed. There was considerable mobility and a good deal of casual labour along with many periods of unemployment. This peculiar situation—a direct outcome of the tradition of self-employment of the immigrants and the clash with cheap Arab labour—blocked the way to further development of the economy. Unemployment was said to be clear proof that the ‘economic absorption capacity of the country’ was exhausted and new immigration impossible. During the period 1918–24 the main body of immigration consisted of young people who could be absorbed only as wage-earners. By 1920 there were about 8,000 workers out of a population of 70,000 and by 1922 about 16,000 out of 84,000.⁷ So the problem of employment—the absorption of the immigrants—was the most pressing need. Virtually the whole period of 1918–32 (excluding the years 1924–26) was characterized by the threat of persistent unemployment.

b. The ‘Road Maker and Builder’ (Solel Boneh)

The response of labour to this situation developed along the following lines:

- a. The ‘conquest’ of the already existing employment potential in the Jewish economy.
- b. The penetration of the large sector of public works, building enterprises, and of the State Sector of the economy (such as ports, railways, etc.).
- c. The establishment of an entirely new and independent Workers’ Economy owned by the workers themselves.

The struggle along line *a*, known as ‘The Conquest of Labour’ (*Kibbush Ha’avoda*), was carried on with varying success throughout the three decades of the British Mandate in Palestine. In the field of public works the situation was similar to that described in agriculture, but the actual development turned out differently.

The claim to a ‘just share’ of the public works of the Government was based on the fact that these were mainly paid for with money raised from Jewish taxpayers. The main obstacle was the problem of ‘equal pay for equal work’—which meant in reality Arab labour. The solution of the problem was the attempt by workers’ groups to accept the current low wages while maintaining their minimum standards of living. These workers were young men who organized contracting groups and carried out public works—usually road-building—on their own account or as sub-contractors to larger contractors. By better organization, equal pay for skilled and unskilled work, economic arrangement of services, and by sharing out the ‘contractor’s profit’ among themselves, they suc-

THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE ISRAELI ECONOMY

ceeded in eking out some minimum wage for every member of the group.

The very character of the public works made it impossible to consolidate these groups into lasting economic entities. Nevertheless, some groups later formed collective settlements. In most groups membership fluctuated greatly because of frequent changes of places of work. The situation called for a countrywide contracting organization.

The General Federation of Jewish Labour (The *Histadrut*, founded in 1920) took over this function. It established an administrative centre to deal with all the contracting of public works. The existing groups in this field, as well as individuals looking for employment, were integrated into a general organization called *Solel Boneh* (Road Maker and Builder). This new organization could obtain better terms than small groups, achieve more goodwill, and could train young inexperienced workers with the help of 'veterans'. *Solel Boneh* could get access to new financial channels: bank credits, supplier credits, discount of customers' bills, etc. Periods of profitable housing construction in Palestine (1924-1926, 1932-36) enabled *Solel Boneh* to take over even public works, sometimes working at a loss in order to provide more employment, sometimes accumulating reserves for new and expanding activities.

In this way the 'administrative' sub-sector of the Workers' Economy gained ground and established itself alongside the collective and co-operative sub-sectors. Moreover, it acquired for the first time some sources of capital accumulation for further economic enterprise.

3. The 'Basic industries'

a. The challenge

The idea of establishing a 'Workers' Society' (*Hevrat Ovdim*) implied an attempt to create from scratch an entirely new economy, run by the workers themselves. In agriculture the way was clear enough: collective and co-operative settlements built with the help of National Capital and National ownership of land. As for industries and services, the best way seemed to be the consolidation and development of the numerous co-operatives that had cropped up all over the country resembling the 'groups' in agriculture and in public works. Where the co-operative way proved to be inadequate, in public works, construction, or larger industrial enterprises, some 'administrative' arrangements had to be made. It meant the establishment of nominated Boards of Directors; but democratization was envisaged for the future. A network of Co-operative Workers' Loans and Savings Associations was established throughout the country, supplemented by a Workers' Bank as a central instrument of finance for the Workers' Economy. In addition, numerous autonomous workers' organizations were maintained to deal with almost all aspects of social life: a network of schools

run by the Labour Federation, adult education, health services, sports clubs, etc. This all-embracing aspiration of the 'Workers' Society' is reflected in the fact that all members of the Trade Unions, even those working as wage-earners in the 'private' sector of the economy, are members of the Society and formally at least co-owners of the assets of the Workers' Economy. The Executive of the Labour Federation is accordingly identical with the Directorate of the Workers' Society. The mood of the twenties is clearly seen in the attempt to run some sort of Labour Army, or Labour Regiment (*Gdud Ha'avoda*), operating different economic activities all over the country and directed by a central Secretariat.

This approach was quite reasonable in the context of the socio-economic structure of the twenties. It was impossible to rely on 'free' economic forces to secure employment, immigration, and growth. It had to be done deliberately by new ways of organization.

b. The compromise

The situation changed significantly in the thirties. The large wave of immigration was characterized by the import of private capital. New industries developed, and a large proportion of wage-earners was absorbed by the private economy. This continued even in the forties; by 1946 there were about 153,000 Jewish wage- and salary-earners out of 250,000 gainfully employed. About 174,000 (or 75 per cent) worked in private enterprises.⁸ They were full-time workers and the 'quest for employment' was no longer a burning issue.

On the other hand there were no ready funds available for the development of the Workers' Economy. After all, this economy was founded and maintained by wage-earners, salaried clerks, and self-employed settlements and co-operatives. Provident funds were of some help, but they were limited in scope. By 1943, the financial position of the Workers' Economy seemed to be as follows:⁹

Workers' Society's own capital	LP 1,000,000
Co-operatives' own capital	„ 2,500,000
Borrowed capital	„ 11,500,000
Total assets	LP 15,000,000

The challenge of the twenties to 'skip' the capitalistic stage of development of the economy had to be modified into a deliberate attempt to establish a strong Workers' Sector within the framework of the privately owned economy. The Directorate of the 'Workers' Society' could not take the lead, and was consequently reduced to a co-ordinating centre leaving full autonomy to the various sub-sectors: Agricultural Settlements, *Solel Boneh*, Consumers' Co-operatives, etc. The decisive factor was, of course, the ability of these sub-sectors somehow to obtain

THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE ISRAELI ECONOMY

adequate finance for their activities. However, there were also strong ideological and emotional motives at work.

c. Priorities

If the Workers' Sector of the economy had to form—for the time being—only part of the existing general framework, it had to be the pioneering sector. This meant that the Workers' Sector must enter branches of the economy which private capital showed a clear unwillingness or inability to penetrate. As capital at the disposal of the Workers' Economy was scarce, it had to be concentrated in the determining ('strategic') branches of the economy. It goes without saying that the enterprises of the Workers' Sector had to be the most advanced technically and were to be carried out on a large scale. They had to offer the workers the best possible labour conditions, to set the pace for the Private Sector.

According to the enduring tradition of the Jewish Labour Movement there were clear criteria for the branches of the economy to be preferred. Ber Borochov stated:¹⁰

The socio-economic structure of the Jewish people differs radically from that of other nations, and is an anomalous abnormal structure.

Instead of concentrating around the vital centre of economic life, the Jews are scattered on its periphery. Obviously, the fate of society does not, to any extent, rest on the needle or tobacco industries. The superfluities of social life, which is made up of the give and take of finished goods, must draw its sustenance from labour in such branches as agriculture, sheep raising, mining, railways, shipping, etc.

. . . In *international* socialism, the class struggle, and the revolution, the part played by the *Jewish* socialism will be as insignificant as the Jewish needle and hammer are, when compared to the non-Jewish tractor, locomotive or steamship. . . .

In his article, 'In the Beginning',¹¹ he said of Jewish immigrants to the United States:

Through their concentration in the large cities, the Jews retain their former economic traditions and are condemned to the final levels of production—the manufacturing of consumers' goods.

So the main criteria seemed to be: *i*, primary production (proximity to nature); *ii*, producers' goods (first levels of production), and *iii*, strategic position (communications, etc.).

d. Building materials

This general attitude—combined with the fact that the main accumulation of profit occurred in the construction activities of *Solel Boneh*—led to the concentration of the Workers' Sector in the industries engaged

in the production of building materials. As a large contractor—responsible for about 66 per cent of building contracting in 1943¹²—*Solel Boneh* had to look for a cheap and reliable supply of building materials. It seemed therefore reasonable to acquire existing plants or to establish new enterprises in the fields connected with building activities. In this way there emerged a large, vertically integrated, industrial concern.

These industries seemed to conform to the accepted 'Borochovian' criteria:

i. Production of raw materials such as stone, cement, lime, etc., was of the class of 'primary production', intimately close to natural resources.

ii. Materials used in the production of investment goods were, as it were, superior to consumer goods, or 'final' products.

iii. These factories were at that time the largest and technically most advanced enterprises in the country. They gave *Solel Boneh* a dominant position and could influence labour relations in other industries as well.

On the other hand, they were pioneering industries in the sense that private capital either did not enter this field or was not successful enough in doing so. The main obstacles seemed to be the heavy investment involved, the long period of pay-off, and the difficulties resulting from periods of slump in the building industry. A large concern like *Solel Boneh* was more flexible and managed to weather bad times.

The share of the Workers' Sector in the Gross Domestic Product generated in industry fluctuated in the period 1953–65 around 20–22 per cent.¹³ The Private Sector in industry was engaged mainly in the production of consumer goods: food, textiles, furniture, leather, paper, etc. The demand for these products is more or less constant and the rate of profits relatively higher. The main shortcoming of this situation was probably the lack of adequate accumulation of capital for further expansion.

e. Other projects

The Workers' Sector made several ventures in other 'basic' or 'strategic' fields of the economy. Usually they were made in close co-operation with the National Institutions or Government Agencies: water supply (*Mekorot*), oil prospecting (*Naphta*), navigation (*Zim*), and aviation. As the demand for capital investment in these fields grew larger, the Workers' Sector had to reduce its share in these ventures. In order to maintain its position—about 23 per cent of the Net Domestic Product by 1965—the Workers' Sector has to invest year by year at least the same proportion of the total gross investment. In terms of the last few years, this has meant about IL 600–750 millions. This seems to be a remarkably heavy task to perform.

On the other hand, many private investors have succeeded in

THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE ISRAELI ECONOMY

developing their projects with the help of State credits out of Development Budgets. The fact that the same political party, or coalition of parties, is in control of the State machinery and the Histadrut does not ensure the support of the State Sector for the Workers' Economy. Apart from the impartiality expected from Government in its relations with both sectors—Private and Workers' alike—there are from time to time issues leading to conflicts between the Workers' Economy and the economic agencies of the State.

However, the stable proportion of the Workers' Sector in the economy seems to suggest some rigidity of approach and even a lack of adaptability to changing conditions.

4. *Scope and structure of the Workers' Sector*¹⁴

The Workers' Sector has never claimed to represent a coherent centrally managed economic entity. Quite the contrary. It looks more like a loose conglomerate of diversified economic groups, co-operatives, large concerns, and even single enterprises. Nevertheless, it is possible to distinguish about four main sub-sectors: 1, the co-operatives; 2, the administrative enterprises; 3, the institutions established by the co-operatives; and, 4, the organizations serving the members of the Histadrut.

The *co-operative sub-sector* is the backbone of the Workers' Economy. It includes the agricultural settlements (*Kibbutzim* and *Moshavim*) and the co-operatives in industry and services (notably transport and communication). The Workers' Society has an indirect control over this sub-sector through the various Audit Unions, the right of veto in matters of principle, and special rights reserved in case of termination of economic activities. By 1965 this sub-sector accounted for about 60 per cent of the manpower engaged in the Workers' Sector: 114,000 out of 190,000. It produced about 52 per cent of the Net Domestic Product generated in the Workers' Sector: IL 954 millions out of IL 1,840 millions.

The *administrative sub-sector* is under much closer control by the Workers' Society: formally at least it means full ownership, nomination of directors, etc. It comprises *Solel Boneh*; the industrial concerns of *Koor*, *Te'us*, *Yakhin Hakal*, *Hasneh* (insurance); the Workers' Bank, etc. (24 per cent of the manpower employed in the Workers' Sector and 28 per cent of the Net Domestic Product).

The *co-operative institutions* include all the consumer co-operatives, the wholesale trade institution (*Hamashbir Hamerkazi*), the co-operative marketing agency for agricultural products (*Tnuva*), the central Provident Funds, etc. These institutions are controlled by the co-operatives or Unions that established them. However, special rights are reserved for representatives of the Workers' Society. They have usually the decisive vote on the Boards of Directors. This sub-sector contributes

about 4 per cent of the Net Domestic Product in the Workers' Sector of the economy.

The *organizational sub-sector* is under the full control of the Labour Federation. It includes the Administration of the Trade Unions, the Sick Fund, etc. (about 10 per cent of the manpower employed in the Workers' Sector and 11 per cent of the Net Domestic Product of the Workers' Sector).

THE ECONOMIC 'STATE DOMAIN'

1. *The integration of the sub-sectors*

The rapid growth of the State Sector of the economy during the first years of the State of Israel was due mainly to the integration of the various sub-sectors that had existed already under the Mandatory Administration: the Jewish National Institutions, the educational and health services of the Jewish community, many non-profit-making institutions, and the so-called 'Concessions' that were dominated by foreign capital.

By 1953 the share of these sub-sectors in the Net Domestic Product was as follows:¹⁵

Government	6.7 per cent
Local Authorities	4.5 " "
National Institutions (excluding enterprises)	1.3 " "
Non-profit organizations	9.5 " "
Total	22.0 per cent

As far as the Government was concerned, there was no intention to build up a large state sector, or to dominate economic activity in general. Apart from accepted National ownership of land and water resources to ensure agricultural development, the general attitude of the Government was to attract private capital, local and foreign alike, even to state-owned industries. No private industry was nationalized; on the contrary, large loans were extended to private investors. Nevertheless, the situation has remained almost unchanged during the last 15 years or so, and boundaries of the 'State Domain' seem to be fixed at about 20 per cent of the Net Domestic Product. The role of the Government Sector in the economy was much larger. By 1959 the situation could be described as follows:¹⁶

Scope of the Government Sector's Economic Activity

Civilians gainfully employed	17.6 per cent
Net Domestic Product	21.6 " "
Purchases out of total resources	25.2 " "
Consumption expenditure	21.1 " "
Gross investment	52.5 " "
Financing of investment expenditure	55.6 " "

What were the factors that contributed to this situation?

2. *The 'Concessions'*

The eastern European immigrants in the Mandatory period (1918–1948) had to solve, among other things, the problem of developing the natural resources of the country. The major projects included: supply of electricity, exploitation of the Dead Sea, oil prospecting, shipping, etc. These projects demanded large-scale operations, advanced technical knowledge, and relatively large capital investment. In fact, the immigrants were reluctant to enter these fields and left them to foreign capital, mainly British, which had the necessary resources and experience in setting up and running large corporations.

3. *Capital gains*

This 'desertion' of the major economic projects calls for further explanation. There was, after all, no lack of capital. Private enterprise had been quite successful in the building industry, in citriculture, and even in some other industries, such as textiles and diamonds. Why was Jewish capital not active in financing these enterprises? Why was it 'profitable' for British capital raised in the City of London to finance them and not for Jewish capital in Palestine, and later on, in Israel?

It seems that the main economic factor behind this situation was the different rate of profit expected in these two capital markets. On the world market, shares that yielded about 5 per cent were 'reasonable', but they were quite 'unacceptable' to the Jewish capitalists in Palestine. The rapid development of Jewish Palestine brought about an enormous rise in prices of real estate, especially for urban building sites; the rise occurred against a background of almost stable prices for goods and services up to the forties. This led to large capital gains that could be 'realized' quite easily. Investment in unfamiliar large-scale projects therefore seemed inadequate, and, consequently, foreign capital filled the gap.

To be sure, there were no restrictions on foreign capital investing in land. Incidentally, many foreigners, especially Jewish tourists, acquired rural and urban plots and several corporations—American, South African, and other—were engaged in large land-development schemes. Nevertheless, the main capital gains accrued to local capitalists. Agricultural land had to be cultivated. Real estate had to be maintained and administered. Palestine was too remote from the main financial centres and there was no clear knowledge of local conditions or of development prospects.

Another point to be emphasized in this connexion is the general financial aspect of large development projects. They usually have a long pay-off period, perhaps too long for a small capital market. The capital market of London, on the other hand, had the necessary familiarity with similar projects, and could act more efficiently and promptly.

4. *The withdrawal of foreign capital*

From the outset, the Government of Israel had to face the withdrawal of foreign capital. The reasons were presumably the lack of free capital on the British market in the early fifties, better prospects at home, and uncertainty as to the political future of Israel. The threat of economic blockade by the Arab countries, and reprisals against companies trading with Israel, played their part as well. The State of Israel had no choice but to invest the necessary capital in the development of this sector of the economy. Foreign interests were 'bought out' and State ownership of some larger industries was established. By 1959 the share of the State Sector in these branches of the economy in terms of Net Domestic Product was as follows:¹⁷

Mining, quarrying, and manufacture	4.3 per cent
Public utilities (water, electricity, etc.)	100.0 " "
Transport and communications	40.3 " "

Nevertheless, all this sub-sector of the State's industrial activities accounted for no more than 6 per cent of the Net Domestic Product in Israel.

THE BALANCE

The specific feature of the Israeli sectoral structure is not the existence of a large State Sector, but the fact that it exists along with an equally large Workers' Economy sector. The Public Economy sectors account for about 45 per cent of the Net Domestic Product, and dominate the most important large-scale enterprises. On the other hand, the Private Sector dominates real estate, industry, trade, finance, and services. It enjoys almost all the profits generated in the economy.

The situation seems to be almost balanced and the proportion between the sectors even in the main branches of the economy is stable. However, technical development, a variation in profit expectations, a change of attitudes, etc., could lead to new developments in the sectoral structure.

NOTES

¹ H. Nahshon, *'Meshek hapo'alim vehameshek hatziburi beshanim 1946-1959'*, (The Workers' Economy and the Public Economy, 1946-1959), *Hameshek Hashitufi* (Co-operative Economics), Nos. 2-3 (505-6), 16 January 1961.

² D. Creamer, *Israel's National Income, 1950-1954*, Jerusalem, 1957, p. 33.

³ Ahad ha'Am, *The Summary*, quoted in R. Nathan, O. Gass, and D. Creamer, *Palestine: Problem and Promise*, Washington, D.C., 1946, p. 282.

⁴ A. Ruppin, 'The Kvutzah' in *Three Decades of Palestine*, Jerusalem, 1936, pp. 131-41.

⁵ G. Muenzner, *Jewish Labour Economy in Palestine*, London, 1945, p. 14; Creamer, *op. cit.*, p. 40; *Meshek ha'ovdim 1960-1965* (The Labour Economy, 1960-1965), the Institute for Social and Economic Research (Labour Federation), Tel-Aviv, 1967, p. 26.

⁶ *Misparim* (Figures), Keren Hayessod and the Statistical Department of the

THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE ISRAELI ECONOMY

Jewish Agency, Nos. 8-9 (August-September 1947), pp. 1, 42.

⁷ Z. Breslavski, *Tnu'at hapo'alim ha-Eretz Israelit* (The Jewish Labour Movement in Palestine), vol. 1, Tel-Aviv, 1955, p. 248.

⁸ Nahshon, op. cit.

⁹ Muenzner, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

¹⁰ B. Borochoy, *Selected Essays in Socialist Zionism*, S. Levenberg, ed., London, 1948, pp. 23-24.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 48. ('In the Beginning' was first published in 1906.)

¹² Muenzner, op. cit., p. 14.

¹³ Creamer, op. cit., p. 40; H. Barkai, 'The Public, Histadrut, and Private Sectors in the Israeli Economy', in the *Sixth Report (1961-1963)* of the Falk Project for Economic Research in Israel, Jerusalem, 1964, p. 33; *Meshek ha'ovdim 1960-1965*, op. cit., p. 26.

¹⁴ Based on *Meshek ha'ovdim 1960-1965*, op. cit., pp. 138, 140, 182.

¹⁵ Creamer, op. cit., p. 29.

¹⁶ Barkai, op. cit., p. 66.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

JUDAISM

The Quarterly Journal Published by the
American Jewish Congress

Featured in the Fall 1968 Issue

A Special Number
Devoted in Its Entirety to
An Examination of

JUDAISM AND ISLAM: THE ANTIPATHETIC SYMBIOSIS

Political Philosophy in Judaism and Islam

Erwin I. J. Rosenthal

The Jewish Quarter in Muslim Cities and Berber Areas

H. Z. Hirschberg

Pro-Islamic Jews

Bernard Lewis

Personal and Collective Security: The Palestinian Need

Rafael Rosenzweig

Arabs on Arabs: Essays in Self-Interpretation

Nissim Rejwan

North African Jewish Studies (Review Essay)

Lawrence Rosen

Prospects for Peace in the Middle East

Victor T. LeVine

*

Single Issue \$1.50

One-Year Subscription (four issues)

U.S. & Canada, \$5.00

Others, \$6.00

Address all subscriptions to:

JUDAISM

15 East 84th Street
New York, N.Y. 10028

THE INFLUENCE OF PARENTAL BACKGROUND ON JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Vera West

THIS is a study¹ based on interviews with 155 English university undergraduates who are all Jewish in the sense that they have at least one Jewish parent.² This does not necessarily imply that they are Jewish by religion, that they feel a need to live in a Jewish community, or that they consider that being Jewish is an important part of their lives. It is one of the purposes of this paper to consider what Jewish birth does in fact mean to the students.

A major assumption which acts as the starting point for the analysis presented here is that parents attempt to educate their children to hold the same basic beliefs as they do themselves. If this process were entirely successful children would grow up with the same values as their parents. In this case students with parents who believe that the Jews should preserve their separate cultural identity would feel committed to that end, and students with parents who believe in the Jewish religion would similarly believe in the Jewish religion. This is a particularly plausible assumption with regard to the Jews because of their stress on the importance of the home as a place for the transmission of Jewish values.

The students who were interviewed do not all hold the same beliefs about the Jewish community and the Jewish religion as their parents; therefore the problem facing us is to account for these differences. This is not an easy problem because there is a multitude of factors which could have intervened between the parents and their children before they became adults. The Jewish community does not exist in isolation but within the wider British society, and is itself continually adopting English characteristics. Throughout their childhood Jewish children are exposed to English culture and English is the mother tongue of the majority. They mainly attend English schools where they receive a general secular education and later attend English universities. Even those who go to Jewish schools take English examinations to qualify

them for university entrance. Most of the students are completely English in appearance and outward behaviour and, since they live in a society where antisemitism is low, they are not forced by a hostile environment into segregating themselves into groups of Jews. Furthermore, they live in a society which is predominantly secular and are not forced into affirming any religious faith.

The students have therefore experienced two overlapping sets of values and are in a position where they can choose between them; they can choose whether to be part of Jewish society or whether to assimilate into the non-Jewish world. The choice which they make will be influenced by the values transmitted to them by their parents and the people they grew up with, as well as by their mainly English and secular education.

In order to study this problem, the type of involvement the students have with being Jewish will be compared with the positions of their parents. Those students who have changed away from the backgrounds they were born into will be studied separately in an attempt to consider the alternative influences on them. The effect of going to university will be examined in this context. Finally, the values held by the students who are in some way involved with the Jewish community will be compared with those who are not, in order to give some qualitative evidence of the differences between them.

Types of Jews

This analysis depends on finding some criteria for describing the different types of Jews in England. This is necessary if we are to say which parents could be expected to have given their children the strongest introduction to Jewish values.

I define Jewish society in England as closed in the sense that in order for someone to be accepted as part of it he must be born a Jew. This assumption is justified by the fact that it is rare for proselytes to the Jewish religion to be universally accepted as members of Anglo-Jewry; they are regarded by many people as different and are not considered 'real' Jews.³ Non-Jews can never become members of the Jewish community in their own right. Thus entry into the Jewish community is based on *ascribed* characteristics acquired at birth rather than on qualities which can be *achieved* by individual effort. There is also a corresponding belief among many Jews that anyone who is born a Jew and therefore has this ascribed status will always remain a Jew whatever his personal choice and actions. Although this belief has a religious basis, it is held by many people who themselves deny the importance of the Jewish religion and is in effect a statement that the Jews are a race and cannot escape this identification. In this inclusive sense both the students who were interviewed and their parents are Jews.⁴ There are, however, degrees of commitment to being Jewish

JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

within this wider definition which are based on the belief and actions of the actors themselves. It is this sort of distinction that I am interested in making here.

First, there are those people who deny the validity of this ascribed characteristic of Jewishness with which they were born and, although they may recognize that they come from a Jewish background, cannot be identified as Jews by their beliefs or actions.

Second, there are those who recognize this racial definition of a Jew as relevant to the organization of their lives and live socially as Jews and participate in the Jewish community, but do not believe in the Jewish religion.

Third, there are those who are Jews in the traditionally accepted sense; who accept that they are members of the Jewish people, believe in the Jewish religion, and live socially as Jews.⁵

The second and third types can be defined as members of the Jewish community, the third type alone as members of the Jewish religion. Religious membership of the Jewish community is the strongest since practice of traditional Judaism necessitates a Jewish community. Traditionally all Jews were of the third type but in the course of adaptation to English society religious orthodoxy is no longer a necessary condition for membership in Jewish society. Rather, the struggle over religious issues is fought out among those who choose to participate in Jewish society.

These categories are, of course, very broad analytic distinctions and there are many varieties of belief and behaviour within each type; in particular there are many differences between people who describe themselves as Jews by religion, varying from those who live a traditional sacred life where Jewish Law guides every action and is inseparable from secular life, to those who disregard the Law and only go to synagogue three times a year.

The students and their parents will be divided into types in the light of these distinctions. The parents are divided on the basis of their synagogal and Jewish organizational membership and their observance of Jewish religious practices. Their actual beliefs could not be taken into account since the information about them was collected at second hand from their children; we have therefore had to assume an identity between their beliefs and actions. Owing to the unsettled nature of a student's situation in society it was necessary to use a more subjective measure of the students' position with regard to Jewish life. Their willingness to marry a non-Jew was taken as an indicator of their willingness to disregard basic Jewish values when planning their future, while their stated level of religious observance was taken as an indicator of the importance of the Jewish religion to them. The students' views were not taken as a basis for predicting what they will do in the future, since it is impossible to know what will happen to them when they leave

university, but rather as evidence of their views at one particular moment of time.

Before this analysis, however, a brief outline of the ways in which the students were selected for interview and a few facts about their background must be given.

The selection and distribution of the students

The students were chosen for interview from lists of Jewish, and where possible, Israel society members⁶ at the universities of Cambridge, Manchester, and Essex, and in London at Imperial College, University College, and the London School of Economics. These lists were supplemented by people known to be Jewish who were not members of any University Jewish society.⁷ The interviews took place between November 1966 and March 1967 and were conducted by the use of an interview schedule with mostly open-ended questions and a supplementary questionnaire which the students filled in themselves. The interviews lasted between one and two hours each. While it cannot be claimed that the students are a representative sample of all English Jewish students, it is hoped that they represent the range, if not the distribution, of practice and opinion among English Jewish students. The final distribution of the students was as in Table I.

TABLE I. *University and sex of the students*

	<i>Cambridge</i>	<i>Manchester</i>	<i>Essex</i>	<i>London</i>	<i>Total</i>
Male	32	27	17	39	115
Female	7	20	7	6	40
Total	39	47	24	45	155

They were distributed between subjects as in Table II.

TABLE II. *Subjects studied by the students*

	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
Arts	10	16	26
Law	8	5	13
Science and technology	38	6	44
Medicine and dentistry	12	2	14
Economics and accountancy	32	1	33
Other social science	14	10	24
Architecture	1	0	1
Total	115	40	155

(N.B. Medicine and Law are not offered as subjects at Essex University.)

JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Ninety-nine of the students said that they were members of a Jewish society at their university, while 56 said that they were not. However, the names of 16 of those who said that they were not members did appear on outdated Jewish society lists.⁸

The families of the students all came to this country as immigrants during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The majority of the students (98) were the third generation of their family in this country; that is, they themselves and their parents were born in this country. Forty-six were native-born with one or both parents foreign-born, while the remaining eleven students were born abroad. The foreign parents were most highly represented in professional occupations and were the least closely affiliated to the Jewish community.

In occupation the parents of the students were predominantly middle-class.

TABLE III. *Occupational class of parents*

	<i>Number</i>	<i>per cent</i>
Professional	40	26
Higher managerial	72	46
Lower managerial and clerical	22	14
Manual	17	11
No response	4	3
Total	155	100

Ninety-one (or 59 per cent) of the students' fathers were self-employed, a very high proportion of independent occupations. Apart from those whose parents were members of the professions, most of the students were the first generation of their families to go to university.

English was the native language of most of the students: 102 of the students had not learnt any other language from their parents, 23 had learnt some Yiddish, and 29 had learnt some other language at home. These languages ranged through German, Russian, Italian, French, and Arabic. (One student did not reply to the question.)

The students were mainly educated at ordinary English schools: 128 had never had any full-time Jewish schooling; 13 had been to a Jewish secondary school and 14 had been to a Jewish primary school. A few were partly educated abroad. All but 19, however, had attended some part-time Jewish religious or Hebrew classes, and ten still spent some of their time in Jewish study.

The students and their parents

Four types of parents were separated according to the distinctions outlined above:

- I Those who are in no way members of the Jewish community and therefore are Jews in the ascriptive sense only: 19.

- II Those who are affiliated to the Jewish community but do not keep any religious observances (ascription plus communal membership): 23.
- III(i) Those who are members of the Jewish community and carry out some religious observances but are not orthodox in the traditional sense (ascription plus communal membership plus religion): 80.
- III(ii) Those who are orthodox members of the Jewish community (ascription plus communal membership plus religion): 33.

If the students' commitment to Jewish communal membership (their willingness to marry a non-Jew) is compared with that of their parents, they are distributed as in Table IV.

TABLE IV. *Parents' communal and religious position and the communal position of the students*

Parents \ Students	I <i>Not members</i>	II <i>Members but not religious</i>	III(i) <i>Religious members but not fully orthodox</i>	III(ii) <i>Orthodox members</i>	Total
willing to marry a non-Jew	17	11	21	7	56
unwilling to marry a non-Jew or uncertain*	2	12	59	26	99
Total	19	23	80	33	155

* 17 of the 99 said they were uncertain whether or not they would be willing to marry a non-Jew.

This distribution shows what one would expect: *the stronger the participation of the parents in the community the more likely the students are to feel committed to remain within the community.* In other words, strong participation in the Jewish community by the parents makes it much less likely that the students will be willing to violate a fundamental norm of Jewry by marrying a non-Jew. As explained above, this is not a predictive statement but rather evidence that the students believe that such a marriage would be wrong and accept that Jews have something in common which necessitates their separate development from non-Jews.

The influence of the parents can be seen more clearly if the students who vary from their parents are compared with those who make the same choice as their parents:

Same as parents: 114 (74 per cent). Different from parents: 41 (26 per cent).

Thus, although the majority of the students are in the same general

JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

position as their parents, 41 have made a different choice. The change is both towards and away from the Jewish community, since two students want to remain within the Jewish group despite the lack of participation of their parents. However, the fact that the remaining 39 are willing to marry a non-Jew despite an unbringing within the Jewish community shows a definite movement away from a belief in participation in it.

When it comes to religion it is clear that while many of the students wish to remain in name within the Jewish faith, their level of observance has declined considerably compared with that of their parents.

TABLE V. *Parents' communal and religious position and the stated religious practice of the students*

Students \ Parents	I <i>Not members</i>	II <i>Members but not religious</i>	III(i) <i>Religious members but not fully orthodox</i>	III(ii) <i>Orthodox members</i>	Total
Strictly orthodox	0	0	1 (B)	6	7
Moderately orthodox	0	2 (B)	25	14	41
Reform/Liberal	0	4 (B)	19	4 (A)	27
Unobservant/no religion*	19	17	35 (A)	9 (A)	80
Total	19	23	80	33	155

* Unobservant Jew: 17, No religion: 63. The two groups have been combined in this table.

B = more religious than parents

A = less religious than parents

Thus although many parents do succeed in influencing their children not to leave the Jewish community entirely, they have less success in teaching them the Jewish faith.

If the figures are looked at to see whether the students hold the same position as their parents, it can be seen that 105 (68 per cent) do hold roughly a similar position and the remaining 50 (32 per cent) have changed from the general religious position of their parents. Once again, although there is a movement both towards (6) and away from (44) the Jewish religion, the majority of students who hold different religious views from their parents have moved away from the Jewish religion. This is even more apparent when the details of the students' observance is looked at; at every level of observance the students are less religious than their parents except in a very few cases.

There is, moreover, some evidence from this survey to show that orthodoxy of belief is declining faster than orthodoxy of practice: 13 of those who described themselves as observant of the Jewish religion also said that they did not believe in God, including eight who described their practice as orthodox. This may also be applicable to the parents

of the students and could help us explain the actions of some of their rebellious children.

Change away from parents and the Jewish community

If we concentrate on the general trend of change away from the Jewish community and religion we are left with the problem of explaining the 39 cases of students who were brought up within the Jewish community but say that they are willing to marry out of it and the 44 cases of students who observe considerably less of the Jewish religion than they were brought up to do.

One hypothesis which is sometimes put forward by those concerned with the preservation of the Jewish community is that the students agree with their parents until they go to university and are exposed to non-Jewish influences. I do not think that this is an adequate explanation and shall attempt to show why, although this is a difficult subject to present evidence about from material which was collected at one point in time and was not designed to account for changes over time.

If we look at the universities the students go to, it can be seen that they vary in their general and their Jewish characteristics. They can be divided according to the size of the town and the university as well as according to the availability of Jewish life.

Manchester University is a large provincial university in a town where there is a large Jewish community. Both student life generally and Jewish student life are very active. Thus students at Manchester can choose whether to involve themselves in the local Jewish community or the student Jewish community, or they can ignore Jewish life completely. If they wish they can live in Jewish lodgings, at home if they come from Manchester, or in the Jewish Hillel House.

The situation at London is similar. There are Jewish student societies at the various colleges which are active in the sense of having weekly meetings. They reflect, however, the general tendency of life at London University to be fragmentary. Students at London University tend to disperse in the evenings and although their friends may all be students, student life is not pervasive. There are, however, large Jewish communities in London, and students who want to live in a mainly Jewish environment can take what they want from the university but live at home or in Jewish lodgings and disperse to the Jewish suburbs at night. Alternatively, they can live in any other part of London and ignore the Jewish community.

Cambridge University has an active student life of every type but a small local Jewish community. As nearly all Cambridge students live in Cambridge away from home, during term-time life must be predominantly among students. During the first year all undergraduates live and eat one meal a day in college. There are, however, exemptions for Jewish students, and the Jewish society has evolved to solve the

JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

problem of creating a Jewish life in a non-Jewish environment; the Jewish society owns the local synagogue and serves meals there for those who do not want to eat non-kasher food. Eating regularly at the Jewish society means separating oneself from the normal student way of life at Cambridge; thus the decision to live a fully Jewish life entails separation from other students. As a result, there is a close-knit, serious, orthodox Jewish student community at Cambridge which attracts some people who have never experienced orthodox life before, while the majority of Jewish students live as ordinary Cambridge undergraduates, although some may go to Israel or Jewish society meetings or to the Friday night service and meal at the student-controlled synagogue.

Essex University is a small new university on the outskirts of Colchester where nearly all students live away from home. There is no Jewish community of any size, and although there is a Jewish society and a small friendship group of Jews, there is little Jewish life available, and anyone who needs a Jewish environment must find life there uncomfortable.

If one assumes that students have some knowledge of what a university is like before they choose to go there, one would not expect many committed Jewish students to go to a university like Essex unless they have absolutely no other choice. On the other hand, students who reject the Jewish community may still go to Manchester, for example, since once there they can ignore the Jewish community if they wish. Thus, if students do not change at university but before, there is likely to be a factor of pre-selection according to the desired degree of Jewish life which could affect the distribution of committed students between the universities.

If we look at this distribution it can be seen that, as expected, they are divided according to the availability of Jewish life at the four universities: London and Manchester have more religious Jewish students than Cambridge and Essex (Table VI).

TABLE VI. *Students' stated religious observance by university*

<i>Religious Observance</i>	<i>University</i>				
<i>Religious Observance</i>	<i>Essex</i>	<i>Cambridge</i>	<i>Manchester</i>	<i>London</i>	<i>Total</i>
Orthodox	4	9	20	15	48
Reform/Liberal	2	5	7	13	27
Unobservant/no religion	18	25	20	17	80
Total	24	39	47	45	155

The same pattern can be seen even more clearly in terms of their attitude to marriage with a non-Jew (Table VII).

VERA WEST

TABLE VII. *Students' willingness to marry a non-Jew by university*

<i>Marriage</i>	<i>University</i>	<i>Essex</i>	<i>Cambridge</i>	<i>Manchester</i>	<i>London</i>	<i>Total</i>
Willing to marry a non-Jew		18	18	12	8	56
Not willing or do not know		<u>6</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>99</u>
Total		24	39	47	45	155

London and Manchester students are also more likely to live at home and, whether or not living at home, are more likely to eat kasher food regularly. The expected relationships can also be found in the degree of Jewish society participation at the universities and in friendship patterns. Manchester and London students are more likely to have mainly Jewish friends.

However, if we return to those students who were isolated as having rebelled against their parents by being willing to marry a non-Jew the position is not so clear, as there are students of this type at all four universities:

Essex: 10, Cambridge: 9, Manchester: 12, London: 8.

These figures are not in themselves conclusive. They represent a larger proportion of students at Essex than at the other universities, but at the same time show that there are significant numbers of students who change at those universities where Jewish life is available. Half of the total number of students at Essex and Cambridge who reject Jewish norms have parents who are not involved in the Jewish community. Furthermore, there is evidence from conversations with the students that they do in fact choose which university they wish to go to in terms of the sort of life they want to lead, and that, if forced to live with Jews against their wishes, they manage to ignore what their parents want and meet the sort of people they want at the university. Going to university certainly strengthens this process since the students can contrast their two environments and opt for the one they prefer. Many of the students also adopt left-wing political beliefs and see inconsistency between their desire for equality, their dislike of racial discrimination, and an assertion of their own ascriptive differences.

If we look at the students who have seriously rebelled against their parents religiously, they are distributed between the universities as follows:

Essex: 4, Cambridge: 13, Manchester: 14, London: 13.

It can be seen that students from religious homes were not very likely to go to Essex in the first place and that most of the change took place at universities where Jewish life is available. When asked about changes in religious observance and belief, only four of these students

JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

said that they had changed since coming to university. Thirty said that they had changed before coming to university, eight denied any change at all, and two said that they had in some way become more Jewish since coming to university. Thus, once again, although university may reinforce decisions to reject the Jewish religion, it does not seem to cause them.

The fact that the students live in a society where religious belief is not strong and where religious practice does not play much part in everyday life is a more likely cause of their rejection of the importance of intricate religious practices. Many students also know that their parents use religious practices as a symbol of their belonging to the Jewish group and not as an assertion of religious faith. There is further inconsistency in what the parents tell their children and what they do themselves. While some students will doubtless behave in the same way, others cannot tolerate this level of inconsistency. This is all the more likely where they also reject the validity of the ascriptive basis of the Jewish group.

It is possible that a formal Jewish education could have prevented this process taking place. This does not, however, seem to be the case. The evidence here is not strong since only 13 attended a Jewish secondary school, but it is nevertheless interesting that these 13 were more likely to reject the Jewish religion than those from similar backgrounds who did not attend Jewish schools (8 out of 13 as opposed to 36 out of 100).

Beliefs about Jews and the Jewish community

Finally, I should like to discuss the beliefs and values which motivate the choices which the students make. For many their beliefs about what sort of life they want to lead crystallize during adolescence before coming to university, but at whatever stage in their lives this process takes place, it is based on their general values about and perception of their environment.

The ideal-typical student who wants to participate in the Jewish community has beliefs about the Jews being a separate group; he will believe that Jews have special ascriptive qualities by virtue of their birth. 'Jews contribute more to society in relation to the number of them there are. The special group the Jews belong to has higher intelligence than most.' He will also believe that this group has special responsibilities:

'When other people had spears and loin cloths the Jewish population had a moral code written down and a deep understanding of what life is all about. The fact is that I have to set a high example to the people in the country where I live in order that they have the attitude that the Jewish religion and people are a proud race and have a great deal to offer the world today, as they have throughout history.'

He will also believe that as a member of this privileged group he has a duty to pass on this heritage: 'I believe that it is my duty to successfully teach Judaism to my children and if I do not I will be a failure.' It would not be inconsistent of him, however, also to express the belief that whatever place the Jewish religion has it is secondary in the wider concept of Jewishness: 'It is more a Jew's background than his practice that counts. Once a Jew always a Jew.'

But not all the factors that hold these students to the Jewish community are based on explicit values. There is also an element of fear: 'If a Jew does something bad it reflects on all the group. We are a minority and haven't much defence against the majority.' This fear of a hostile out-group and love of Jewish life also generate a need for Jewish company and a feeling of unease in non-Jewish circles: 'I went to teachers' training college before coming here and loathed it. I was the only Jew in the college and needed others. I felt very uncomfortable and left before Christmas.' This belief in Jewry does not, however, exclude criticism—but it is always criticism within the Jewish community. As the girl quoted above said: 'At college when there were no other Jews I felt lonely and lost. I need a protective wall of other Jews and friendliness. But now I am back in the fold I am disgusted by the idea that money equals God.'

On the other hand, the students who reject association with the Jewish community have a completely different and contrary set of beliefs. I may not have been able to establish at what stage these beliefs are formed by those who have different views from their parents, but once formed they force rejection of those Jews whose beliefs are contradictory.

The focal point of this difference is the rejection by these students of the ascriptive qualities of Jews. They perceive the world as, or would prefer the world to be, based on universalistic values. They frequently repeated the phrase, 'people are people', meaning that they would prefer not to judge or be judged according to ethnic characteristics. In general terms this implied that they resented what they felt was the Jewish community's emphasis on ascriptive qualities. They criticized Jews for sticking together, for being insular, for saying, 'If he's a Jew I'll bother, if he is not I won't', even for having different business ethics when dealing with non-Jews and with Jews. On the personal level this feeling is expressed as follows: 'My Jewishness wouldn't tell people much about me. It is not one of the important things about me. My attitude is not that of a Jew. I would tend to dissociate myself from people who think of me as a Jew.' Or as another boy said, 'I am a Jew through having come through the Jewish community, through knowing Jews. I am more aware of Jews in detail than other people are. I know a lot about them but they do not include me.' For some of the students the ascriptive demands made by Jews even made them feel uncomfort-

JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

able: 'If I was among Jews they would expect a brotherhood which I do not feel. These feelings are not expected among non-Jews. Therefore I feel more comfortable with them.' Rejection of the Jewish community is also often combined with a negative stereotype of English Jews. There were frequent complaints about the 'self-imposed Ghetto', 'the Jewish intolerance of non-Jews', of 'Jewish racialism', of the emphasis on marrying a Jew. There were also complaints of a community based on materialism and ostentation, which were not confined to those who had already rejected the Jewish community, although they were perhaps more virulent when they came from them. They felt that there was an emphasis on big expensive weddings, on loud voices, on flashy dress, on flashy expensive cars. One boy called it the 'fitted carpet mentality', while others talked of a certain area of London being full of 'spoilt youth'.

Basically the students rejected the premises on which they believed the community was based. It is well summed up by one student's words: 'It is opposed to all the values I hold dear. My own moral and political and religious attitudes are extremely radical; the Jewish community is claustrophobic and puritanical. There is pressure on material success, conventional norms and getting married. I feel that I am a rebel against what I was brought up with.'

Thus, those who support and those who reject the Jewish community have completely different and opposing sets of beliefs. The first group accept that the Jews have special ascriptive qualities while the second group oppose this. The first group, however critical they may be, need and want to live among Jews; the second group dislike the community which the Jews form. The first group accept, at least in part, the Jewish religious tradition; the second group oppose it and religion in general.

I have not written here about the dimensions of ascriptive Jewishness, but it should be emphasized that not all the students who reject the Jewish community deny their Jewishness. Some of them are concerned about world Jewish problems, with Israel, with positive beliefs about Jewish intellectuals, and particularly with the effects of Nazism on the Jews. These are, however, analytically separate problems from their relationship to the English Jewish community.

Conclusion

This article has shown that the majority of the students hold views about participation in the Jewish community and religion similar to those of their parents. Those who have changed away from the position of their parents have been examined separately, and it is suggested that they were not influenced by their university experience but had decided what life they wanted to lead before coming to university. Further research would be necessary to discover when and how this choice is made.

NOTES

¹ This research was carried out under the auspices of the Institute of Contemporary History and Wiener Library, supported by a grant from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture. It was supervised by Professor S. J. Gould.

I should like to thank Mrs. Marlana Schmool and Zion Zivedi for their great help in discussing my work with me.

² I am aware of the fact that according to Jewish Law it is necessary to have a Jewish mother to be a Jew. Nevertheless, some half-Jewish students with non-Jewish mothers do feel identified with Jewry. In any case the numbers are small: mother not Jewish: 7, father not Jewish: 4.

³ For example, E. Krausz, *Leeds Jewry: Its History and Social Structure*, Cambridge, 1964, pp. 100-104, writes of the difficulty of non-Jewish marriage partners being accepted even if conversion takes place. They may, however, be accepted after several years.

38 of the students who were interviewed in this survey said that they would not be willing to marry a non-Jew who had become a convert to the Jewish religion before they met. (All these students came in the group who said they would not be willing to marry a non-Jew.)

⁴ In 11 cases the students had one non-Jewish parent. See note 2.

⁵ These three types of Jews do not include all the logically possible types, but rather the most likely types. For example, it is quite possible to believe in the Jewish religion but not participate in a Jewish community. This is, however, an unusual type of Jewishness when considered in the light of the nature of the Jewish religion. Another case which has been missed out is that of the person who

feels strongly that he is racially Jewish but dislikes the fact and tries to hide it. This, by its nature, is a difficult subject to collect information about, although I have evidence that a few students do feel like this. I could not, however, collect information of this type about the parents.

⁶ Israel Societies are based specifically on interest in the State of Israel. Not all Israel society members are Jewish, and membership of an Israel society demands a less comprehensive scale of Jewish involvement than membership of a Jewish society.

⁷ Owing to a failure in locating students who were not members of Jewish societies at London University, the students interviewed there are the least representative of the total range of opinion among Jewish students.

⁸ In his article on sampling Jewish students in Britain ('Locating Minority Group Members: Two British surveys of Jewish University Students', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. VI, No. 1, July 1964), E. J. de Kadt compares two samples of Jewish students, one based on a survey of Jewish society members with non-members added and one based on secondary analysis of a general survey of English students. In the first, 83 per cent of the students were at some time members of a Jewish student society. In the second, 60 per cent said that they were members of a Jewish student society. The proportion of Jewish society members in this study comes in between these two surveys. (74 per cent were members if all students were included who were at some time members of a student Jewish or Israel society, 64 per cent if only those who said they were members at the time of the interview were included.)

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH ON THE ANGLO-JEWISH COMMUNITY*

Marlena Schmool

Introduction

SOCIAL research on the Jewish community in Great Britain has increased considerably in recent years with the establishment—even if only on a limited and modest basis—of communally sponsored research organizations.¹ In addition, research students are working in this field at the universities; some of these students are working on specialized projects and may have only limited contact with allied research undertaken elsewhere. In view of the number of enquiries received at the Statistical and Demographic Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews it would appear that a systematic Register of Research in this field would be useful, both in preventing duplication of work and in directing research workers to those examining allied topics. The *Register of Research in the Social Sciences* (originally issued by the National Institute of Economic and Social Research and now, as the *Register of Research in the Human Sciences*, compiled by the Ministry of Technology) has served as a model for the present Register.

The present edition of the Register has been drawn up on the basis of information available to the Unit in June 1968. It includes details of social research currently being undertaken in Anglo-Jewish studies, together with information about recently completed projects (including recent publications). Further editions are planned and it is hoped that readers will submit details of any further projects which might be included.

For each project the following information is given, in so far as it is relevant and available:

- (a) title of the project;
- (b) a short description of the project;
- (c) the name of the person or committee responsible for the research;
- (d) the name(s) of the principal research worker(s);

* This Register was compiled in the course of the work of the Statistical and Demographic Research Unit of the Board of Deputies, London.

- (e) the actual or proposed starting date;
- (f) the proposed completion date;
- (g) date and details of publication of interim results;
- (h) probable date and place of publication of final result.

The Register is divided into two parts: (A) research undertaken or sponsored by Jewish communal organizations, and (B) research undertaken under university auspices (as a research thesis or otherwise). Within each part, the entries have been grouped in alphabetical order of the names of the institutions sponsoring the research (where appropriate, the words 'University of' are omitted). Research projects have been numbered serially throughout the Register for subsequent convenience of reference. Included in part A are research projects undertaken by provincial communities where such projects cover more than the routine collection of communal statistics. Enquiries regarding a particular entry should be addressed to the person or organization concerned.

Part A. Research undertaken by Jewish Communal Organizations

BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS

Statistical and Demographic Research Unit,

Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place, London, W.C.1.

Established 1965. Compiles statistical data on various aspects of the community and prepares interpretative studies of trends, etc. c. Functions under a Special Committee of the Board of Deputies (Chairman: Mr. Harry Landy); d. Honorary Research Adviser: Dr. S. J. Prais; Research Officer: Mrs. Marlena Schmool.

1. a. *Trends in Synagogue Marriages in Great Britain*.
 c. d. As above.
 e. January 1966.
 g. Reports on 1966 and 1967 available in mimeograph.
 h. 'Statistics of Jewish Marriages in Great Britain, 1901-65', *JJS*, Vol. IX, No. 2, December 1967.
2. a. *Demographic trends in Anglo-Jewry*
 b. Analyses of the Anglo-Jewish population based on fertility, mortality, and marriage statistics.
 c. d. As above.
 e. April 1966.
 h. 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population, 1960-65', *JJS*, Vol. X, No. 1, June 1968.
3. a. *Trends in Religious Observance*
 b. Analysis of changing patterns of consumption of kasher meat, matzot, etc., over past generation.

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH

- c. d. As above.
- e. August 1967.
- f. March 1969.

- 4. a. *The Socio-Economic Class Structure of Jews in England and Wales*
 - b. Analysis of a sample of Jewish deaths (carried out with the help of the Registrar-General).
 - c. d. As above.
 - e. January 1968.
 - f. April 1969.
- 5. a. *Causes of death among Jews in England and Wales*
 - b. c. d. As entry No. 4.
 - e. January 1968.
 - f. April 1969.

See also entry No. 7, below.

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH AFFAIRS

13-16, Jacobs Well Mews, George Street, London, W.1.

Established London 1966. Conducts research into international and national questions affecting the welfare and status of Jews throughout the world.

- 6. a. *Pilot study investigating the extent of poverty among the identified Jewish population*
 - b. A pilot study involving the analysis of 308 case files from the Jewish Welfare Board (1963-64) to determine the factors causing application to the Board and to obtain comprehensive data on the clients.
 - c. Professor S. J. Gould, with Research Board.
 - d. Miss R. Morris.
 - e. March 1967.
 - f. September 1968.
- 7. a. *Aspects of Jewish Identity*
 - b. Sample study of (i) Jewish population of Greater London and (ii) Jewish University Teachers.
 - c. Professor S. J. Gould, with Research Board and in conjunction with Board of Deputies.
 - d. Miss R. Harris.
 - e. June 1968.
- 8. a. *Study of Organizational Structure of Jewish Communities throughout the World*
 - b. Collection of data on the organizational structure, functioning,

MARLENA SCHMOOL

and legal status of Jewish communities throughout the world, with a view to establishing the main structural patterns and preparing a comparative analysis.

e. 1968.

JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

74a, Charlotte Street, London, W.1.

The principal functions of the Board fall under the headings of General Welfare, Convalescence, Loans, Welfare of Old People, Welfare and Employment of Boys, and Family Welfare.

9. a. *Cases receiving aid from the General Welfare Department of the Welfare Board*
 - b. A study of the differences in the characteristics and treatment of those cases (i) receiving and (ii) not receiving a weekly allowance from the General Welfare Department, examining the usefulness of monetary and non-monetary aid given by the department and the rationale behind the allocation of weekly allowances.
 - d. Miss R. Hager.
 - e. March 1968.
 - f. February 1969.

MERSEYSIDE JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

5, Oxford Street, Liverpool 7.

Compiles demographic data on local Jewry; annual reports are issued.

10. a. *Demographic Studies of the Liverpool Jewish Community*
 - c. Dr. Mervyn Goodman.
 - e. 1965, continuing.
 - g. 'A Research Note on Jewish Education on Merseyside, 1962', *JJS*, Vol. VII, No. 1, June 1965; 'Liverpool Jewry', *In the Dispersion*, Vol. 5-6, Spring 1966.

Part B. Research undertaken under University Auspices

CAMBRIDGE, FACULTY OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

11. a. *Community Study of Cambridge Jewry*
 - c. Mrs. L. Mestel (Supervisor Dr. E. R. Leach).
 - e. July 1965.

JEWES' COLLEGE

Institute for the Training of Teachers,

11, Montagu Place, London, W.1.

Within the Institute an Educational Workshop was set up in 1967

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH

to investigate various practical problems in Jewish education at the school level and to provide practical guidance for Hebrew teachers.

12. a. *An Educational Experiment at Jews' College*
 - c. M. Levin, M.A.
 - d. M. Levin, S.C. Reif.
 - e. November 1966.
 - f. July 1967.
 - h. Available in mimeograph.

LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS Houghton Street, London, W.C.2.

13. a. *Working-Class Jews in Present-day London: A Sociological Study*
 - b. A sample survey of two Jewish groups living in similar accommodation. Areas covered are Hackney and Stepney; in each area 50 Jewish families were interviewed. The research was financed by *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*.
 - c. J. Carrier (Supervisors Professor M. Freedman, Dr. P. Cohen).
 - e. November 1965.
 - f. Autumn 1968.
 - g. 'A Jewish Proletariat' in M. Mindlin and C. Bermant, eds., *Explorations*, London, 1967.
14. a. *Political Behaviour of British Jews*
 - b. A study of the political attitudes of Jews in Britain, in the general context of minority group behaviour, to discover what issues are politically most important to Jews and how these differ from the views of the general voting public.
 - c. Mrs. J. Samuels (Supervisor Dr. P. Cohen).
 - e. March 1968.
 - f. June 1969.

NOTTINGHAM, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

15. a. *Forms of Inter-Generational Conflict in the Jewish Family*
 - b. An analysis of four types of conflict based on interviews with a sample of Jewish youths and their parents.
 - c. G. Cromer, for M.A. degree (Supervisor Professor S. J. Gould).
 - e. October 1967.
 - f. October 1969.
16. a. *Social Mobility of the Jewish Immigrant*
 - b. A comparative study of social mobility focused on Baghdadi Jews of India and the Far East now living in London and Israel.
 - c. P. Gottlieb, for M.A. degree (Supervisor Professor S. J. Gould).
 - e. October 1967.
 - f. October 1969.

MARLENA SCHMOOL

OXFORD, ORIEL COLLEGE

17. a. *The Social Determinants in the Religious Practices and Organization of the Jews in England, with special reference to the United Synagogue*
b. The influence on religious practices and organization of the changing economic, cultural, and social circumstances of Jews in English society. Detailed attention is given to the organizational structure of the United Synagogue; the emergence and legitimation of new patterns of authority; the division of functions between lay and ecclesiastical bodies and their relationship; and the importance and effects of bureaucracy.
d. S. Sharot (Supervisor Dr. B. R. Wilson).
e. October 1965.
f. September 1968.

READING, INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY HISTORY AND WIENER LIBRARY

4, Devonshire Street, London, W.1.

Established Amsterdam 1933, transferred to London 1939, renamed 1964. Association with the University of Reading, 1967. Research on Anglo-Jewry undertaken as from 1964.

18. a. *Research on the attitudes and identification of Jewish Students*
b. Interviews with 155 Jewish University Students.
d. Mrs. V. West (Supervisor Professor S. J. Gould).
e. November 1965.
f. November 1967.
g. 'The Jewish Commitment of the Jewish Student', *The Wiener Library Bulletin*, Vol. XXII, No. 2, Spring 1968.

NOTES

¹ The Statistical and Demographic Research Unit of the Board of Deputies was established in 1965; the Institute of Jewish Affairs (affiliated to the World Jewish Congress) was founded in 1966; in addition, the Wiener Library (estab-

lished before the Second World War) should be noted as having recently taken an interest in this field (see Entry No. 18).

² *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*.

SHAUL ESH—IN MEMORIAM

On 2 April 1968, the community of historians, and especially of Jewish historians dealing with the period of the holocaust, suffered a grievous loss in the untimely death in a road accident of Dr. Shaul Esh, Senior Lecturer at the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Shaul Esh was born in a little Rhenish town in Germany in 1921. Reared in a traditional Jewish milieu, member of a religious Zionist group, he immigrated to Palestine in 1938. He studied at the Mikveh Israel agricultural school and a religious teachers' seminary, spent some time as a teacher in a religious children's village, and in 1944 registered at the Hebrew University. From 1952 we find him again working for his religious youth movement as an emissary in Switzerland, where he also obtained his Ph.D, his thesis being *The Holy One, Blessed Be He—A contribution to the history of a post-biblical appellation for God* (published—in German—in Leiden in 1957).

Returning to Israel, Esh became an editor at Yad Vashem, and was responsible, between 1955 and 1959, for the issue of the 'Yad Vashem Studies', in which he published some of his own articles. Immersing himself more and more in the study of the holocaust, he emerged as one of the great experts on the history of that difficult and tragic period. Finally, in 1959, he was one of the very few who joined Professor Moshe Davis in founding the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, where he worked until the time of his death.

Shaul Esh's method was based on the most meticulous and careful examination of documents and evidence of various kinds; his articles always give the impression of a careful exactness in content and style, one might even say an absolute neatness in placing words on paper, a sense of responsibility towards the reader and—in lectures—towards the student, which always left one with the strong impression of the absolute reliability of everything that was said or written. He was no great friend of vague generalizations or hasty conclusions. But it should not be thought that he did not see the wood for the trees. Among his published works we find contributions to general discussion such as 'The Dignity of the Destroyed: Towards a Definition of the Period of the Holocaust' (*Judaism*, vol. II, no. 2, 1962), and his lecture 'Some Observations on the Place of the Sephardim in Modern Jewry' (*Actas del primer simposio de estudios sefardies*, Madrid, in press). Generally, however, he preferred to make his observations by a detailed analysis of some representative issue, and by the analysis itself show where he stood in the general discussion. This emerges for instance in his 'A German in Lodz Ghetto' (Hebrew; in *Amot*, vol. 2 [11], 1964); there he shows the extent and the limitations of occasional German sympathy for Jews by means of an incident which also gives him the opportunity to show the

dilemma of the *Judenraete*. The method he uses is the one he always liked best: a detailed analysis of documents.

Similarly, his predilection for philology comes out clearly in his masterly study 'Words and their Meanings' (*Yad Vashem Studies*, V, 1964), where he analysed twenty-five examples of Nazi idiom and showed through them how ideology transmitted itself through language into action.

His major book on the history of *Ha'avara* (the transfer of funds by Jews from Germany to Palestine in the thirties) was unfortunately not completed. His lecture on that theme at the Third World Congress of Jewish Studies in 1964 gave a foretaste of what the book may contain; the manuscript is extant and it is hoped that it will be completed and published.

Shaul Esh's interests were many. He helped organize meetings dealing with contemporary Jewish studies in England and Spain and Western Europe (and, together with Professor Gould, published in 1966 a book containing contributions by a number of authors to the problems of British Jewry). He published collections of documents on the Nazi era; he conscientiously and faithfully fulfilled his duties towards his students; he helped to develop the new methods of oral documentation at the Institute. But occasionally he would, as it were, take time off and devote his efforts to such themes as 'Variant Readings in Mediaeval Hebrew Commentaries—R. Samuel Ben Meir (Rashbam)' (in *Textus*, Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project, vol. V, 1966), the editing of the *Pinkas* of the Berlin *Gemeinde*, 1723–1854, in continuation of the work of Joseph Mayzel (Jerusalem, 1962), and the editing of a small book in memory of Eliezer Shamir, an outstanding member of Kibbutz Sdeh Eliyahu (1957), where he felt some of his deepest roots were.

Shaul Esh was not an orator; his lectures were apt to be on the dry side. But they were permeated by the strictest standards of intellectual honesty, buttressed with a tremendous knowledge and an imposing array of facts, and therefore thoroughly convincing. Despite the sad nature of his chosen subject, Shaul Esh was a man who loved life, and enjoyed it. Rather reticent at first contact, he could open up to people in whom he had acquired confidence. His political opinions were firm and decided, though he kept them strictly to himself; his views on contemporary life were realistic; his patriotism was deep and unostentatious—a couple of years ago he returned from a period of call-up with a gleeful smile and confided to his close colleagues that he had been distinguished as the outstanding soldier (he was a private) in his reserve unit.

Shaul Esh was a friend of innovations, of new methods and new people and new ideas. When he died, he had new projects in mind and new ways to approach a most difficult subject. Unfortunately, he was not to develop them further. The Institute and the community of scholars in Israel and all over the Jewish world have lost a dear friend and a good historian. May he rest in peace.

YEHUDA BAUER,
The Hebrew University,
Jerusalem

BOOK REVIEWS

W. W. ISAJIW, *Causation and Functionalism in Sociology*, vii + 158 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1968, 25s.

The subject matter of this book has long been a central issue in social science. Indeed the literature on 'functionalism' and 'functional analysis' over the last forty years is the sociologists' counterpart to the flourishing Goethe and Shakespeare industries! There is room, therefore, for an up to date progress report—one which surveys the literature and, from a specific standpoint, appraises the debate. This is what Professor Isajiw attempts—in large measure successfully. The book stresses the importance of what Isajiw calls 'telecausality', that is, explanation in terms of 'ends which are not intended by those in action'. Such explanation is contrasted with explanation in terms of efficient causes ('productive causality'). Thus the functionalist strives to explain the *persistence* of 'specific variables . . . within a system', not their existence. It may be argued, of course, that this is a rather special focus. After all we may be more interested in why, for example, a particular kind of religious institution comes into being in a quite specific, if inchoate, form. Such an interest is just as sociological as an interest in why it 'persists'. Indeed—and, of course, this is not Professor Isajiw's fault—what is meant by 'persistence' is not always clear. The fact that entities may (and do) change and evolve, even while they 'persist', presents notorious problems. Isajiw is sensitive to this and other cruces—e.g. the difficulty of extracting from the functionalist corpus testable statements rather than fertile (or futile) tautologies; the challenge presented by psychological 'reductionism'; the varieties of functional analyses, some being more tightly woven than others into controversial essays in general theory. The impression grows that the functional approach may be logically at its strongest when allied with such 'general theory'. For it is in practice difficult to appraise the logic of functionalism (as distinct from the usefulness of asking functional questions), outside a wider concern with system and system-states. Yet this logical force is bought at an empirical loss. For all too often in the literature this wider concern flies off into woolly abstraction or else into equally thick pseudo-empirical references to cybernetics. How this comes about is traced and documented in this book. Most of the gambits and theoretical by-ways are clearly described. Professor Isajiw, though his writing is often elliptical and, oddly, dispenses frequently with both the definite and indefinite articles, has written a sensible hard-headed survey which will be widely used. In 129 pages he summarizes a great deal of sometimes intractable material—and he shows, through exegesis and criticism, the relevance to sociology of philosophical acumen. For, after all, have not many functionalists been talking philosophy (often ineptly) without knowing it?

JULIUS GOULD

BOOK REVIEWS

GABRIEL MARCEL, EMMANUEL LEVINAS, ANDRÉ LACOCQUE, *Martin Buber, L'Homme et le Philosophe*, introduced by Robert Weltsch, 75 pp., Editions de l'Institut de Sociologie de l'Université libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, 1968, 120 F.B.

The three essays which, along with Dr. Weltsch's informative and perceptive biographical introduction, constitute this little book about Martin Buber, were presented at a conference of the *Centre national des hautes études juives* held in Brussels in 1966. First, Gabriel Marcel discusses Buber's philosophical anthropology, with characteristic interpolations of his own views, which run so remarkably close to Buber's. Second, Emmanuel Levinas, professor at the University of Poitiers, discusses Buber's relation to contemporary Judaism. Lastly, the Protestant theologian, André Lacocque, offers a highly personal appreciation, in terms of a treatment of 'Individual and Person', of Buber's extraordinary influence upon Protestant theology today.

The symposium can be welcomed as a useful introduction to the study of Buber's thought. There is indeed very little critical work on Buber, especially in English—which is surprising in view of his marked influence upon Anglo-Saxon thinkers. Perhaps, now that his long life of prolific study and manifold activity is over, the period of critical assessment will begin.

It was in German that most of his writing was done. And despite his long Indian summer as a teacher and leader in Palestine and in the State of Israel, it is in and through his ambiguous relationship to German culture and politics that his specially Jewish message has to be understood. Thus it was into German that (with the help of Franz Rosenzweig until Rosenzweig's premature death in 1929) he translated the Bible, and it is against the background of German philosophy and literature that he presents his most characteristic insights. The essays here collected mention this fact only casually. M. Marcel, however, with his customary insight and lightness of touch, does not omit to mention the 'extremely complex relationship' between Heidegger and Buber, a relationship which includes common elements as well as divisive ones. Studies of this relationship in greater depth are certainly required.

Yet it is also a fact that Buber was not a German: but how is he to be described? He called himself a Polish Jew, but this is true only in a somewhat banal sense. However, I do not mean to imply that he was simply a child of the Enlightenment, a kind of modern Moses Mendelssohn, a liberal Jew, emancipated, and assimilated to western European culture. On the contrary, the decisive moments in Buber's life are those in which he becomes aware, in a new way, of the sources of Jewish life and consciousness, or at least of two of them, the Bible and Hasidist thought. M. Levinas, in noting this, justly draws attention to Buber's neglect of the Rabbinic tradition, and to his highly individualistic treatment of the Hasidist tradition. And Dr. Weltsch reminds us of Buber's failure to win his fellow-citizens in Israel over to his special conception of Hebrew humanism, with its revolutionary implications for a bilateral State, in which Arab and Jew might co-operate.

These criticisms mark a desirable effort towards a balanced assessment of Buber's thought. Further, M. Levinas speaks of the vagueness and imprecision of Buber's talk about God. Certainly, this has to be said. Yet

BOOK REVIEWS

Buber's influence upon so many different realms of thought must also be taken into account. Primarily it seems to have been his understanding of biblical faith, as mediated through his own distillation of Hasidist thought and life, which enabled him to enter into a prolonged dialogue with the actual world of urgent political, educational, and personal problems in our time. And when Buber said that his whole work was a dialogue with God, this has to be understood as a dialogue conducted in and through man's social concerns. And there is no doubt that he was immensely successful in coining language, and offering insights, which have been fructifying in such varied fields as education, politics, religion, sociology, and art—and, in general, in the context of the burning question of identity and purpose in our society.

Was he then more than a gifted popularizer? M. Marcel comes nearest, in his acute and sympathetic discussion of Buber's ideas, especially the concept of *Vergegenwärtigung*, *présentification*, making present, to raising critical questions. Significantly, he would prefer the word 'tension' to the word *Beziehung*, 'relation', to express Buber's view of the relation of the 'I' to the world.

What is lacking in the present studies is an assessment of Buber's thought in terms of its own background and growth. In particular, the influence of Franz Rosenzweig, and the parallel development of Ferdinand Ebner's ideas, receive no attention. The difficulty which M. Marcel finds with Buber's talk about 'interhumanity' (*Zwischenmenschlichkeit*) can be properly faced only when we ask whether Buber is not trying here to say something which cannot be properly said in terms of his own distinction between the realm of I-It and the realm of I-Thou. If, as I think, Buber was really trying to express the reality of lived life in terms of man-in-the-world-in-God, then the scheme of intentionality provided by the 'I' (whether of the I-It connexion or the I-Thou relation) seems unsatisfactory. The distinction between I-Thou and I-It is certainly a serviceable tool for dealing with so much that is destructive of the person and of real community in our contemporary activities. But are I-Thou and I-It simply to be regarded as alternatives? Buber did not mean them to be so regarded. But can he reach, by their means, the primary reality which is the permanent assumption, and goal, of all his work?

Such questions deserve to be followed up; and it is much to be hoped that the beginnings of critical work, which may be detected in the present essays, will lead to further studies of this most 'a-typical man' of modern times.

R. GREGOR SMITH

OTOMAR J. BARTOS, *Simple Models of Group Behavior*, xii + 345 pp.,
Columbia University Press, New York and London, 1967, 72s.

Most sociologists, in this country at any rate, are apt to confuse applications of mathematics in sociology with those of statistics. Even an extremely useful textbook, J. S. Coleman's *Introduction to Mathematical Sociology*, adds to the confusion since despite its title it deals mainly with statistical methods. In

BOOK REVIEWS

the United States it has often been the case of using not more than the symbolism of mathematics (for a mordant critique see A. P. Sorokin, *Facts and Foibles in Modern Sociology*), or else the impetus has come from mathematicians and economists whose primary objective has been either to widen the field of applied mathematics or to investigate problems of particular interest in economic theory. One would have thought that by now sociologists might have taken the trouble to formalize their speculations and to raise their clichés to the level of technical terms, verbally or mathematically. My own preference is for mathematical precision, and my expectation is that mathematics will become as much a tool of sociological theory as it has been of economic theory.

Bartos's book should be viewed as an introduction to the power of mathematical methods in sociological reasoning. It is suitable for those whose education does not extend beyond O-level mathematics: it is certainly not a difficult book despite its inherent sophistication. The potentially most valuable parts of mathematics are those of recent years—say the last two decades—and the power of the newer mathematics seems to be needed to produce worthwhile results in the social sciences. But it should be recognized that sophistication and technical difficulty do not necessarily go together; and Bartos has taken sufficient trouble to avoid the latter without sacrificing the former.

The book divides into two main parts which correspond to stochastic models and to deterministic models, each of a special kind. The first part of about 150 pages deals with Markov chains and their applications. A Markov chain consists of a set of states and of the probabilities of the transition of a 'particle' from a given state to some other state. (It should be noted that Markov chains belong to probability theory but not to ordinary statistical analysis.) In the present context these states may be social classes, political parties, or attitudes. Whether any given situation should be described by this particular mathematical language is a question both of how well the facts fit, and whether the results are 'interesting'; the gain from such a formalization arises from the fact that if it is appropriate we can immediately draw upon powerful mathematical theorems (such as the existence of equilibrium states). Bartos's examples illustrate the point well in relation to social dominance, of Asch's experiments on the effects of group pressures and of occupational and geographic mobility. Of particular value is his emphasis on the shortcomings of the cruder models.

The second part centres on game theory. Sociologists have been comparatively slow in absorbing relevant parts of this theory into their systems: part of the difficulty may arise from the fact that the mathematics of the more interesting cases—the non-zero-sum games—is incomplete and that therefore few strong theorems are readily available. However, a certain amount of laboratory experimentation has been carried out in order to determine the empirical validity of some of the theoretical conclusions. In any case, I would assert that the formalism of game theory whenever it is even remotely appropriate can—at the very least—serve to give precision, and may—if one is lucky—produce surprising results. By way of introduction the author quotes a number of simple examples such as battle strategies and 'Prisoners' Dilemma'; he goes on to the more refined concepts such as Nash

BOOK REVIEWS

equilibria, and then describes a number of experiments which he and others, notably Rapoport, have carried out. One might have wished to see a wider spectrum of applications since the range of situations in which participants have partly opposing and partly common aims is very wide.

I should have liked to find some mention of the applications of matrix algebra to problems in the theory of communications and hierarchies: if the student has worked his way through the brief but adequate introduction to matrices he may as well reap a third crop in addition to the ones described. This, however, is not a severe criticism if the book is accepted as a presentation of *some* of the relevant mathematics and *some* of its applications; and it may stimulate others to give a comprehensive treatment of the more formal sociological theories, a task unlikely to be completed by one man. To quote the author: 'It is our belief that once sociologists become acquainted with mathematical theory as intimately as nineteenth century sociologists were with biology, mathematical theory will become as fruitful to sociology as was the organic analogy.' His book is a very welcome step towards this state of affairs.

GEORGE MORTON

WILLIAM A. BELSON, *The Impact of Television. Methods and Findings in Programme Research*, x + 400 pp., Crosby Lockwood & Son, London, 1967, 50s.

This is an important book, written by an eminent research psychologist. For many years Dr. Belson was in the Audience Research Department of the B.B.C., and is now head of the Survey Research Centre at the London School of Economics. He is holder of the first Gold Medal of the Market Research Society in Britain and is also a holder of the Thomson Gold Medal for Media Research.

The book is addressed to three audiences: to the planners and producers of television programmes, to those who wish to understand the ways in which evaluation might be carried out, and to the research worker interested in methodology. The needs of these three audiences differ, as does their customary way of communicating with one another. As a result, the book hovers unevenly between crisp and sharp presentation which everyone can understand and enjoy (the first two chapters and sections IV and V), and a highly technical style, difficult for anyone but a methodologist.

The book is well arranged. It shows clearly how important it is for producers, when designing their programmes, to have available information about the views and knowledge of their target audience. Dr. Belson illustrates the point by discussing specific B.B.C. enquiries. This part makes fascinating reading. Of special interest here is the 'Hurt Mind' series. Information was first gathered about the public knowledge of, and attitude towards, mental illness and the mentally ill; later an attitude change study was carried out to assess the impact of the programme.

Other specific studies which are described relate to the comprehensibility of programmes. A particularly fascinating study is that of the impact of a

BOOK REVIEWS

programme entitled 'Bon Voyage'. This illustrates extremely well the vicissitudes in achieving a desired objective: in this case the teaching of French to would-be travellers to France. This objective, Belson shows, was fully achieved. The viewers did learn more French—but at a cost: they have suddenly realized what it means to travel in a country where people do not speak English. The intellectual realization has been changed by the programme to an emotional one—which resulted in the viewers becoming less keen than before to go to France. A nice cost benefit analysis.

What is missing in the book is an evaluation by the author of such findings and with it an attempt at suggesting how greater effectiveness might be achieved or undesirable side effects avoided. This is because these studies fail to analyse in detail the content of the programmes themselves, this being seen as the 'given' in the situation. One would have wished Dr. Belson to devote more time to a consideration of how the programmes themselves might be analysed.

Also one would have wished him to speculate more (he is unusually perceptive and experienced), and to ask himself what body of social psychological knowledge would aid the producer and the research worker. By keeping communication research sharply divided from the main trend of work in social psychology, on learning and attitude change, both sides lose.

Perhaps the most important sections of the book are the last two. In section IV he deals with the need for studying the growth of television and its social impact on interests, on the buying and reading of newspapers and periodicals, and he looks at television as an institution that must be understood in relation to the other institutions of the society. It is this interconnectedness which, though obvious, is very often left out of account in studies of television. The final chapter deals with television research, past and future.

This book has done a great service to the field, and will, I hope, make an impact on television companies which should see research as an integral part of their planning. At present, research is seen as a luxury which, in times of financial stringency, is readily sacrificed; and of course, in many companies, it has never been properly developed. The book is of great value to the research worker because of the quality of the methodology described.

HILDE T. HIMMELWEIT

SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN, *A Population Survey of the Greater Springfield Jewish Community*, xv + 182 pp. (+ survey questionnaire), Springfield Jewish Community Council, Springfield, Mass., 1968, n.p.

The Jewish community of Springfield numbers some 11,500 persons (comparable, in Great Britain, with a community having a size between those of the Liverpool and Glasgow communities). In 1966 it carried out a sample study involving a quarter of all households, to each of which a questionnaire was administered by an interview of about two hours' duration (reviewer's

BOOK REVIEWS

estimate based on the questionnaire reproduced in the book; the average interview time is unfortunately not given). The study, which had broad descriptive aims, was conducted by Professor S. Goldstein, a sociologist of Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, who had previously carried out a similar enquiry for the Greater Providence community; he was assisted by no fewer than a hundred voluntary interviewers from the community, who were given a certain amount of *ad hoc* training.

A substantial study of this sort would be an achievement even for a much larger community, and compliments are clearly due to all concerned. But a review in this *Journal* should go beyond compliments, and must attempt a critical assessment of the contribution of this and similar recent surveys to our understanding of contemporary Jewish society. In view of the cost of such surveys, and the scientific standards that inspire them, it would be incorrect to assess them by other than professional and scientific standards.

The representativeness of the sample is of prime importance. It is obviously easier to reach the affiliated section of the community; and the extent to which marginal members are included will affect the answers to many questions—on ritual observances, education, etc. The Springfield area has a relatively dense Jewish population, close to 5 per cent of the total (or double the average U.S. proportion), and in some sections (Longmeadow) the proportion rises to one household in three. One must therefore suspect that the Springfield area will have a relatively high proportion of affiliated persons, willing or choosing to live in such an area, while those who are more assimilated will have moved elsewhere. Further, as successive generations drift from Orthodoxy to Reform (a trend clearly brought out in this study), one might expect an area such as this to be under-weighted with the younger age-groups. In fact, the survey reveals great variations in age structure among the various sections of the town (the newer sections having more young people, etc.) and an overall deficiency for the Jewish community appears only in the ages under 10 (where there are 14 per cent in the Jewish population compared with 21 in Springfield generally); however, even the general population in Springfield appears to have a relatively young age distribution, and no clear conclusion emerges on this point.

The above qualifications do not, of course, affect the validity of the sample with regard to its representativeness of Springfield; but one must be cautious in extrapolating the results of this enquiry to the wider American community (equally, the problems of contacting a sample of the wider American community would be much greater than encountered here).

The Springfield sample was drawn from a community master-list, which was checked in various interesting ways; these checks suggested that no more than 5–10 per cent of the community residing in that area were outside the list. The sample was found to contain a small number of duplicate listings and, as a technical point, it must be observed that it is not adequate merely to omit these duplicates. The duplicate entries arise from larger households and, possibly, also from those who are wealthier and may have several contributing names on the list; the list therefore yields a sample subject to various biases (the correct treatment is to ask for the number of names that appear in the master-list in *all* sampled households, and then weight inversely with that number).

BOOK REVIEWS

Owing to the geographical mobility of the community and, particularly, since the younger age-groups tend to move outside the geographical boundaries defined for this enquiry, it is thus difficult to attach significance to differences between the Jewish and general populations with regard to age structure and, equally, with regard to sex composition, household size, fertility, etc., unless those differences are very large. In fact, no very large differences were found in the demographic structure.

Comparisons are, of course, the essence of studies of this type; that 74.4 per cent of Jewish households own their own homes, or that 7.5 per cent of those aged over 60 would like a smaller house, to take two findings of this survey, conveys little unless one is able to compare these facts with the general population. In very many tables in this report, however, the reader looks in vain for such comparisons—presumably because information in precisely this form has not been collected for the general population. There are also surprisingly few cross-references to the Greater Providence study. If there were specific needs by the community for information of this type no further justification is required for collecting it—but it is not evident from the report that this was generally so.

It might also be suggested that some of the findings hardly need establishing with the help of such heavy equipment. Thus, the basic trend of the community towards Reform with the passing of time could adequately be established by reference to the number and types of places of worship and other communal institutions, and the date of their establishment. But only two pages are devoted to such an historical survey (they appear under the separate authorship of Donald Weisman, the Study Director)!

As against these doubts, it might be argued that only a household survey can provide information on the more detailed patterns of communal cohesion, ritual observances, and their interrelations. This may be correct in principle; but in practice it does not appear that anything important emerges from the various cross-classifications. It hardly needs a statistical survey to establish that Orthodox people eat Kasher to a greater extent than do Reform, or that the lighting of Hanukah candles is curiously widely observed in the United States. On the other hand, the reviewer would have been interested in some simpler, if more general, questions than appeared here: for example, how many still observe (or remember) the Sabbath in some way as a day of rest, and in what ways; and how many observe some form of ritual restriction on their diet (whether separate milk and meat dishes are used, as was asked in this survey, seems too refined a question in the American context).

It is not possible within the scope of a short review to do adequate justice to the wide-ranging topics covered in the fifty-six interview questions; the above selection, and comments, must serve as a sample. Undoubtedly, amidst the mass of numerical data contained in this report, there is much information that is relevant to various problems, and much that may become significant in due course in the light of history; but the question that will probably remain in the reader's mind is whether a household sample survey of such massive proportions is necessarily the best, most economical, or quickest way, of obtaining such information.

S. J. PRAIS

BOOK REVIEWS

ELI GINZBERG and Associates, *The Middle-Class Negro in the White Man's World*, viii + 182 pp., Columbia University Press, New York and London, 1967, 45s.

The title of this book is over-generalized. In fact it presents the results of two probes (in Atlanta in the South and New York in the North) into the views and aspirations of some young Negro men from a middle-class background who were attending or expecting to attend college in 1964-5.

The primary aim of the enquiry was to 'examine the perceptions of a group of middle-class Negro college youth of the reality they confront and their responses to it. We hoped to learn how they see their future and what they are trying to do to shape it according to their hopes and desires. In this way, we should gain insight into whether the integration of the Negro into American society is likely to follow the pattern of other minorities or whether it will remain unique.'

The assumption behind the enquiry was that of the gradualist white liberal—that such integration into the white man's world via the stratificatory system could happen, given social action on all fronts. The authors' findings seemed to justify this. The young men were 'making their plans for the future in terms of their interests and aptitudes, with little reference to their being Negro. Like middle-class white youths, these young people come from environments which predisposed them to pursue higher education to prepare for preferred positions in the labor market. Educational attainment, with its promise of occupational opportunity, is basic to their planning. Since their racial identity has not heretofore interfered seriously with the shaping of their goals, they see little reason to anticipate future barriers because of this factor.'

Preferred positions were increasingly available as a result of civil rights pressures and the reduction of racial discrimination in employment. Occupational choices were considerably influenced (as with their white middle-class coevals) by considerations of money; about half the respondents were hoping to live in the suburbs of large cities; and most, while approving of the Civil Rights Movement, were not actively participating and feared the growing violence of the ghettos. Few were directly involved with the future of the Negro community as a whole.

Ginzberg comments approvingly on the findings as a whole. 'The politics of race relations has receded far into the background; its place has been taken by concern with the psychology of motivation!' This finding and the generally optimistic tone of the study reflect a picture which was shortly to be shattered by the violent ghetto uprisings of the black lower class or underclass, and the increasing challenge to the American middle-class 'way of life' voiced by 'Black Power' militants preaching a 'black mystique', and by radical students, white as well as black.

Some may find this book an interesting picture of the near past, not of the present. Yet the achievement-oriented, non-militant Negroes interviewed in it still exist, and they are unlikely to have become 'Black Panthers' overnight. 'Black Power' has many definitions, and it may be that their version, non-violent, achievement-oriented and middle class, will, particularly if they begin to think more responsibly of their own community, also contribute

BOOK REVIEWS

unobtrusively but effectively to the ultimate integration of American society as a whole.

As President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders reported earlier this year: 'Discrimination and segregation have long permeated much of American life; they now threaten the future of every American.' Choice is, however, still possible in their view between the present course, which tends to polarization and destruction, and 'the realization of common opportunities for all within a single society'.

SHEILA PATTERSON

S. N. EISENSTADT, *Israeli Society*, ix + 451 pp., Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1967, 75s.

Israeli Society is the product of fifteen years of research on, and of theoretical thinking about, the development of Israeli social structure. The book, which was finished at the end of 1965, is based on research carried out since 1951 by the Department of Sociology of the Hebrew University, under the direction of Professor Eisenstadt. The author has, in addition, made use of a mass of data provided by the Central Bureau of Statistics of the State of Israel and by various institutes of social and economic research.

Professor Eisenstadt treats the transition from the society of the Yishuv (the Jewish community settled in Palestine before 1948) to that of the State of Israel. The economic and social structure of Israeli society was transformed by the pressure of mass immigration while the Zionist and pioneering ideology of the early period is no longer in harmony with the present state of social development.

The author's perspective is historico-sociological. The first part of the book is concerned with the institutions of the Yishuv. Chapters 6 and 7 in Part II ('The Emerging Social Structure') are the substance of the book. Professor Eisenstadt analyses Israeli society before the Six-Day War by making use of the general theory which he has elaborated to explain the process of modernization of developing societies. He describes lucidly and objectively the major difficulties facing Israeli society in the course of its growth: (a) social stratification crystallized in ethnic groups (those originating from Europe and America being at the top of the ladder, while the immigrants from Asia and Africa gradually form a proletariat); (b) the desire for social and occupational advancement evident in all sections of the population; and (c) the birth of a new élite characterized no longer by pioneering ideology but by superior social status. At this stage of its development, the integration of immigrants faces Israeli society with a major problem. Professor Eisenstadt bluntly criticizes the method employed by the State to achieve the economic integration of the newcomers, particularly of the orientals among them. Nor does he hesitate to stress the difficulties confronting a new immigrant seeking full acceptance into the community of the *vatikim* (earlier settlers).

The education of the young and their integration into the national society play a major role in the recent development of Israel. The author, in Chapter

BOOK REVIEWS

8 ('Education, Youth and Family'), analyses the changing ideologies which inspire the educational system and the emergence of new needs. He shows that pioneering Jewish movements are attracting ever-decreasing numbers; he describes (and criticizes) the main experiments which aimed at giving young oriental immigrants easier access to secondary and higher education. The development of institutions of secondary and higher learning is, however, closely linked with the State's economic evolution. On the one hand, it is necessary to satisfy the demands for a skilled work force, while, on the other hand, being careful not to over-produce an 'intelligentsia' which might not find employment within the limited confines of a very small State.

Chapter 9 is entitled 'Political Structure and Institutions'. Here again there is evidence of an excellent compilation of data bearing on the development of the political parties and the principal points of conflict which have arisen in the (frequently fierce) Knesset debates, debates which have also animated the press and public opinion. The author pays special attention to the development of religious parties and the birth of particularistic movements which find expression in the formation of tiny ethnic groups. Israeli bureaucracy seems to him to be in a state of hypertrophy and he wonders whether the political institutions—their vulnerable points revealed by the 'Lavon affair'—will be capable of dealing with the new needs which have arisen with the State's economic and social development.

Having examined, at the level of the institutions, the tensions between the pioneering ideology (still defended by the *vatikim*) and the dynamic social reality, the author notes that the same tension can be observed in the realm of culture and of values. He analyses the transition from tradition to the modernism achieved by Zionist ideology. Most Israelis identify themselves as Jews, but not necessarily linked to Diaspora Jewry. The majority of the older inhabitants are aware that by identifying themselves as Israelis or as Jews, they are asserting not only their patriotism: they are referring to wider values, traditions, and orientations, however inarticulate or indefinable these may be (p. 389). The author here limits himself to the present, and one may wonder about the fate of these patterns of identity when, in the comparatively near future, the old will have disappeared from the scene. Professor Eisenstadt expresses his opinion in the following passage (p. 389):

But whatever the exact definitions of this Israeli self-identity may be, one of its most striking aspects is that it no longer defines Jewish identity in terms of a minority group or culture. Being a Jew in Israel does not necessitate the definition of one's identity in relation to a majority group or culture, and does not involve the problems, uncertainties and anxieties which have constituted such an important part of Jewish life and identity throughout the modern world.

In the life of art and culture, one often observes a tendency in Israel to under-estimate, and sometimes to ignore, the tribulation and vicissitudes which Jewry had to endure during the two thousand years of the Golah. Hence the serious divergences, evidenced before June 1967, between the Jews of Israel and those of the Diaspora. Moreover, the waves of mass migration since the establishment of the State have given rise to sub-cultures. The author does not hesitate to speak, in this context, of a 'cultural pluralism' (pp. 380-6), a concept which until recently was highly criticized in

BOOK REVIEWS

Israel. Is this a courageous initiative on his part? Or is it a sign that opinion has evolved beyond the tensions between 'westerners' and 'orientals'?

After too short a chapter on the Arab and Druze minorities, the author concludes (in Chapter 12) with a comparison between the development of Israel as a modern society, that of the U.S.A. (another society made up of immigrants), and that of the U.S.S.R. (another society founded on socialist principles).

The essential theme of the book—the growing rejection of ideology under the pressures of social dynamism and the emergence of new aspirations—might well be used to explain not only Israeli but other societies. From that point of view, the book has a universal application. But history has moved faster than the writing of the book, which was still at the printers when the Six-Day War broke out. The data stop at the end of 1965. Thus, *Israeli Society* today poses as many questions as it has resolved; it is by now as much the work of an historian as of a sociologist. It is far too early to say whether the numerous consequences of the War will invalidate or confirm the predictions outlined by the author.

This is obviously a case where totally unforeseen circumstances may have altered the future and where Professor Eisenstadt certainly cannot be taken to task! On other points, and precisely because he writes both as an historian and a sociologist, the author could be more fairly criticized. The society of the Yishuv is shown as homogeneous and appears somewhat monolithic and stereotyped: admittedly, its institutions were structured by an ideological and pioneering element; but there were other elements which balanced this inclination. The author occasionally alludes to these other elements, but a more searching analysis would probably have shown the heterogeneity of the pre-State society and its latent conflicts.

He stresses repeatedly the problems arising in the absorption of immigrants from Muslim countries; and he notes, in passing, the heterogeneity of different so-called oriental communities. Here again, one would have wished for a deeper analysis of the points of differentiation between these communities. It is regrettable that in this particular case, the historical perspective is abandoned.

But these points of criticism look trivial when one considers this monumental work and the great ambition (which the author has fulfilled) of making use of the best research carried out during the last thirty years on the Yishuv and on Israeli society. *Israeli Society* will remain a basic work because of the importance of its data and the clarity of its analysis. It bears, on every page, the mark of a man who has a profound knowledge of the society in which he has grown up and lived, and which he does not hesitate to criticize in particular contexts. This vast scientific synthesis is also a striking portrait of intellectual honesty.

GEORGES FRIEDMANN

CHRONICLE

The Central Bureau of Statistics of the Government of Israel states in its figures for 1967 that the Jewish population of Israel has increased almost fourfold since the establishment of the State. In 1948 there were 649,600 Jews in the country, compared with 2,383,600 at the end of 1967. Natural increase accounts for 635,000, and immigration for 1,100,000. The growth rate of the Jewish population in 1967 was the lowest since 1948—a net increase of 38,700 or 1.7 per cent. The low figure is due partly to a slump in the birth rate (24.2 per thousand) and partly to emigration (10,529) in 1967. On the other hand there were 14,237 immigrants in that year.

The Jewish birth rate in Tel Aviv was the lowest in the State—13.2 per thousand, in contrast to Jerusalem—25 per thousand, while the kibbutzim had the highest—25.2. It is pointed out that a high proportion of kibbutz members are in their twenties and thirties.

While Jewish mothers throughout the country averaged 3.4 births, the comparative figure for Muslim Arab mothers was 9.7, and for Christian Arabs 4.3.

*

The *Jewish Chronicle*, in its issue of 13 September 1968, gave details of an exclusive survey carried out for them by the Public Opinion Research of Israel Ltd. The survey disclosed that only 31 per cent of Jewish married couples in Israel used contraceptives, while 11 per cent refused to state whether they did or not. Six per cent stated they were not aware of the existence of contraceptives; 8 per cent said that they had 'religious and moral objections' to contraceptives, while 19 per cent said that they did not need them.

Twenty-five per cent of those not using contraceptives said that they wished to have more children.

*

The Israeli Cabinet has decided to offer incentives to return home to Israelis who have lived abroad for a long period of time. Among these incentives are a wide range of tariff and customs reductions, and permission to bring some types of goods for which import licences are normally required.

*

The Central Bureau of Statistics in Jerusalem announced last July that the total number of students in institutions of higher learning in Israel during the 1967-68 academic year was 25,541. Of these, 11,458 attended the Hebrew University, 4,943 the Technion, and 4,852 Tel Aviv University. The total academic staff of the institutions was 3,749, of whom 1,343 were at the Hebrew University.

*

CHRONICLE

At the 1968 diploma ceremony at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 152 doctorates, 338 M.A.s, and 55 certificates of post-graduate higher education were awarded. This was the Hebrew University's 38th degree-awarding ceremony since its foundation.

Five hundred and fourteen students graduated this year from Tel Aviv University, the largest graduating class so far: 66 received the Master's and 329 received the Bachelor's degree. Among the recipients were the first 20 doctors to graduate from the University's medical school.

*

The Committee for Research at the Bar Ilan University has approved 200 research projects in the fields of natural sciences, Jewish studies, humanities, and sociology. The various projects are financed by the Government of Israel, foundations abroad, and the university's own funds. The total outlay for these projects will be IL7,000,000.

*

The housing minister of Israel is reported to have stated last September that eighteen outpost settlements have been established since the Six-Day War. Ten of the new settlements are on the Golan Heights, five in the Negev and Sinai, and three on the West Bank. It is planned to establish two more on the West Bank and one in the Negev.

*

The head of the Jewish Agency's Department for Education and Culture in the Diaspora announced that more than 10,000 students are studying Hebrew in the Diaspora under its auspices. Two thousand teachers have been sent to 26 countries. The Religious Department for Education and Culture has established links with 250 schools abroad, comprising 60,000 students.

*

At present some 11,500 boys and girls are receiving education in Youth Aliyah institutions in Israel, including more than 1,500 orphans. During the 35 years of its existence, more than 130,000 Jewish youth have passed through Youth Aliyah institutions, 100,000 of whom went to Israel in the past 20 years.

*

Professor Moshe Davis, head of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, has announced the establishment of the Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora. The Centre will be under the auspices of the School of Education and the Institute of Contemporary Jewry. It aims to strengthen Jewish education in the Diaspora by training teachers and educational leaders at a high academic level and to offer in-service training. The Centre will also undertake research projects in the field of Jewish education in co-operation with interested individuals and groups.

Within the general framework of the University, the Centre will provide for a B.A. degree in Jewish and General Studies, and a teaching certificate

CHRONICLE

especially geared to Jewish schools in the Diaspora. Graduate students who wish to specialize in Jewish Education will be offered courses for M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in that field.

*

The World Union of Jewish Students is moving its headquarters from Paris to London. At a meeting in England, the European Executive of the Union accepted the Federal Union of Jewish Students in Germany as a member union. There are 600 to 700 Jewish students in Germany (including 200 Israelis).

*

At the biennial convention of the World Council of Synagogues, held in London last July, it was stated that reports were received from most countries of an active interest in Jewish life and a steady growth of community activities. India and Germany, however, reported that their communities were in a state of decline. It was pointed out that there are now only 15,000 Jews left in India, compared with 25,000 ten years ago; the loss was due entirely to migration to Israel. Another 10,000 are expected to emigrate in the next few years.

*

The General Secretary of the Central Council of Jews in Germany was reported to have stated in Geneva last July that the average age of Jews in Germany during the last ten years remains without change under 46. The number of Jews in Germany who are members of various Jewish communities is 27,000. There are, in addition, numbers of Jews in Germany who are not registered members of the Jewish communities but remain Jewish and therefore must be counted as such.

*

The German Information Centre reported in New York that West German banks have donated more than 100,000 DM (\$25,000) for the establishment of an 'Adenauer—Ben Gurion Foundation' to promote youth exchanges between Israel and the Federal Republic.

*

The eighth annual congress of the Federation of Argentinian Jewish Committees was held in Buenos Aires last September. The General Secretary of the Federation reported that there were 21,000 pupils in Jewish schools; 5,000 of these were in the provinces.

There are only 15 rabbis in Argentina and two rabbinical seminaries.

*

At a meeting of the Conference of Jewish Organizations in Geneva last July, it was stated that although at least half of the Jewish children in the Diaspora attend some type of Jewish school, outside Israel there are only 90,000 who continue their Jewish studies beyond the elementary school level.

*

CHRONICLE

Warwick University in England has announced the establishment of a Bearsted Lectureship in Jewish History. The aim of the Lectureship is 'to ensure that all history students should, as a matter of course, be familiar with the role and the contribution of the Jewish people'.

*

The annual report of the Central British Fund for Jewish Relief and Rehabilitation, published last May, recorded that there were no more Jews left in Aden. The Jewish population of Algeria, 130,000 in 1960, has now been reduced to 3,000. Only 1,600 Jews were left in Egypt, 200 in Libya, 50,000 in Morocco (200,000 in 1960), and 16,000 in Tunisia (61,000 in 1960).

*

The Jews of Ceuta and Melilla, two towns in the Spanish enclave of Morocco, enjoy influence and prosperity amid complete religious freedom. There are 600 Jews in Ceuta (out of a total population of 75,000), and 3,000 Jews in Melilla (out of a total population of 100,000). These Jews are integrated socially and economically with the predominantly Roman Catholic Spanish population and the small Muslim community. The Jews of Ceuta are strictly orthodox and are collecting funds to erect a new synagogue. The community also maintains a Hebrew School and the Spanish government pays the salaries of the teachers. This information was given by the Vice-President of the community.

*

At the World Jewish Congress Governing Council Meeting last July, the Persian representative said that Persian Jewry were able to register great progress in education. There are 1,400 Jewish pupils out of a population of 80,000, which is ten times the ratio for the country as a whole. 400 Persian students are now studying at Israeli Universities, while previously it was the custom to go to American or European universities.

*

During a visit to Montreal in July 1968, Rabbi Yehuda Leib Levin of Moscow said that there are in Russia 102 synagogues and prayer groups registered with the Soviet authorities. Definite figures concerning the number of rabbis in the Soviet Union cannot be ascertained, since there is no central Jewish rabbinical body.

*

The HIAS annual report stated that in 1967 more than 49,000 Jewish men, women, and children received resettlement and related assistance from United Hias Service. They included 6,242 migrants and refugees who were helped to settle in Western countries. As a result of the Six-Day War almost 25,000 Jews fled from Tunisia, Morocco, Libya, Egypt, Lebanon, and other Arab countries.

*

CHRONICLE

According to the Annual Report of the Jewish Welfare Board, published last May, 15 per cent of the Jewish community in Great Britain are over 65 years of age, as against 11 per cent in 1961 and 7 per cent in 1931. The Board is very concerned about the welfare of the elderly, and is at present engaged in building homes for another 750.

*

An agreement of Mutual Aid was signed in Tel Aviv between the Histadrut and ORIT (the Pan-American Labour Federation) embracing 28,000,000 members in 50 labour organizations. The main points of the agreement are a comprehensive programme for the training of trade union organizers; an exchange of teachers and experts; joint activity in co-operatives; exchange of information, and regular meetings of experts on development projects.

*

During the Tel Aviv International Trade Fair, it was stated at the American Embassy that U.S. exports to Israel during 1967 amounted to \$195,600,000, and American purchases in Israel reached \$89,900,000. This compared with \$221,600,000 and \$77,400,000 respectively in 1966.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Atteslander, Peter, and Girod, Roger, *Sociological Contributions I*, 349 pp., Hans Huber Publishers, Berne, 1966.
- Aubert, Vilhelm, *Elements of Sociology*, viii + 247 pp., Heinemann Educ. Books, London, 1968, 30s.
- Barri, Tomàs, *Els Dos Jubilats, La Badada de Karl Marx*, 126 pp., Barcelona, 1968, n.p.
- Bell, Carolyn Shaw, *Consumer Choice in the American Economy*, xvii + 429 pp., Random House, New York, 1967, \$7.95.
- Central Bureau of Statistics, *Census of Population and Housing 1967, East Jerusalem*, xlv + 64 + 47 pp. (Hebrew and English), Central Bureau of Statistics, Jerusalem, 1968, IL3.
- Central Bureau of Statistics, *Census of Population 1967, Housing Conditions, Household Equipment, Welfare Assistance and Farming in the Administered Areas*, xxxv + 48 + 33 pp. (Hebrew and English). Central Bureau of Statistics, Jerusalem, 1968, IL2.
- Cohen, Percy S., *Modern Social Theory*, 247 pp., Heinemann Educ. Books, London, 1968, 35s.
- Davis, Moshe, ed., *Diaspora Jewry and Eretz Yisrael, Iyar-Sivan, 5727, June 1967* (Hebrew), publication of the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry, 100 pp., The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Jerusalem, 1968, n.p.
- Fraenkel, Josef, ed., *The Jews of Austria, Essays on their Life, History and Destruction*, xv + 585 pp., Vallentine, Mitchell, London, 1967, 63s.
- Freid, Jacob, ed., *Jews and Divorce*, xiii + 208 pp., Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1968, \$5.95.
- Golan J., ed., *Statistical Yearbook of the Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, 1967*, lxxii + 386 pp. (Hebrew and English), Department of Research and Statistics, Tel Aviv, 1967, n.p.
- Medding, P. Y., *From Assimilation to Group Survival, A Political and Sociological Study of an Australian Jewish Community*, 309 pp., F. W. Cheshire, Melbourne, 1968, \$6.00 (Australian).
- Moser, Shia, *Absolutism and Relativism in Ethics*, vi + 237 pp., Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, 1968, \$8.75.
- Nove, Alec, *Soviet Jewry and the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution*, Noah Barou Memorial Lecture 1967, 22 pp., The World Jewish Congress, British Section, London, 1968, 2s. 6d.
- Tsur, Jacob, *Sunrise in Zion*, trans. Violet M. MacDonald, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1968, 42s.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

- COHEN, Abraham; B.A., Lecturer on Israeli Economy at the Hashomer Hatzair Study Centre, Givat Haviva, Israel. Chief publications: *Cyclical Fluctuations in the Economy of Israel* (in Hebrew), Merhavia, 1956; a series of articles entitled 'Profits in Israel, 1960' (in Hebrew) in *Bashaar*, Social and Cultural Review, vol. V (1962), 3, 5, 6; vol. VI (1963), 1, 2, 3, 5; vol. VII (1964), 1, 4, 6.
- DAVIS, Moshe; M. H. L., Ph.D., Head of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Research Professor of American Jewish History, Jewish Theological Seminary. Formerly Dean, Teachers Institute, Jewish Theological Seminary; Provost, Jewish Theological Seminary. Chief publications: *The Emergence of Conservative Judaism*, Philadelphia, 1963; *The Jewish People in Metamorphosis*, Syracuse, N.Y., 1964; 'Jewish Religious Life and Institutions in America', in Louis Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion*, New York, 3rd. edn., 1960, also published as Hebrew volume *Darkei ha-Yahadut be-Amerikah*, Tel Aviv, 1953; 'Centres of Jewry in the Western Hemisphere: A Comparative Approach', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. V, No. 1, June 1963. Currently engaged in chairing the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry at the home of the President of Israel, and editing its publications. Is also engaged in the preparation of a volume of essays on the history of American Judaism for the Texts and Studies in American Jewish History Series to be published jointly by the American Jewish Historical Society and the Institute of Contemporary Jewry; and in editing a volume for the Random House Series on Contemporary Jewish Civilization.
- EITZEN, D. Stanley; Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Sociology in the University of Kansas. Chief publications: 'The Use of Banks and Textor's "A Cross-Polity Survey" for the Ranking of Nations', *Social and Economic Studies*, XVI, No. 3 (September 1967); 'Under What Societal Conditions? A Reply to Homans, "Bringing Men Back In"', *The Kansas Journal of Sociology*, II, No. 2 (Spring 1966); 'A Conflict Model for the Analysis of Majority-Minority Relations', *The Kansas Journal of Sociology*, III, No. 2 (Spring 1967).
- SCHMOOL, Marlana; B.Soc.Sc. (E.P.S.), Research Officer, Statistical and Demographic Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews, London. Has published (co-author) 'Statistics of Jewish Marriages in Great Britain: 1901-1965', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. IX, No. 2, December 1967; 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population 1960-1965', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. X, No. 1, June 1968. Currently engaged in statistical surveys of various aspects of Anglo-Jewish life.
- SOBEL, B. Z.; Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Sociology, Brandeis University; formerly Instructor in Sociology, Miami University. Chief publications:

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

'“Agnosticism” in Detroit', *Midstream*, May, 1966, Vol. XII, No. 5; 'Protestant Evangelists and the Formulation of a Jewish Racial Mystique: the Missionary Discovery of Sociology', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Fall 1966, Vol. V, No. 3. Currently writing a series of research reports on Arabs in Israel.

WEST, Vera; M.A., Research Assistant, University of Essex, Department of Sociology. Has published 'The Jewish Commitment of the Jewish Student', *The Wiener Library Bulletin*, Vol. XXII, No. 2, Spring 1968.