

THE
JEWISH JOURNAL
OF
SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR

Morris Ginsberg

MANAGING EDITOR

Maurice Freedman

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Judith Freedman

VOLUME ELEVEN 1969

Published on behalf of the World Jewish Congress
by William Heinemann Ltd

CONTENTS

<p>'Anti-Zionism' and the Political Struggle within the Elite of Poland by <i>Celia Stopnicka Heller</i> 133</p> <p>Appeal of Hasidism for American Jewry Today, The by <i>Efraim Shmueli</i> 5</p> <p>Australian Jewry in 1966 by <i>Walter M. Lippmann</i> 67</p> <p>Books Received 113, 260</p> <p>Books Reviewed 3, 119</p> <p>Book Reviews 97, 237</p> <p>Chronicle 108, 255</p> <p>Edgware Survey: Factors in Jewish Identification, The by <i>Ernest Krausz</i> 151</p> <p>Edgware Survey: Occupation and Social Class, The by <i>Ernest Krausz</i> 75</p> <p>Jewish Populations in General Decennial Population Censuses, 1955-61: A Bibliography by <i>Erich Rosenthal</i> 31</p>	<p>Kaifeng Jewish Community: A Summary, The by <i>Donald Daniel Leslie</i> 175</p> <p>Mixed Marriage in an Israeli Town by <i>Erik Cohen</i> 41</p> <p>New Left and the Jews, The by <i>Nathan Glazer</i> 121</p> <p>Note on Aspects of Social Life among the Jewish Kurds of Sanandaj, Iran, A by <i>Paul J. Magnarella</i> 51</p> <p>Note on Identificational Assimilation among Forty Jews in Malmö, A by <i>Liva Herz</i> 165</p> <p>Notes on Contributors 115, 261</p> <p>Notice to Contributors 4, 120</p> <p>On the Civilizing Process (Review Article) by <i>Martin C. Albrow</i> 227</p> <p>Reconstitution of Jewish Communities in the Post-War Period, The by <i>Daniel J. Elazar</i> 187</p> <p>University Education among Iraqi-Born Jews by <i>Hayyim J. Cohen</i> 59</p>
--	---

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

Albrow, M.C.	227	Krausz, E.	75, 151
Cohen, E.	41	Leslie, D. D.	175
Cohen, H. J.	59	Lippmann, W. M.	67
Elazar, D. J.	187	Magnarella, P. J.	51
Glazer, N.	121	Rosenthal, E.	31
Heller, C. S.	133	Shmueli, E.	5
Herz, L.	165		

AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS

Albrow, M. C.	100, 101, 105, 227, 241	Krausz, E.	104
Diamond, A. S.	97	Levy, H.	238
Geber, B. A.	102	MacRae, D. G.	106
Gellner, E.	237	Martin, D.	251
Glazer, N.	240	Parkes, J.	252
Jacobs, L.	99	Pear, R.	242
Kessler, C.	245	Sofer, E.	248

BOOKS REVIEWED

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Atteslander, P., and Girod, R.,
<i>Sociological Contributions</i> 105</p> <p>Aubert, V., <i>Elements of Sociology</i> 101</p> <p>Banton, M., <i>Roles, An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations</i> 106</p> <p>Bensimon-Donath, D., <i>Evolution du Judaïsme marocain sous le Protectorat français 1912-1956</i> 237</p> <p>Cohen, P. S., <i>Modern Social Theory</i> 100</p> <p>Dushkin, A. M., <i>Jewish Education in the Diaspora—The Problems of Teachers and Teaching</i> 238</p> <p>Elias, N., <i>Über den Prozess der Zivilisation, Soziogenetische und Psychogenetische Untersuchungen</i> 227</p> <p>Freid, J., <i>Jews and Divorce</i> 97</p> <p>Goldstein, S. and Goldscheider, C., eds., <i>Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community</i> 240</p> <p>Kehrer, G., <i>Religionssoziologie</i> 241</p> <p>Lever, H., <i>Ethnic Attitudes of Johannesburg Youth</i> 102</p> <p>Lipset, S. M., <i>Revolution and Counter-revolution, Change and Persistence in Social Structures</i> 242</p> | <p>Martin, D., <i>The Religious and the Secular—Studies in Secularization</i> 99</p> <p>Medding, P. Y., <i>From Assimilation to Group Survival, A Political and Sociological Study of an Australian Jewish Community</i> 245</p> <p>Mitscherlich, A., <i>Society without the Father, A contribution to Social Psychology</i> 248</p> <p>Owen, C., <i>Social Stratification</i> 106</p> <p>Qualey, C. C., ed., <i>Thorstein Veblen, The Carleton College Veblen Seminar Essays</i> 251</p> <p>Stacy, M., <i>Methods of Social Research</i> 104</p> <p>Stein, L., and Yogev, G., eds., <i>The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann</i> 252</p> <p>Zimmerman, C. C., <i>Sorokin, The World's Greatest Sociologist: His Life and Ideas of Social Time and Change</i> 106</p> |
|--|--|

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME XI NO. I

JUNE 1969

CONTENTS

The Appeal of Hasidism for American Jewry Today	<i>Efraim Shmueli</i>	5
Jewish Populations in General Decennial Population Censuses, 1955-61: a Bibliography	<i>Erich Rosenthal</i>	31
Mixed Marriage in an Israeli Town	<i>Erik Cohen</i>	41
A Note on Aspects of Social Life among the Jewish Kurds of Sanandaj, Iran	<i>Paul J. Magnarella</i>	51
University Education among Iraqi-Born Jews	<i>Hayyim J. Cohen</i>	59
Australian Jewry in 1966	<i>Walter M. Lippmann</i>	67
The Edgware Survey: Occupation and Social Class	<i>Ernest Krausz</i>	75
Book Reviews		97
Chronicle		108
List of Books Received		113
Notes on Contributors		115

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>)	Eugène Minkowski (<i>France</i>)
André Chouraqui (<i>France & Israel</i>)	S. J. Prais (<i>Britain</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>)
O. Klineberg (<i>USA</i>)	

© THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS 1969

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

BOOKS REVIEWED

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Page</i>
J. Freid	<i>Jews and Divorce</i>	A. S. Diamond	97
D. Martin	<i>The Religious and the Secular</i>	L. Jacobs	99
P. S. Cohen	<i>Modern Social Theory</i>	M. C. Albrow	100
V. Aubert	<i>Elements of Sociology</i>	M. C. Albrow	101
H. Lever	<i>Ethnic Attitudes of Johannesburg Youth</i>	B. A. Geber	102
M. Stacey	<i>Methods of Social Research</i>	E. Krausz	104
P. Atteslander and R. Girod	<i>Sociological Contributions</i>	M. C. Albrow	105
C. C. Zimmerman	<i>Sorokin, The World's Greatest Sociologist</i>	D. G. MacRae	106
B. Sugarman	<i>Sociology</i>	D. G. MacRae	106
C. Owen	<i>Social Stratification</i>	D. G. MacRae	106
M. Banton	<i>Roles, An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations</i>	D. G. MacRae	106

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.

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM FOR AMERICAN JEWRY TODAY

Efraim Shmueli

Hasidism interpreted

THIS article is not primarily about Hasidism itself (the pictist movement among eastern European Jews) in any of its intrinsic aspects, but about the astonishing acceptance of some Hasidic ideas, if not practices, by American (particularly Jewish) intellectuals today, and even by the wider public. The emotional impetus and the intellectual and psychological insights of reinterpreted Hasidism seem paradoxically to have an intimate connexion with types of emotion and patterns of thought generated in a modern technological society. Hasidic ideas seem to have a generative or revitalizing force, a fascinating creative vitality. To mention only a few examples, Norman Mailer has made comments on Buber's *Tales of the Hasidim*,¹ and either emphasized their beauty and relevance for modern man or reinterpreted them. Psychologists and psychoanalysts, such as Erich Fromm, have utilized some Hasidic insights, and Abraham J. Heschel's philosophy of Judaism is a kind of Hasidism partly couched in terms of existentialism.

Religious life is for Abraham Kaplan the life of wholeheartedness and intensity. He quotes the Hasidic saying 'Sin is what we cannot do wholeheartedly'. It is lack of integrity which constitutes a sin. Kaplan finds Hasidism to be compatible with mature religion, a religion which expresses not dependence but humility, 'not anxiety but seriousness of purpose, not guilt but responsibility, not fantasies of complete fulfilment, but gratitude and joy in God's world just as it is'. Writing about Zen he explains that this theory puts its reliance on wholeheartedness and intensity of effort, 'like the author of Deuteronomy and the Hasidim of eighteenth century Judaism'.² The Hasidic communities, particularly in Brooklyn, New York, have become the subject of an increasing number of sociological and anthropological studies.³ These ghettos had an immediate impact upon their Jewish neighbours.⁴ The Lubavitcher rabbi, leader of the Habad Hasidim, began, immediately after his arrival in New York in 1940, to organize his community, to establish

all-day schools and in general to propagate his ideas. His influence since that time has grown immeasurably. Other Hasidic rabbis, also refugees from Hitler, followed his initiative.

More and more books are being written in English (and apparently read) on Hasidic theology—tales, anecdotes, aphorisms, and the like. The most astonishing achievement in the translation of Hasidic literature seems to me to be the translation of the *Liqqutei Amarim* (Tanya).⁵ Hasidic thoughts and stories have gained acceptance and have permeated various circles in the academic community. In Erich Kahler's discussion of our contemporary moral and religious predicament, he quotes two Hasidic anecdotes and praises Hasidism in the following statement: 'This movement, which evolved in eastern Europe in the eighteenth century, carried on the old intuitional, anti-formalistic tradition of the prophets and the Kabbalah and was, in the form of a reformation, a true resurgence of the spirit of original Christianity.'⁶ Other writers have found Hasidic thoughts valuable on other grounds. The wider public likes Hasidic music and dances, stories and anecdotes. Rabbi Herbert Weiner closes his film strip on the Besht (Rabbi Israel ben Eliezer—1700—1760—the *Baal Shem Tov*, the 'Master of the Good Name', the founder of the movement) and Hasidism with the following words: 'Our time, like theirs is an age of great threats and of great promises. Their world also seemed dark and often hopeless. But their lives were suddenly lit up by a great flame of joy, of holiness and of faith. If we try to come close to them in memory and with proper intent of heart, with kavanah, as they would say, may it not be that the spark of the fire they knew may also kindle the dry timber of our own lives.'⁷ At a service in a Reform temple which I recently attended, Hasidic dances were performed to arouse feelings of awe and piety. This experiment, so highly questionable, has been repeated in other Reform synagogues. The phenomenon, however, is symptomatic. It emphasizes the problem of the apparent reversal of the whole attitude of the reform movement, and by the same token of the whole emancipationist religious movement, including the Conservative and Neo-Orthodox, towards Hasidism. The present-day response of American intellectuals to Hasidic ideas and symbols, as well as to psychological insights, is a problem worthy of serious consideration.

The revival of Hasidism also goes well with the religious existentialist trend influenced by Kierkegaard and the 'Theology of leap', by which sophisticated scholars, scientists, and college graduates try to come back to a simple post-sophisticated faith, to return to a new acceptance of a body of traditional pieties.

It is certainly not the idea of a simple unquestioning faith that appeals to intellectuals. The idea that submission to God's reign and the acceptance of the 'yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven' need fundamentally no explanation but only an acknowledgement that they are decrees

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

of God's will, can hardly appeal to many intellectuals. The doctrine of Hasidism today, as it was from the beginning, is that the *Mitzvah* is essentially a divine decree which transcends reason. God's reason is infinite, human reason is limited, and all explanations of God's precepts often fall into error. 'They may be useful only if and insofar as they help to preserve the precept, but must by no means be regarded as *the* reason for the precept.'⁸ An Orthodox Jew observes a precept because it is the inscrutable will of God. This attitude is hardly bound to attract intellectuals or the larger masses of contemporary Jews who have left the Orthodox fold.

I do not intend to discuss here basic Hasidic ideas as they were in their own context. I shall deal with particular ideas as reflected in the minds of contemporary Jews. Some of these ideas seem to be most helpful in evolving a reflective faith, in a traditional sense, but one brought up to an intellectual level of full contemporary self-awareness and capable of articulation in modern psychological and philosophical terms. Some others have little to do with traditional faith but still express the 'will to believe' in the sense of William James's theory of living a momentary and forceful option. This 'will to believe' seeks the psychological rewards of security and personal integrity in an absolutistic external reality, and therefore construes an image of a powerful God. Other Hasidic ideas are remoulded in essentially secular, or even atheistic, philosophies.

Discussing his own interpretation of Hasidism, in response to the criticism made by Gershom Scholem,⁹ Martin Buber distinguishes between two different approaches in which 'a great tradition of religious faith can be rescued from the rubble of time and brought back into the light'. The first is the scholarly reconstruction of the tradition in an objective and exact manner, in order to instruct future generations. The other approach restores the buried tradition by recapturing the sense of its former power: 'Such an approach derives from the desire to convey to our own time the force of a former life of faith and to help our age renew its ruptured bond with the Absolute.' This way of transmitting an old faith to contemporary readers cannot be an attempt by a detached scholar who stresses doctrines and is generally preoccupied with the tradition as an object of knowledge. On the other hand, as long as the commandment is performed 'with fidelity' it is not necessarily merely subjective. The second approach is thus that of a man 'who faithfully and adequately tries to communicate the vitality and power' of a buried faith.¹⁰

This paper suggests a third approach: an extrinsic interpretation which tries to illuminate the social aspects of Hasidic teachings and their appeal. It addresses itself to the image of Hasidism as reflected in the minds of Jews today, not necessarily 'faithfully and adequately'. Such an approach inevitably reflects on the inner possibilities of the

Hasidic teachings to raise significant problems and to solve them in a way which is still gratifying today. In other words, methodologically we cannot avoid complicating the main topic of this paper by bringing in the problem of an intrinsic interpretation of Hasidic teachings in their own terms. In this sense, the paper may serve a double purpose: (1) it will try to cast light on the intellectual endeavours to come to grips with the predicaments of our times; (2) and on the other hand, it will concern itself with the vitality and the regenerative power of the 'enduring' contributions of Hasidism to Judaism. Mainly, it attempts to provide a sociologically oriented analysis of some Hasidic ideas in the perspective of their affinity with ideas of present-day intellectuals.

Besides the approaches of the historian of religion and the theologian, and of the philosopher or the apostle of the religious tradition, there certainly is room for a sociological and philosophical approach which seeks to explore what aspects of Hasidism are considered by our contemporaries as worthy of being 'rescued from the rubble of time', and what the future possibilities of such an effort are—whether 'faithful and adequate' or not. This extrinsic interpretation tackles a question pertaining to the sociology of knowledge, its insight into 'situationally conditioned thought', and its 'historical perspective' and methods. What happens to processes and movements when transplanted from their original intellectual-historical constellations into a different environment? Who is vitally interested in this transplantation, and why?¹¹

Older attitudes towards Hasidism

The return to Hasidism as an attractive pattern of beliefs and intellectual insights is particularly surprising in the Reform Movement today. The founders of the Reform Movement either paid no attention to, or dismissed entirely, or scolded, their contemporary Zaddikim. A most articulate European Reformer, Aaron Chorin (1766–1844), a contemporary of a whole galaxy of most illustrious Zaddikim, was the first of the liberal rabbis to formulate his views on Reform in print. He wrote in Hebrew on the Hasidim: 'For a long time now I have noticed with regret the sad situation of my correligionists. A portion of them have surrendered to superstition, another to unbelief. While that harmful conglomeration of pious simulators, the Hasidim, spreads more and more and daily wins new supporters, another group eschews all religious obligations and declares as true only that which the senses can witness.'¹²

Abraham Geiger (1810–1874), for example, did not know and did not care about (or at least he did not mention) his contemporary, Rabbi Mendel of Kotzk (d. 1859). And Isaac Mayer Wise (1819–1900), the most militant champion of the Reform Movement in America, did not mention and did not care about his contemporary Isaac Meyer of Ger (d. 1866), the disciple of the Rabbi of Kotzk, or

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

about his grandson Aryeh Leib Alter (d. 1905). Both these Westerners certainly dismissed their pious eastern European contemporaries as obstacles to enlightenment and progress and resented them (if they took any notice of them at all). Geiger's biographer writes: 'Like most of the Jewish scholars of his day, he was not inclined by personal temperament to appreciate the element of mysticism in faith, nor would he even make the attempt to understand any form of religion built on mystical contemplation.'¹³ Although Geiger appreciated the beauty of tradition and the elements of inspiration and rejuvenation, and although his whole effort was in the direction of a new spiritual interpretation of Judaism, he could not properly evaluate the attempts made by the Hasidic Movement along the same line, although not with the same results. To some extent he appreciated the role of emotional expression in religion, but he could not see its beauty in Hasidism because of his other prejudices.

Even the middle-of-the-road movement which rallied around Zachariah Frankel (1801-1875) and Heinrich Graetz (1817-1891), the so-called Historical School of Breslau from which the Conservative Movement emanated, both in Europe and in America, was hostile to Hasidism. Graetz, for instance, writes: 'There arose in Poland a new Essenism, with forms similar to those of the ancient cult, with ablutions and baths, white garments, miraculous cures, and prophetic visions. Like the old movement, it originated in ultra-piety, but soon turned against its own parent, and perhaps hides within itself germs of a peculiar kind, which, being in course of development cannot be defined.'¹⁴

Graetz calls the Besht a 'wonder-doctor' who appeared to have communication with the spirit world and was often in a state of rapture which was induced by frantic movements of the whole body while praying, a condition of over-excitement. The Hasidim, he says, waged a war against the Talmudists, and when barbarism and degeneracy increased after the death of the founder, the feud between them and the Talmudists led to a complete rupture.¹⁵

About Dov Baer, the Great Maggid of Meseritz (1710-1772), he writes that his theory concerning the importance of the Zaddik is real blasphemy. Dov Baer thought that everything that the Zaddik does and thinks has a decided influence on the upper and lower world. The Deity reveals Himself especially in the acts of the Zaddik; even his most trifling deeds are to be considered important. In his *Stuebel* or 'hermitage' (i.e., his dirty little retirement chamber), he considered himself as great as the Vicar of God in his magnificent palace. The Zaddik was also to bear himself proudly towards men; all this was 'for the Glory of God'.¹⁶ Hasidism, according to Graetz, was a sort of Catholicism in the pejorative sense of an authoritarian and sacramentalist superstition within Judaism.¹⁷ Indeed, this evangelical revivalist

movement which, for the first time in Jewish history, took for itself deliberately the name Hasidim (pious), this second great Jewish reformation, a thousand years after the Karaites, was a lower-class movement; and it could hardly attract liberal western European Jews who were on their way to full emancipation and to greater participation in western European culture. Hasidism appeared to them much too superstitious and obscurantist, a movement of ignorants, too intensely fervid, emotional, irrational, and mystical, though comforting for the masses. They considered it a repellent sect, like the Methodists in England or the Dunkards in Germany, the contemporaries of Hasidism, and out of step with the enlightened era.

It seemed that after some penetrating remarks in Moses Hess's *Rome and Jerusalem* (1862), the first appreciative essay on Hasidism to appear in the Western World, probably the first longer essay in English on this movement, was written at the end of the nineteenth century by Solomon Schechter, in his *Studies in Judaism* (1896). Even this essay, entitled 'The Chassidim', has much to say against the theology of the movement and particularly against the cult of the Zaddik, 'which naturally doomed it to perversion and failure'.¹⁸ When at the end of the essay Schechter evaluates Hasidism, he mentions that among the Hasidim of today there is not one in ten thousand who has the faintest conception of those sublime ideas which inspired the Baal Shem Tov and his immediate disciples: 'It is still the interest of the wretched ringleaders of a widely spread delusion to crush and keep down every trace of reflection and thought so that they may play at will with the conscience and purses of their adherents.'¹⁹ Only the law against which the original Hasidim protested put limits to the licence of its 'modern false prophets'.²⁰ Schechter, however, brings a sympathetic understanding to the ideas of Hasidism, and he concludes his essay with these sentences: 'Amid much that is bad, the Chassidim have preserved through the whole movement a warm heart, and an ardent sincere faith. There is a certain openness of character and a ready friendliness about even the modern Chassidim, which are very attractive. Religion is still to them a matter of life and death. Their faith is still real enough to satisfy the demands of a Luther, but it is diverted and wasted upon unworthy objects. If Chassidism is to be reformed, its worship must no longer be of man; it must be brought back again to the source of all Beauty, all Wisdom, and all Goodness; it must be restored to God.'²¹

These sentences may serve as an initial answer to the problem of the appeal of Hasidism, but many other aspects must be considered or clarified. When asked in a class, 'What elements do you like in Hasidism?', my students replied in this order: joy, music, dance, God-intoxicated community, the democratic anti-clerical, anti-bureaucratic tendency according to which the simple man is like the scholar. The attraction of Hasidism today has certainly something to do with our

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

sensitivity to the absurd in our life, with the fear of emptiness, boredom, and meaninglessness, with the despair of man today and with modern attempts to overcome the feelings which originate in our so-called alienation.

I would like to explain this attraction along the following three lines: the ideological dimension; the psychological dimension; and the existential dimension.

The legitimacy of the traditional trends

We have today achieved a more mature understanding of eastern European Jewish culture. The ideas of Judaism as expressed in the Bible and medieval and modern Jewish philosophy now hold a more dignified position than they used to have among Western intellectuals and the Jewish intellectuals under their influence. Moreover, the *Shtetl* (the small-town Jewish community of eastern Europe) and its culture, despised and neglected in the emancipationist period, has become today an important element in Jewish awareness.²² This culture is now more highly valued by Western intellectuals, sociologists, and philosophers. The special ways in which the *Shtetl* has fulfilled the needs of its people have been examined with great interest and significance.²³ We now have a deeper understanding of the various aspects of Judaism, however bizarre and strange they may appear to the rationalists; we realize that Jewishness is more than Judaism, just as man is more than the idea of man as defined in a rational system, and doctrines matter less than sources of creativeness. The idea of Judaism as an ethical monotheism was mostly fashioned in the prevalent pattern of nineteenth-century liberalism and Protestant biblical criticism. It was moulded in such a way that Jews could participate in the liberal nationalism of the gentile citizens, and it stressed the common origin of Judaism and Christianity, the so-called Judeo-Christian tradition. Judaism became the religion of a universal ethical monotheism, of a rational optimism, opposing 'segregation' and the darkness of mysticism. It appealed to reason, to the universality of goodwill and moral duty. It was established (and assumed) that the Bible is a source of rational authority which imposes upon man moral tasks. The mystery of divine holiness is the moral law and its realization. Judaism is a pedagogic religion, and its task to educate humanity is still unfinished. The consciousness of faith is the coefficient of the rational moral law. Today a broader understanding of Jewish culture pays attention also to the mystical trends in Judaism which had another image of God and the Jewish people. These are apparently better able to interpret the history of the Jewish soul, the anguish, the suffering the martyrdom, the intensity of faith, and the intensity of apostasy.²⁴

Jewish society founded upon the Torah, as interpreted by the Talmudic sages and later rabbis, imposed upon the Jewish nation a

set of strict rules of pietism. Legal, ritual, moral, and theological elements were fused. Yitzhak Baer has called it a 'mytho-theological mold'. Referring to the laws and teachings of Jews throughout the Middle Ages, this historian remarks: 'Their attitude was conceived in an atmosphere of mythological thinking where care was taken not to couch religious ideals in rational terms or to express ideals in rational terms or to express their relation to the practical world in matter-of-fact language. Therein lay their strength and also their weakness.'²⁵

Baer, Scholem, Herschel, and other Jewish and non-Jewish scholars, took a broader view of the history of Jewry and the teachings of Judaism. These teachings included mythology, ascetic lore, and mystic drives of pietist communities which did not distinguish clearly between the observance of the ritual commandments, the pursuit of social justice, the introspective purging of the heart, or even the magical domination of the world.

Not only the so-called American anti-intellectual bias but the whole dimension of faith necessary for the believer draws modern men to the mystic trend of Hasidism. Here we have a movement whose founders insisted that it was not the letter but the spirit of the law which was important. The ignorant villager mattered religiously and humanly as much as the most erudite rabbi. The Lord does not object even if a man misunderstands what he learns or prays, provided only he strives to communicate his love. The ideal type of spiritual leadership is not that of the student of Torah, the learned rabbi, but of the Zaddik who experienced inner revival. He is the illuminated whose heart has been touched by God and who has thus achieved actual proof of the possibility of human reality approximating the dimension of spirituality. Hasidism is not a theory of rational ethos—it is rather mysticism turned Ethos.²⁶

We are able today to appreciate the way in which this movement tried to resolve the conflict involved in the paradox of solitude and communion. Gershom Scholem describes the resolution of this paradox as the most characteristic peculiarity of the Hasidic movement. 'What gave Hasidism its specific character was primarily its advocacy of the founding of a religious community on the basis of a paradox common to the history of such movements, as the sociology of religious groupings has shown. Briefly the originality of Hasidism lies in the fact that mystics who had attained their spiritual aim—who in Rabbinic parlance had discovered the secret of true *devekuth*—turned to the people with their mystical knowledge. Their Kabbalism became ethos, and instead of cherishing as a mystery the most personal of all experiences undertook to teach its secret to all men of good will.'²⁷

Thus, the first answer to our problem presented in this paper within the so-called ideological dimension is this: through the broadening of our views on Jewishness and Judaism, and through a more comprehen-

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

sive understanding of their multiple facets, Jewish intellectuals respond with a deeper insight to the irrational trends of the Hasidic doctrine and way of life, and the larger population responds emotionally to Hasidic ecstasy and enthusiasm. Since the whole intensity of feelings among Hasidim was a mystical, individualist moralization which found its way to organized community life, Hasidism has apparently been able to show the ordinary Jew of today the possibility of an inspired life. Even under profane conditions of contemporary urban life, its warm intimacy attracts those who feel 'alienated' from the shallower aspects of modernity and of moralistic Judaism, from the whole atmosphere of the Enlightenment movement as reflected in the 'Science of Judaism'. The broader aspects of recent social and philosophical research do not confirm the belief in a rapid progress in overcoming human and social imperfections by the application of 'scientific knowledge' and in developing Judaism from 'medieval superstitions' to an 'enlightened' modernity.

The modern Jew, after the traumatic experiences of our time, feels the need for emotional and spiritual support by the accumulated warmth, enthusiasm, and ecstasy of his ancestors, and senses an impoverishment, a betrayal, in the narrowing down of the broad and deep dimensions of his history.

Psychological dimensions

Jewish intellectuals nowadays more and more discover that the deeper insights of modern psychological analysis are to be found in the trends of Jewish mysticism, and that some of these insights are spelled out by Hasidic teachings. Let us examine, for example, the attitudes towards evil and law.

'It is one of the important characteristics of psychoanalysis that it views evil as a distortion of love. The paradoxical identification of good and evil pervades all Freud's writings so that their classical polarity is virtually obliterated.'²⁸ Now, the Hasidic doctrine shows at least an ambivalence towards evil. The sanctification of life by sublimation, by the so-called 'uplifting of the divine sparks' which have been scattered even in the demonic shells, demands necessarily from man that he enter the realm of evil, darkness, and sin. In order to gather the scattered sparks he has to enter into the realm of the demonic powers, into the shells which psychoanalysis interprets today as the unconscious. Man must liberate the holiness held fast there. He must learn from Satan. No one can be consciously good unless he knows evil.

'When you perceive Satan diligently seeking to persuade you to commit an evil deed, understand that he is endeavoring to fulfil his duty as he conceives it. Learn from him diligence in performing your bound duty, namely to battle and overcome his persuasion.'²⁹ Though evil is still there, we have to learn from it, to become familiar with it in order to overcome its powers. Some other Hasidic aphorisms and

parables express the belief that evil does not exist at all; it is only an illusion. It may be only a temporary darkening of the mind and a weakening of moral inspiration. Essentially, it is an hallucination and not a reality. R. Nahman of Bratzlav (d. 1811) strongly stressed this aspect; evil is non-being. Other Zaddikim thought that the *yetzer ha-ra*, the evil inclination, is a power in man to do that which God prohibited him to do in order that man be free, free even to rebel against Him, and only thus free to accept His Kingdom voluntarily. The will of man is the only limitation of God's power, and evil is the pre-condition of his freedom.³⁰

When man attempts with all the intensity of his powers, even with the force of his evil inclination, to do good deeds, he is redeeming evil from darkness and unholiness. He turns the dark unclean drives towards God and thus purifies them. He annihilates the division between the subconscious and the conscious and thus makes evil illusory. Its destructive potentialities are redeemed by the constructive emotions. The constructive emotions are reinforced by the power of the evil drives. Hasidic teachings were an attempt to resolve unconscious conflicts and were opposed to the conventional moralizing of the Maggidim—the Preachers—because they were castigating and awakening exaggerated guilt complexes in their hearers. The Zaddikim maintained that by castigating his own passion and by victimizing himself man is prone to brutalize others. Indeed, the moralistic zeal, particularly of the lower middle class, brought many to perdition.³¹

According to Hasidic teachings, health and enjoyment are most important. 'Do not consider the time you spend for eating and sleeping wasted. The soul within you is rested during these intervals and is able to renew its holy work with fresh enthusiasm.'³² 'If the vision of a beautiful woman comes suddenly to man's eyes or if he perceives any other fair and lovely thing he should unhesitatingly ask himself whence comes this beauty except from the divine force which permeates the world. Consequently the origin of this beauty is divine, and why should I be attracted by the part?'³³

Sometimes the evil spirit betrays a man, persuading him that he has committed a deadly sin. He might have committed an infringement of the law, or he might have done no wrong at all. The spirit's purpose is to drive him into despondency over the supposed lapse, and by inducing a condition of gloom to render him incapable of service. Let man beware of this dastardly trick! Let him retort to the spirit: 'I perceive thy design to lure me from service. Thou speakest a lie! If indeed I have sinned a little, the more gratified will my Creator be if I refuse to let my offense interrupt the joyousness of my service. On the contrary, I will go on serving Him in a happy mood. For I serve not for my own ends but to give God pleasure. If I do not worry about this peccadillo, with which thou chargest me, God will not take it

amiss. For I ignore it, that my service be not stayed for a single instant.'³⁴ This is the greatest rule of service: Bid melancholy avaunt! There is no man on earth who does not sin. The sin makes the Zaddik human and enables him to guide others. No true saint would be able to see wickedness in others if he did not experience wickedness himself.

Hasidim used to quote the Talmudic statement that a fine dwelling, fine clothes, and a beautiful wife broaden a man's understanding; and they used to add that they need all the understanding to serve the Lord fittingly. Sexuality as the focus of consciousness has a deep root in Kabbalistic literature; in the Zohar and the Hasidic literature the sexual metaphor is used very freely and is exalted to a sacred symbol. Love obliterating the boundaries between ego and object, between lover and the beloved, is symbolized by the relation between God and the community of Israel. The unification in love in the sexual act is in the Kabbalah particularly a symbol of the termination of exile. The *Shekhinah*, identified with the community of Israel, is the bride and God the lover.

The healthy eros redeems man from evil and makes his world a world of harmony. By understanding that evil is only illusory, because it can be turned in the direction of the everlasting good, man 'deserves' a harmonious world. 'Man was created last for the following reason: if he is deserving, he shall find all nature at his service; if he is undeserving, he shall find all nature arrayed against him.'³⁵

Like Spinoza's 'intellectual love of God', reason itself is, according to Hasidism, emotionally charged and must give the emotions the place to which they are entitled. Though the Law of the Torah has to be obeyed, passive conformity and uninspired obedience destroy saintliness. Compulsion produces self-hatred and self-destruction and consequently hate and destruction of others. In the redeemed world the yoke of Torah, the restrictions resulting from the sin of eating from the Tree of Knowledge, will be removed. Though Hasidism was never antinomian, it was in some conflict with the literal sense of the law. The Kabbalah taught the Jews the taste and savour of the Tree of Life, by which Israel will be mercifully redeemed from exile and the words of the Scripture will be fulfilled: 'And the Lord alone will lead him and there will not be with him a strange God.'³⁶ The days of redemption were described as no longer under the shadow of the Tree of Knowledge, of Good and Evil, but in the light of the Tree of Life. Israel will no longer be subject to the law which prescribes what is permitted and what is forbidden or what is pure and what is impure. There will no longer be either questions which come from the sight of evil, or disputes which arise from the sight of impurity because the impure spirit will cease to exist.³⁷ Mysticism with its inordinate inquisitiveness was never satisfied with the literal sense of the scriptural text and its laws. It dug into the most hidden meaning, and though the law gained thereby in reverence by

becoming founded upon cosmic and theosophic bases, the Mystic, the Hasid, achieved some independence of emotions and enjoyed intellectual insights which were at variance with the discipline of the dry law and its uninspired observance.

By emphasizing the pleasurable aspects of life, although in a religious framework, against mystical asceticism and legal rabbinic restrictions, Hasidism opened up new possibilities for a harmonious and joyful life. Hasidism was a movement similar to romanticism in the Western world; it was, as Moses Hess stressed in his *Rome and Jerusalem*, a bridge between the medieval Jewish man and the modern Jewish man. Even Graetz, who condemns the Hasidic movement, describes the Besht as a romantic hero and a Rousseau-type lover of God. 'The spurs of the Carpathian mountains were his teacher . . . the spells of the mountains and the fountains whispered secrets to him . . . his audible prayers re-echoed in the mountains which appeared as an answer to his supplications . . . he spoke his words with fervor and intense devotion, or cried them aloud in the solitude of the mountains.'³⁸ This romantic mood was an expression of the search for freedom from the restrictions of the community, of flight from the central institutions.

The search for personal freedom was ideologically expressed in romanticism and Hasidism alike. S. W. Baron comments on the affinities between Hasidism and Rousseau: 'His appeal to the untutored common man in many ways resembled those of the contemporary German Pietists or East European Jewish Hasidim, all of them reminiscent of the simple but fervent Galilean peasants some seventeen centuries before. It also corresponded to his antimonarchical, democratic ideals and, being essentially subversive of the established order, had a positively revolutionary ring.'³⁹

The ambivalent attitude of Hasidism towards the Law of the Torah finds its expression in modern American Jewish literature in two ways. The first is enthusiastic acceptance with the realization that sacred acts, or *mitzvot*, represent Divine acts. 'The mitzvot are of the essence of God, more than worldly ways of complying with His will. In a sacred deed, we echo God's suppressed chant; in loving the mitzvot we intone God's unfinished song.'⁴⁰ The other way is the rejection of the Law: the restrictions of the Torah are no longer appropriate to our 'redeemed' world of democracy in an affluent society of full civil rights and economic expansion, in the era of the Jewish State, and of modern science; the scientific spirit liberates us from ancient taboos and relieves us from guilt by explaining the origins of the prohibitions. The latter way is the more prevalent.

Hasidism and Existentialism

Thus Hasidic ideas and moods which were not so acceptable in central and western Europe a century ago became popular in our

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

generation in America and in Israel. It would be unsound to trace the origin of ideas merely to social and economic factors, but the popularity of ideas is undoubtedly determined, at least in part, by factors dominant in a social and cultural contact. Whereas original thinkers anticipate their time, the popularity of ideas is, by definition, a manifestation of their times. Likewise, the originators of existentialist philosophy, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, did not elicit response in their era of liberalism and of rationalistic belief in progress. Their writings became popular in our times of anguish and insecurity. The teachings of both movements voice today what many feel but are unable to express. Besides, there are some affinities between Hasidism and existentialism in their more specific attitudes towards decision, that is, authenticity of the self, and tradition and individuality. I shall briefly describe these affinities.

Hasidism was a response to times of physical distress and spiritual meaninglessness, when religious and moral demands and institutionalized religion inadequate to genuine religious commitments followed the external path and seemed to be remote from inner reality. Like Existentialism in our days, Hasidism opposed the abstractness of these demands and of institutionalized doctrines. The Zaddikim rejected the legalistic, pilpulistic overlearning just as the Existentialists fight modern overspecialization. In both there is a deep dissatisfaction with rationalistic knowledge. Both were searching for a personal 'way of life'. Both were recasting the meaning of life in relation to the individual.

Existentialism, to the extent that so many heterogeneous thinkers can be lumped together under the rubric of one philosophy, teaches that man is more than just a type, an essence, a general character defined by some social role. In his every action he defines his own essence. He is not specified and determined beforehand—prior to his very concrete existence and to his manifestations. In contrast to the romantic or the idealistic image of man, the existentialist philosopher does not believe that the self is an unfolding spirit. The purpose of history does not reveal itself almost automatically in the deeds of talented individuals. 'History' or 'Spirit' does not give the self its very nature.

Man defies definition, but he has to be given meaning here and now. Man is nothing else but the meaning which he makes of himself by his own choices. Existentialism developed a philosophy based on the mystery of the concrete individual in the whole context of his everyday life, the mystery of the whole man with his gloomy aspects (like death, anxiety, guilt, fear, and despair) as well as his sphere of decisions. Whatever meaning and value we may find in our life is the upshot of our choices and decisions. 'A single little mistake is capable of throwing life's prodigious balance-sheet into confusion.'⁴¹ By a genuine choice we are truly human. The self can become lost in the indefinite area of possibility and contingency. Gone is the optimism of the belief that the self is carried along securely on a path of steady development. 'If

possibility outruns necessity, the self runs away from itself, so that it has no necessity whereto it is bound to return—then this is the despair of possibility.⁴² The self is fully realized only through a synthesis between possibility and necessity, freedom and determination.

Of course, original Hasidism did not accept such an anthropocentric self-sufficient philosophy. Yet it, too, stressed the importance of personal choice and decision. Man by his concrete deeds is responsible for the whole world. Furthermore, Hasidism also sensed that a perilous contingency is a distinguishing feature of reality, and the self tends to become lost in it. Like Existentialism, Hasidism believes that in every decision man is responsible also for what becomes of others. When a Hasid was once asked what had been most important to his Zaddik, he replied: 'Whatever he happened to be doing at the moment.' The relation with the highest meanings of life is established in concrete human daily situations. 'Where is God's dwelling?' asked the Kotzker Rabbi, the Hasidic counterpart of Kierkegaard, and he replied: 'God dwells wherever man lets Him in.' God, the totality of meanings and values, does not have an abode in this world without intimate relation to man's choice. Although he is everything and everywhere, he depends upon man's ultimate decision and is looking for man's hospitality. God's dwelling is man's commitment.

This existentialist idea of 'engagement' in the language of J.-P. Sartre, which found its equivalent in the English 'involvement' or 'commitment', is particularly stressed by Buber and his followers and by Heschel. They find it to be the core of Hasidism, implied in all Judaism. Buber quotes approvingly the Besht's interpretation of the verse in Ecclesiastes, 'Do all that your hand finds to do with all your strength.' He also agrees with the saying of a Zaddik: 'Everybody should see which way his heart draws him, and then he should choose this way with all his heart.'⁴³ The danger inherent in personal choice is a deep concern of most Existentialists. Needless to say, the shortcomings of hesitation, lukewarmness, and indifference can be totally outweighed by commitment to atrocities and destruction. By insisting on the acceptance of the tradition of the divine commandments, Hasidism avoids the dangerous temptation of destructive commitments left open in the Existentialist doctrines.

As against the isolation and loneliness of romantic individualism, revived by the Existentialists, Hasidism stresses a community with God, with Torah, and with the Chosen People. The authentic Jewish individual cannot be estranged from the commitments prescribed by his tradition. Though he is called to exercise his freedom of decision and assume his responsibility by choice, he chooses the way of life by which his ancestors lived before him.

Existentialists may rightly argue that by his dependence on past tradition, the Hasid loses his individual authenticity. But there is still

an immense difference between a non-deliberate and compulsory conformity to pre-established patterns of traditional life and a deliberate choice of these patterns. The difference was elaborated by the Besht thus: 'Some persons have faith because their fathers taught them to believe. In one sense, this is satisfactory: no philosophical axioms will break their belief; in another, it is unsatisfactory since their belief does not come from personal knowledge. Others come to belief through conviction after research. This is satisfactory in one sense: they know God from inner conviction; in another it is unsatisfactory: if other students demonstrate to them the fallacy of their reasoning, they may become unbelievers. The best believers are those whose beliefs are satisfactory in every way; they believe because of tradition and also through their own reasoning. This is what we mean when we say: "Our God and the God of our Fathers." The Lord is our master, both because we know He is our God, and because our fathers have taught us that he is God.'⁴⁴

In other words, the mature Jewish person, according to Hasidism, is neither an enslaved conformist dedicated to tradition *per se*, nor an irresponsible rebel looking for the realization of his genuine authenticity in totally independent choices which reject the past. As a matter of fact, Hasidic teachings tended to instruct primarily by practice; the complexes of religious meaning were learned through daily training in gradual acquaintance with the themes and motifs of the religious literature, with the stories, parables, laws, and beliefs and in association with the Zaddik and his Hasidim. In the same way a philosopher recently described the existential approach to religion: 'One grows into it, and it comes only with patience and honesty, preoccupation and fidelity. Once one sees and knows the how, one no longer asks for proofs of God's existence; for God's existence is an assurance given only the way the conviction that there is a world is given. Indeed, one knows God.'⁴⁵ The rise and strengthening of Jewish individualism through Hasidism merits a separate analysis.

The development of Jewish individualism

Maturity of mind was manifested in the Hasidic movement in the personality of the Zaddik. The image of the Zaddik is an important point in the development of the idea and practice of individualism in Jewish history. What is meant by individualism will be elucidated in what follows. Suffice it to say here that individualism is a psychological, political, and cultural dynamic structure which appreciates and cultivates individual differences in character, ways of life, opinions, and beliefs, and promotes the variety of personal choices.

We shall not discuss here the problem whether modern secular individualism is an illegitimate and distorted upshot of religious individualism of the Protestant type, or whether religious individualism itself

was only a limited manifestation, restricted to one realm only, of the broader and more intensive drive which expressed itself fully in both secular and religious modern forms alike when restrictions were removed. Jewish individualism was certainly most influenced by the growth of capitalism, industrialism, urbanism, and generally Western 'nominalism'. It has, however, also its autonomous origins. We shall analyse them briefly.

The rich diversity of the human personality, that 'infinite variety' which Shakespeare's Mark Antony marvelled at in Cleopatra, is a wonder long ago emphasized by the Talmudic sages. Not only is each person the embodiment of the divine image endowed with dignity and worth, but his individuality is totally different from that of other human beings. 'For man stamps many coins with the one seal of the first man, yet not one of them is like his fellow. Therefore, everyone must say, "For my sake the world was created."' ⁴⁶

The Jewish view of personality seems to have some advantages over the Christian view. From the beginning the relationship between God and man in Judaism was completely unmediated by sacraments and institutions. The Jew has always felt that he is facing God without intermediaries and stands directly under His providential rule. The Jew has also assumed personal responsibility for his deeds without being able to gain remission by confession or indulgences. He is fully aware that the magnitude of his responsibilities defines the real stature, of his personality.

The problem, however, was the expression of the diversity of individual differences within the existing social and political order of the community, and the right of personal convictions in religious matters, especially the right not to conform to the traditional patterns of life. It was a long time before the reverence of the sacred image of the human being, its mystery and pathos, became secularized into a respect for the fathomless and diverse peculiarities of the individual and his right to express them freely in a responsible way. Jewish destiny and doctrines imposed strict limitations. The fact of individualism was always acknowledged and marvelled at. Of course, there were always in Jewish life a great many individualistic drives, particularly expressed in the Middle Ages by Hebrew poets and philosophers, but the fact did not become a norm. The tolerance of individual characteristics of the personality was not paralleled by the tolerance of individual conviction in communal and religious matters. A people always struggling for survival could hardly offer many opportunities for personal self-development in the modern sense, of offering—at least theoretically—individual liberty of choice among many possible ways of life. The community, and its religion and destiny, were of primary importance. It was believed that genuine personality could be developed only through the traditional patterns of the community.

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

Historical Judaism cannot be identified with liberalism or democracy.⁴⁷ Its range of meanings transcends any established political system. Therefore, it was able to live with many political and social orders. Only totalitarianism which seeks to dominate all aspects of life, including religion and family, is incompatible with Judaism. A conscientious Jew could neither approve of the deification of the state nor of the abolition of legal and moral restrictions on the means employed in the pursuit of the alleged aims of the deified state. The foe of the Jews and Judaism was always the totalitarian ruler, be he Antiochus or Stalin, who wanted all of the subject, above all his soul, in order to control his entire life. Whereas Jews rejected the absolute claims of totalitarianism, the authoritarian political and social system which was predominant in former generations, as long as it knew restraints and respect for the rule of law, could expect loyalty and approval from Jews. This attitude was expressed by a medieval legal decision in the sentence: 'The law of the state is law, but the arbitrary decree of the state is not law.'⁴⁸ Of course, the difference was never forgotten between the relative justice of the state and its laws and the absolute justice of the divine law, between the kingdom of man and the kingdom of God. Jewish community life itself was based, long before and after the Middle Ages, on authoritarian principles.

Jewish historians from Jost (1793-1860) to Dubnow (1860-1941) have stressed that the national group discipline was imposed by official religion. Jost hinted as much when he asserted that the spiritual structure of the Talmud fulfilled the function of the homeland in the life of the people.⁴⁹ Graetz enlarged this idea. 'Talmudism', he asserted in the introduction to the fifth volume of his history, in German, 'maintained Judaism in the Diaspora.' It built a spiritual homeland and a kind of state within the state.⁵⁰ This notion was maintained by Dubnow and by many other historians and thinkers towards the end of the nineteenth century. Ahad Ha'Am and Bialik emphasized that complete religious separation was an indispensable necessity for national existence. They held that Jews ought to be grateful to the leaders of former generations for expelling from the national body the fighters for individual freedom and the individualistic movements which they saw as a danger to continued national existence. Whether or not we include among the defenders of 'the religion of individuals' Jesus, the early Christians, the Karaites, the disciples of Maimonides, Uriel Acosta, and Spinoza, and whether we accept this verdict or not, we cannot deny the authoritarian attempts to suppress all rebels. These rebels, the non-conforming personalities and groups, nevertheless existed. They reflected the thoughts and activities of Jewish individualism.

The otherwise admirable summary of Dubnow's philosophy of history in Jacob B. Agus's *The Meaning of Jewish History*⁵¹ is considerably

weakened by the author's strong bias against nationalism and against Dubnow's allegedly low estimation of religion. This may be the reason why Agus ignores the fact that the attitude towards Jewish individualism was not different in the views of Dubnow's predecessors, quoted above, who certainly held religion in the highest esteem. This whole 'functionalist' approach of Jewish historians and thinkers assumes that 'survival' is not only a biological but also a social reality and that needs and responses in a 'surviving' culture are directly related and turned towards each other. As with 'functionalism' in anthropology and sociology, the implicit hypothesis in this interpretation of Jewish history is that it is a self-regulating system; the Jewish people is seen as a coherent self-regulating entity. Every cultural and social feature of the Jewish people is functionally indispensable.⁵² Hence the idea that the authoritarian pressure in Jewish life fulfilled a vital function. It is obvious that such a functionalist theodicy has the greatest difficulty in explaining alternatives and deviations from the normative 'survival' pattern, for example, rebellious personalities and sectarian movements. Indeed, one must agree that 'historically speaking functional analysis is a modification of teleological explanation i.e., of explanation not by reference to causes which "bring about" the event in question but by reference to ends which determine its course'.⁵³

The most outspoken manifestations of Jewish individualism are to be found in the mystical literature, the messianic movements, and Hasidism. In them one perceives the rich potentialities of human life, personal inclinations and longings suppressed by a collective self-enclosurement and ascetic self-discipline. The whole individualist underground of spiritual and emotional life was not yet visible. But the suppressed emotions removed some prohibitions and were hoping to remove the authoritarian fetters from the individual and the whole people. The mystical scholars and visionaries, and later on the charismatic Zaddikim, were the first to proclaim their right to cultivate their individuality without, however, rejecting literally the traditional precepts. In the mystical trend R. Moses Hayyim Luzzatto could proclaim a Magna Carta of religious individualism: 'Every man has to be guided and instructed according to his personality, according to the calling which he pursues, or the business in which he is engaged. The method of attaining saintliness which applies to one whose calling is the study of the Torah does not apply to the manual laborer, and neither method applies to one who is engaged in business. Each man must be shown a method which fits his occupation. Not that there are different kinds of saintliness, since saintliness must consist for all alike in doing that which is pleasing to the Creator. But since there are different kinds of men, the means of accomplishing that purpose are bound to vary. The man who is compelled to labor at the meanest work is as capable of being a perfect saint as one who never leaves off the study of the Torah;

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

as it is written: ". . . in all thy ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct thy paths".⁵⁴ That is why the Hasidic rabbis could be so profound in individualizing, so intimate and personal. The Bereditchever could bolster the ego of a coach-driver who sought his advice as to whether he should give up his occupation because it interfered with his regular attendance at the synagogue. The rabbi asked him: 'Do you carry poor travellers free of charge?' 'Yes,' answered the driver. 'Then you serve the Lord in your occupation just as faithfully as you would by frequenting the synagogue.'⁵⁵

Hasidism responded with awe and wonder to the marvel of the Zaddik. From the Zohar it derived the idea that each Jewish soul is unique and indispensable in the cosmic processes of creation and redemption, a letter of the Torah, thus participating in the bottomless depth of the divine will. The more complicated theosophic doctrines of the Kabbalah were ignored. The mysticism of personal life in its relation to God, to the community and its spiritual leaders, became of main importance. The ideal type of the Jewish man ceased to be the devoted student of the Torah. Instead, the Zaddik, often not a great scholar, became himself the embodiment of the Torah. The personality of the inspired medium of revelation is himself doctrine and more so. In European civilization fascination with and awe of the dignity of the saint, and in the Renaissance period of the successful *condottiere* or the *principe* of the Machiavellian *virtù*, or the great artist, was transformed into general esteem for the worth of every personality. Likewise, in Jewish civilization, the mystical conception of the charismatic personality of the Zaddik was transferred to the personality of every Jew, of every man. The 'routinization of charisma' (to use Max Weber's term) brought about the spread of reverence for the mystery of each person. The mystery and dignity of the sacred image was secularized in the regard for the rights of a person to express his individuality both in the spiritual and in the social and political spheres.

The contribution of Hasidism to this process is not to be underestimated. Particularly in America today, it may manifest itself in an extreme individualism derived from the Hasidic emphasis on the infinite peculiarities of the sacred personality and intensified by the traits of character, institutions, and ideas developed by American society. This individualism is totally anti-authoritarian. But the contribution of Hasidism may also be manifested in an extreme authoritarianism derived from the cult of Zaddikism and intensified by the potent processes in American modern society. There will always be the 'Authoritarian Personality' with its need for clear-cut decisions and emotional reassurance, for cognitive security in group feeling, and strong leadership. The impact of the Hasidic climate of moods and ideas was always felt in both these opposite directions.

In America, the rabbi, because of his exceptional role in Jewish life

as almost the only repository of Jewish knowledge, as a spiritual leader of a congregation largely uninformed of things Jewish, benefits from this authoritarian trend which releases more and more members of the synagogue from personal responsibilities and from performing daily *mitzvot*. 'For whether American Jews like it or not (and some of them do not), they are heavily dependent on their rabbis. The future character of American Jewish life, in fact its very existence will be largely determined by its spiritual leaders.'⁵⁶ The worship becomes largely vicarious. Specialization lessens the scope for individual participation, especially so in the Reform Temple. The worshipper is a spectator and his experience is largely that of a bystander. As with mass culture media in general, the rabbis as producers of the religious cultural products become an élite catering for the tastes of their consumers rather than developing or cultivating autonomous ones. The synagogues tend, like the Protestant churches, to take into account the beliefs of influential members in moral and dogmatic beliefs and practices, since these members have initiative and provide funds.

On the other hand, there is a possibility that both the rabbi and the secular Jewish leader may profit also from a mature non-authoritarian urge for leadership. Edwin Wolf illuminates this possibility in referring to Hasidism: 'That there is a search for leadership is apparent from such a twentieth-century paradox as the surprising resurgence of Hasidism. People are looking for something in which they can believe, something to which they can be loyal, something which sees them as souls. With their business-like methods, the synagogue, the welfare fund and the miscellaneous civic and fraternal organizations are not providing that something. The organizations can convince, but they can no longer inspire. Soon they must seek men who can inspire, even if it means the sloughing-off of established ways of thought and action.'⁵⁷

We may, therefore, conclude that the individualism, privacy, and internalization achieved in modern society have their high price in solitude, loneliness, questioning, and doubts, and all the risks of decision-making. Hasidism may be a distraction, in a sentimental sense, from a 'disenchanted world', but it may also provide for some intellectuals the support of genuine leaders and of a community they yearn for.

The Establishment and salvation

To conclude our discussion of the affinities between modern Western Jewish life and Hasidism, we shall consider the relation of Hasidism to the Land and State of Israel.

It is a well-known fact that after some early minor attempts to settle in Palestine, the Hasidic movement up to the rise of Nazism was in fact, if not in principle, strongly opposed to the modern settlement in Palestine. No Zaddikim of great reputation could be found among the many religious leaders of the *Hibbat Zion* or Zionist movement. The

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

attitude of the Hasidic Establishment was rather hostile to the building of the National Home by human efforts; the restoration of Israel to its Land was believed to be essentially a divine miraculous act. Only in the proper course of time, known only to God himself, when the whole of Israel would be permeated by the divine spirit, would the efforts of personal salvation induce God to redeem his people. Meanwhile, every Jew was called upon to work on his own perfection. Each one was, so to say, his own saviour, each one had the Messianic quality, a portion of the Messiah.

As early a Hasidic teacher as Dov Baer of Meseritz, probably because of his struggle with the antinomian remnants of the Messianic movements, stressed the idea that it is easier to approach God in the Diaspora than in the Land of Israel. God in the Diaspora—he teaches—is like a King outside his palace riding in the open country, where it is easier for the common man to come closer to him. Although maintaining traditional beliefs, Hasidism spiritualized and personalized the Messianic hope for the national restoration. Redemption was believed to be a continuous process of deliberate acknowledgement and intensive acceptance of the kingdom of God by fulfilling the daily obligations.

Down to our day Hasidim were in practice staunch defenders of life in the Diaspora. Needless to say, the destiny of some eastern European Jewish communities would have taken another turn if the Zaddikim had urged their followers to settle in Israel, as some remnants of the great dynasties of the Zaddikim do today.

After the restoration of the Jewish State, some very powerful sections of the American Jewish Establishment likewise have stressed the 'salvation of the soul', the 'excellence' and perfection of the individual, minimizing the importance of physical and national redemption. Some theologians emphasize that Exile is mainly a spiritual reality. 'To be sure, it is also a reality, well founded upon the history and conduct of nations. It is a spiritual reality of enormous importance because it accords with that particular freedom which is appropriate to the Jew. What the sin of Adam was to every man, the Exile of the Holy Spirit, the Exile of the community of Israel, the Exile of the faithful remnant of Zion, is to the Jew. The special destiny of the Jew is to witness to the evil which man does not alone to the individual, but to providence.'⁵⁸ Thus, the concrete history of a dispersed people becomes the result of the 'freedom to do evil'. All his struggles for survival, all his sufferings, and all disasters, are events in a metaphysical cosmic history of the 'Supernatural Jew'. No wonder that Arthur A. Cohen contends that the Exile endures and that Israel in spite of being in its homeland is in *galut*, as are all things Jewish until their proper consummation.⁵⁹ This is indeed a position very close to traditional Hasidism.

The modern man, integrated in the affluent American society, even if he is in some conflict with the Establishment, does not concede that

the Jewish question still exists in concrete historical contexts. He will argue, as Cohen does, that the founding of the State of Israel consummates the natural return of the people to their homeland, and that by now the physical incubus of Diaspora is virtually ended. 'Even if Jews choose not to return, determine not to be gathered unto the Land, decide to remain in the countries of the Dispersion, it cannot be doubted that Diaspora has ended.'⁶⁰ Only exile has not ended, he maintains. Well, this can be doubted. It seems to me that one can validate just the opposite thesis: exile has ended in its main historical and actual aspects, if the term is not stretched to a metaphysical-cosmic length; the dispersion, however, remains.

Conclusion

The present paper does not explicitly discuss the assumptions and ramifications of the European sociology of knowledge or its American offshoots. It accepts as a valid, though latent, frame of reference the assumption that the place, the time, and the structure of a society and its pressures influence decisively, if not totally determine, intellectual outlooks, particularly 'revitalization' movements.

The Hasidic movement found some viable answers to Jewish community life in times of extreme emotional, intellectual, and socio-political stress. Without unnecessary elaboration upon the specifics, I have tried to indicate in these pages how it is that certain affinities of emotional and ideological configurations have made Hasidism attractive to contemporary Jewish life and thought, particularly in America, and that the explanation of this phenomenon has its implication for the understanding of the intellectual climate in a modern technological society.

It may be assumed that the contemporary re-establishment of some Hasidic communities in America contributed to the rekindling of the general interest in the movement. A variety of studies of the contemporary Hasidic communities,⁶¹ especially in Williamsburg, New York, stress the persistence and the viability of the Hasidic way of life in a modern technological society. The reshaped Hasidic answers fascinate intellectuals in their present unrest. Surely, the conditions for the development of Jewish community life have meanwhile changed considerably. In general, organized religion has accommodated itself very comfortably to the American industrial-technological way of life. In fact, it has made powerful strides in the last decades. Bertrand Russell once pointed out⁶² that fishermen of the sailing vessels type are more inclined to be adherents of religion, while fishermen who go out in motor-propelled boats tend to be estranged from it. Yet, whoever observes American life sees evidence that the men of the motor vessels and the many other mechanical devices cling to religion and affiliate with churches. This phenomenon of religious

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

resurgence in America teaches us a good deal about the character of American society and the role of religion and its beliefs here as well as their local functions. The ways and thoughts of American life have expanded throughout the world with great rapidity. Many wonder if the forces of religion in America are the remnants of an outmoded view of man and the world, the after-growth of a past civilization, or the burgeoning of a new civilization whose future is not limited only to this country.

The impact of Hasidism upon the American scene is a result of an emotional and intellectual fermentation within organized religion and outside its confines (the vogue of Zen Buddhism, Hippism, ESP, Situations-ethic, the 'loss of community' theme, the 'alienation' literature, etc.), when an achievement-oriented society finds itself in a crisis of transition.

Our period of unprecedented advance in science and technology, in the standards of living and democratization of choices, also became the time of the totalitarian holocaust and of the increased unrest of the West resulting from the widespread feeling that the traditional values have lost their significance and have not yet been replaced. The predicament of modern Western society has been described in sociological writings by various terms ('lonely crowd', 'insane society', 'status seekers', 'organization men').

Meanwhile, American Jews and Gentiles alike have accepted in a way 'the Jewish heritage', as perhaps exaggeratedly emphasized recently⁶³ by such a perceptive theatre critic as Walter Kerr. His statement is most significant in relation to our problem:

A vast transition has reversed what we are looking at. It's not just a matter of having been so exposed to Jewish entertainers and Jewish novelists that their tricks of rhythm that curled up in everyone's ears and come to feel at home there . . . It goes right to the bone, all the way in. The literate American mind has come in some measure to think Jewish, respond Jewish. It has been taught to, and it was ready to. After the entertainers and the novelists came the Jewish critics, politicians, theologians. Critics and politicians and theologians are by profession molders: they form ways of seeing. And America, at this particular moment in *her* history, desperately needed a new way of seeing. She had been moved, willy-nilly and by circumstances, into a world environment that called for an unfamiliar response: she had to learn how to deal effectively, courageously, and even humorously with irrational pressures that descended like lightning, with hostility, frustration and despair. An experienced teacher was available.

In such a changed atmosphere, with the increasing role of post-Freudian and existentialist thinking, some basic Hasidic attitudes to life have become attractive.

NOTES

¹ 'Responses and Reactions to M. Buber's Tales of the Hasidim', *Commentary*, Vol. 35, June 1963, pp. 517-18; August 1963, pp. 164-5; October 1963, pp. 320-1.

² Abraham Kaplan, *The New World of Philosophy*, New York, 1961, p. 323.

³ To mention only a few: Morris Freilich, 'The Modern Shtetl, A Study of Cultural Persistence', *Anthropos*, Vol. 57, 1962, pp. 45-54; George Kranzler, *Williamsburg: A Jewish Community in Transition*, New York, 1961; Solomon Poll, *The Hasidic Community of Williamsburg*, New York, 1962; Israel Rubin, 'Chassidic Community Behavior', *Anthropological Quarterly*, 1964, Vol. 37, No. 3; S. Spiegler, 'Fact and Opinion: Hasidism integrated into Williamsburg YMHA', *Journal of Jewish Social Service*, Vol. 41, Spring 1965.

⁴ B. Beck, 'Cultural Transition, Impact of Hasidim on their Jewish Neighbors', *The Jewish Digest*, Vol. 11, Sept. 1966.

⁵ Rabbi Schneur Zalman of Liadi, *Liqutei Amarim*, trans. by Nissan Nadel, New York, 1962.

⁶ *The Tower and the Abyss, An Inquiry into the Transformation of the Individual*, New York, 1957, p. 192.

⁷ Rabbi Herbert Weiner, *Teacher's Guide to Baal Shem Tov*, New York, 1962, p. 31.

⁸ *The Significance of the Skull Cap*, New York, 1957.

⁹ Gershom Scholem, 'Martin Buber's Hasidism—A Critique', *Commentary*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 1961, pp. 305-16.

¹⁰ M. Buber, 'Interpreting Hasidism', *Commentary*, Vol. 36, No. 3, 1963, pp. 218-25.

¹¹ Karl Mannheim formulated the 'situational determination' of knowledge most clearly in his *Ideology and Utopia* (trans. L. Wirth and E. Shils), New York, 1936, p. 243, 'Hence the thesis that the historico-social process is of essential significance for most of the domains of knowledge receives support from the fact that we can see most of the concrete assertions of human beings when and where they arose, when and where they were formulated.' The present essay is a comment on Mannheim's thesis.

¹² Quoted in W. Gunter Plant, *The Rise of Reform Judaism, A Source Book of its European Origins*, New York, 1963, p. 33.

¹³ Max Wiener, *Abraham Geiger and Liberal Judaism*, Philadelphia, 1962, p. 76.

¹⁴ H. Gractz, *History of the Jews*, Philadelphia, 1895, Vol. V, p. 374.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 374.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 382.

¹⁸ Solomon Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, London, 1896, p. 44.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

²² Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog, *Life is with People. The Jewish Little Town of Eastern Europe*, foreword by Margaret Mead, New York, 1952.

²³ Margaret Mead in her Foreword to *Life is With People*, p. 19, writes: 'An organized systematic knowledge of the culture from which they came, in addition to a scientific account of a culture, should contribute to a new understanding of these values.'

²⁴ Y. F. Baer, *Galut*, New York, 1947, p. 116: 'The historical thought of modern Judaism still suffers from the effects of an improperly understood religious-political heritage.'

²⁵ Y. F. Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, New York, Vol. I, 1961, p. 14; and see particularly his Hebrew book, *Yisrael ba'Amim* (Israel Among the Nations), Jerusalem, 1955.

²⁶ Martin Buber, *Hasidism*, New York, 1948, p. 158: 'In Hasidism, and in it alone, so far as I can see in the history of mankind, has mysticism become Ethos.'

²⁷ Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, New York, 1961, p. 342.

²⁸ David Baken, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*, New York, 1958, p. 105.

²⁹ Louis J. Newman, ed., *The Hasidic Anthology*, New York, 1934, p. 97, 6; p. 95, 3.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 415, 5; and see Abraham J. Heschel's exploration of the 'Right and wrong needs' in his *Man is Not Alone, a Philosophy of Religion*, Philadelphia, 1951, pp. 188 ff.

³¹ Very close to modern psychological findings: 'The main form which hostility or resentment assumed was moral indignation, which was invariably characteristic for the lower middle class from Luther's time to Hitler's. While this class was actually envious of those who had wealth and power and could enjoy

THE APPEAL OF HASIDISM

life, they rationalized this resentment and envy of life in terms of moral indignation and in the conviction that those superior people would be punished by eternal suffering.' Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*, New York, 1941, p. 96.

³² This saying is attributed to the Baal Shem Tov in Aaron of Apt's *Kether Shem Tov*, Lemberg, 1849, p. 4a.

³³ Quoted as a homily of the Besht by Simon Dubnow. See Newman, ed., *The Hasidic Anthology*, op. cit., p. 508: 193, 1.

³⁴ Attributed to the Besht, Newman, ed., *The Hasidic Anthology*, p. 433: 166, 1; and see the whole chapter on 'Sin and Transgression'.

³⁵ *The Zohar*, translated by Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon, London and Bournemouth, Vol. II, 1949, p. 164a.

³⁶ Deut. 32: 12. The comments of the Zohar on this verse and on similar ones indicated the esoteric belief that the realm of Law is imposed by a 'Strange God'.

³⁷ *The Zohar*, translated by Harry Sperling, Maurice Simon and Paul P. Levertoff, Vol. III, London and Bournemouth, 1949, p. 246; and similar homilies on the verse 'Let him Kiss me with the Kisses of his Mouth' (Song of Songs 1: 2) and other verses of the Song of Songs, *ibid.*, pp. 348-9.

³⁸ Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Vol. V, op. cit., p. 376. Graetz was at least inclined to a moderate appreciation of the romantic mood. However, he is here indicating that the romantic Zaddik communes neither with nature nor with God; he simply communes with his own mood. Graetz would agree with Babbitt's account of the Rousseauist communion with nature: 'The Nature over which the Rousseauist is bent in such rapt contemplation plays the part of the pool in the legend of Narcissus. It renders back to him his own image. He sees in nature what he himself has put there. The Rousseauist transfuses himself into nature in much the same way that Pygmalion transfuses himself into his statue.' Irving Babbitt, *Rousseau and Romanticism*, Cleveland and New York, 1962, p. 233.

³⁹ S. W. Baron, *Modern Nationalism and Religion*, New York, 1960, p. 25.

⁴⁰ Abraham J. Heschel, *Philosophy of Judaism: God in Search of Man*, New York, 1956, pp. 289-90.

⁴¹ S. Kierkegaard, *The Concept of*

Dread, trans. W. Lowrie, Boston, 1946, p. 68.

⁴² S. Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death*, trans. W. Lowrie, New York, 1954, p. 170.

⁴³ Walter Kaufmann, *The Faith of a Heretic*, New York, 1963, p. 67.

⁴⁴ *The Hasidic Anthology*, op. cit., p. 110: 45, 5.

⁴⁵ Paul L. Holmer, 'Religion from an Existential Standpoint', in J. C. Feaver and W. Horoz, eds., *Religion in Philosophical and Cultural Perspective*, Boston, 1967, p. 172.

⁴⁶ *Mishnah, Sanhedrin*, 4-5. Danby's translation.

⁴⁷ In principle one may agree with Meir Ben-Horin who identifies modern Judaism with democracy. By democracy he means 'A human association under consent freely arrived at, consent informed by relevant evidence, consent open to imagination, open to compassion, open to the possibilities of reality.' By Judaism he means an 'operative living civilization of the Jewish people'. He argues that to the extent that Judaism is 'consent-directed' it cannot be challenged or threatened by another consent-directed society such as American democratic society. On the contrary, Judaism is in itself a challenge to all non-free societies which deny or subvert the idea of consent. It is 'a challenge, a decomposing ferment to the inhuman antisocieties which violate the image of God in man and worship absolutes arbitrarily chosen and adored in tortures and varieties of annihilisms'. We may agree with this view, in principle, with its stipulations. But these statements are hardly an historical account of the relation of Judaism to the growth of democracy. This whole concept of Judaism is too abstract and non-historical. Meir Ben-Horin, 'Theses on Democracy, Judaism and Jewish Education' in J. Pilch, ed., *Philip W. Loun, A Jubilee Volume*, New York, 1967, pp. 62-69.

⁴⁸ Tosefoth to *Babab Kamah* 58: 1.

⁴⁹ Although Jost mostly stressed the external pressure as a unifying factor, he believed that the prayer book and the Talmud unified the people from within. J. L. Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten*, Berlin, 1820-1828, Vol. V, pp. 16, 226; *Geschichte des Judentums u. seiner Sekten*, Leipzig, 1957, Vol. I, pp. 7-9.

⁵⁰ In the English edition, *History of the Jews*, op. cit., Vol. II, Philadelphia,

1895, p 634: 'The Talmud was a family history for succeeding generations in which they felt themselves at home, in which they lived and moved'; and on p. 635: 'The Talmud preserved and promoted the religious and moral life of Judaism.' Earlier, p. 632, he says that the Talmud became 'the fundamental possession of the Jewish race, its life's breath, its very soul, the only reality'.

⁶¹ Jacob B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, New York, 1963, Vol. II, p. 37.

⁶² Cf. B. Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*, Chapel Hill, 1944, p. 34: 'Function means, therefore, always the satisfaction of a need.'

⁶³ Carl G. Hempel, 'The Logic of Functional Analysis', in May Brodbeck, ed., *Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, New York, 1968, p. 185.

⁶⁴ Moses Hayyim Luzzatto, *Path of the Upright*, Philadelphia, 1956, p. 229.

⁶⁵ *The Hasidic Anthology*, op. cit., p. 470, 178: 2.

⁶⁶ Bernard J. Bamberger, 'The Ameri-

can Rabbi: His Changing Role', in T. Friedman and R. Gordis, eds., *Jewish Life in America*, New York, 1955, p. 323.

⁶⁷ Edwin Wolf, 'Leadership in the American Jewish Community', *The JPS Bookmark*, March 1964.

⁶⁸ Arthur A. Cohen, *The Natural and the Supernatural Jew*, New York, 1962, p. 300.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁷¹ Rubin, 'Chassidic Community Behavior', op. cit., indicates, p. 147, that the Hasidic type of community, with its emphasis upon the informal and expressive over the formal and instrumental, may be highly adaptable to the urban-technological setting. It replaces a purely residential community strained in times of great mobility with a type of community which is not limited to residential boundaries.

⁷² Bertrand Russell, *The Scientific Outlook*, London, 1931, p. 151.

⁷³ *New York Times*, Sunday Edition, April 14, 1968.

JEWISH POPULATIONS IN GENERAL DECENNIAL POPULATION CENSUSES, 1955-61: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

Erich Rosenthal

DEMOGRAPHERS engaged in the study of Jewish populations have frequently expressed concern about the paucity of adequate data.¹ This bibliography² is presented here to make recent demographic data on Jewish communities in general population censuses more easily accessible and to serve as a more or less complete inventory of all such data. This task could not have been accomplished without the work of the Statistical Office of the United Nations. It has brought together in *Demographic Yearbook, 1962, 1963, and 1964* the results of scores of recent population censuses from all parts of the globe.³

Data relevant for Jewish populations have been compiled in three tables, dealing with religion, ethnicity, and language. The information on religion will be found in *Demographic Yearbook, 1963*, Table 11 entitled 'Population by religion and sex: each census, 1956-63', and in *Demographic Yearbook, 1964*, Table 32 (Supplement to Table 11). The census returns for ethnicity and language will be found in Tables 9 and 10 of the *Yearbook, 1963* and in Supplementary Tables 30 and 31 of *Yearbook, 1964*. Countries whose censuses returned Jews either in terms of religion, nationality, or language are listed in the Reference Tables accompanying this article. The returns for Argentina, Morocco, and for a 1957 sample survey for the United States were added to the *Yearbook* list.

The tables published in the *Demographic Yearbook* contain the date on which the population enumeration took place and the total number of persons of a given religion, nationality, or language, classified by sex. The Reference Tables presented here have omitted the classification by sex but have added the precise reference to each census and a summary of the content of the published data.

A perusal of the list of countries in the Reference Tables reveals that significant Jewish communities are not represented. In Europe, census

returns are not available for, among others, France, Great Britain, and Hungary. In the western hemisphere such information is missing for, among others, Brazil and Uruguay. It appears that in some countries a question on religion, ethnicity, and mother tongue was not included in the census schedule, while in others the answers to one or more of them were not published. In the United States the 1960 decennial census enumerated mother tongue but not religion. Religion was enumerated in the above-mentioned 1957 sample survey.⁴

Of the 34 countries listed in the Reference Tables, 14—or 41 per cent—held their enumerations in the first year of the decade (1960), while 10—or nearly 30 per cent—arranged theirs in the second year (1961). The virtual coincidence in time of enumerations in over two-thirds of the countries listed should be especially helpful to the student of international migrations in general and, in view of recent sudden relocations of Jewish communities, to the student of Jewish migrations in particular.

In countries where a co-operative relationship exists between communal Jewish agencies and the government bureau charged with the administration of the next decennial population census in 1970 or 1971, arrangements for the inclusion of proper questions and for special tabulations should have been completed by the summer of 1968. In countries where surveys of the Jewish population are undertaken by private Jewish communal agencies every effort should be made to synchronize these surveys with the official enumeration of the total population so that maximum comparability between governmental and privately sponsored data can be secured.

True comparability will be achieved if the operational definitions of a Jew are identical. Most commonly, Jews are categorized in terms of religion or a combination of ethnic nationality and mother tongue. A glance at the Reference Tables reveals that in most parts of the world, population censuses have defined the Jewish population in terms of religion. Canada is the only country which produces returns for all three categories.

Religion, ethnicity, and mother tongue are 'soft' categories, and it is difficult to set up operational definitions that will yield a uniform response in any one country. Since definitions often vary from country to country, it is difficult to make international comparisons.

According to the *Demographic Yearbook, 1963*⁵ the data on religion

represent—in unknown proportions—religious belief or religious affiliation; the latter may be of recent origin or dating from childhood. No criterion is used by the enumerator to determine church 'membership' and none is possible to verify 'belief'. Moreover, there is a definite tendency for this question to remain unanswered on a large number of census schedules; in some countries, such as New Zealand, respondents have the statutory right to refuse to answer the question on religion. Therefore these

JEWISH POPULATIONS

statistics . . . must be used only as rough indicators of the distribution of population by broad religious designations.

Similarly, the category 'ethnic composition' relates⁶

to a series of categories which are not uniform in concept or terminology. Rather they represent a variety of characteristics or attributes, variously designated by countries as race, colour, tribe, ethnic origin, ethnic group, ethnic nationality (as distinct from legal nationality), etc. . . . By and large the[se] statistics . . . have one advantage over country-of-birth or citizenship data as indicators of ethnic composition. The attributes on which they are based do not change even though their interpretation may be subject to variation. Thus, they may serve as the best indicators of the ethnic composition of populations and, hence, of cultural and social heterogeneity or homogeneity.

Mother tongue is usually defined as 'the language spoken in the individual's home in his early childhood'; it is considered a very sensitive index 'because linguistic differences tend to persist until complete cultural assimilation has taken place'.⁷ Since 'the census question on which the statistics are based is essentially the same in each country' this category yields a high degree of comparability between countries.⁸ The return of 'Jewish' for this category means Yiddish for all countries except Turkey where the return is Ladino.

The designation given to Jews varies from country to country. Most frequently they are identified by the term 'Jew'. Sometimes the term 'Hebrew' or 'Israelite' is used. While individuals who identify themselves in these terms are most probably members of the religio-ethnic group known as Jews, one cannot take it for granted that this is the case in every single instance, as the recent Mexican experience has shown. The 1960 census of Mexico enumerated 100,750 'Israelitas'. However, according to the Mexican correspondent of the *American Jewish Year Book*, members of several Protestant sects had identified themselves as 'Israelitas' in the enumeration, thus inflating the actual number of Jews residing there. Jewish communal agencies have estimated the number of Jews in Mexico from a minimum of 30,000 to a maximum of 45,000.⁹

This experience illustrates the first difficulty of attempting to analyse census returns from a distance. The second difficulty arises from the fact that the outsider is in no position to judge the quality of each population enumeration in general or the reliability of response to questions on religion, nationality, and language—subjects that often are charged with political, social, and psychological dynamite.¹⁰

Since government publications are notorious for baffling the researcher, full bibliographical details have been added to the Reference Tables, wherever possible, in order to ease access to the published data.¹¹ The tabulations were inspected and their content summarized with the aid of categories developed by the *UN Yearbook*.¹² It will be

ERICH ROSENTHAL

seen that the most frequently published data, after population size, concern the distribution of the population by major civil divisions (provinces, states, etc.) and its sex composition.

Census data are often obsolete by the time they are published, and demographers need access to them as soon as they are available. The *Population Index*¹³ renders a valuable service by giving this information in its section 'Official Statistical Publications'. (The *Index* refers to religion, ethnicity, and mother tongue explicitly only if these categories appear in the title of a government publication.)

The difficulty of 'locating information about the tabulations contained in many censuses' has motivated a research group at Duke University to explore the feasibility of a census information retrieval system.¹⁴ The basic purpose of the research group was 'neither data storage nor bibliography, but an index which will tell a researcher what censuses provide information on particular population characteristics and how these characteristics are defined, mapped, cross-indexed, compared and discussed'.¹⁵ I suggest that a project be set up which would establish such a retrieval system for Jewish population data from official and private sources.

Research workers interested in historical demography will find *Jewish Demography and Statistics*¹⁶ and the recently completed *International Population Censuses Bibliography*¹⁷ indispensable. The latter lists the population censuses of each country from the first published census up to 1960; however, as in the case of the *Population Index*, specific references to religion and nationality occur only if they appear in the title of a census publication.

Reference Tables

JEWIS IN GENERAL POPULATION CENSUSES OF THE WORLD BY DATE OF CENSUS, TYPE OF IDENTIFICATION, SOURCE AND NATURE OF TABULATIONS, 1955-61

LEGEND

a: size of population	j: age composition
b: population trend	l: marital status
c: major civil divisions	m: occupation and industry
d: minor civil divisions	n: intermarriage
e: capital and large cities	o: literacy and employment status
f: locality size groups	p: birthplace and occupation
g: urban-rural residence	q: citizenship
i: sex composition	x: census not available for inspection

TABLE 1: Africa

Country	Date of Census	Religion			Ethnicity			Mother Tongue		
		Jews Number	Source	Content	Jews Number	Source	Content	Jewish Number	Source	Content
		Morocco	June 1960	159,806	1	a, c, e				
Rhodesia (Southern Rhodesia)	26 September 1961	7,057	2	a						
South Africa	6 September 1960	116,189	3	a, b, c, i, m						
Tunisia	1 February 1956	8,561	5	x	57,792	4	a, c, d			
United Arab Republic	20 September 1960		6	a, i						
Zambia (Northern Rhodesia)	26 September 1961	852								

1. Royaume du Maroc. Ministère de l'économie nationale. Division de la coordination économique et du plan. Recensement démographique. (Juin 1960.) Population légale du Maroc. Table E, pp. 91-2.
2. Rhodesia. 1961 Census of the European, Asian, and Coloured Population. Central Statistical Office, Salisbury, Rhodesia. Table 15, p. 44.
3. Republic of South Africa. Bureau of Statistics. Population Census, 6 September 1960. Volume 3: Religion. Tables 1-4.
4. Service des Statistiques. Recensement général de la population de la Tunisie du 1 février 1956: Répartition géographique de la population. Census not available for inspection.
5. Government of the Republic of Zambia. Final Report of the September 1961 Censuses of Non-Africans. Appendix 11: September 1961 Census of Non-African Population. Table 6. Religion by race and sex, p. 55. Lusaka, Central Statistical Office, August 1965.

TABLE 2: *America, North and South*

Continent and Country	Date of Census	Religion			Ethnicity			Mother Tongue		
		Jews Number	Source	Content	Jews Number	Source	Content	Jewish Number	Source	Content
<i>America, North</i>										
Bermuda	23 October 1960	21	1	a						
British Honduras	7 April 1960	1,101	2	a, d, i						
Canada	1 June 1961	254,368	3	a, c, d, i	117,344	4	a, b, c, d, f, g, i	82,448	5	a, b, c, d, e, g, i
Jamaica	7 April 1960	600	6	a, d, i						
Mexico	8 June 1960	100,750	7	a, b, c, i						
Netherlands Antilles:										
Aruba	27 June 1960	188	8	x						
United States	1957	5,000,000	9	a, c, g, i, j, n				593,605	10	a, b, c, e, g, i, j
United States	1 April 1960									
<i>America, South</i>										
Argentina	30 September 1960	275,913	11	a, c, d						
Chile	29 November 1960	11,700	12	x						

1. Census of Bermuda. Table 27.
2. West Indies Population Census. Census of British Honduras. Volume II, Table 2.
3. Dominion Bureau of Statistics. 1961 Census of Canada. Population. Religious Denominations: Bulletin SP-3. Ottawa, 1963.
4. Dominion Bureau of Statistics. 1961 Census of Canada. Population. Ethnic Groups: Bulletin 1.2-5. Ottawa, 1962. Religion by Ethnic Groups: Bulletin 1.3-8. Ottawa, 1964.
5. Dominion Bureau of Statistics. 1961 Census of Canada. Population. Official Language and Mother Tongue: Bulletin 1.2-9. Ottawa, 1963. Language by Ethnic Groups: Bulletin 1.3-10. Ottawa, 1963.
6. West Indies Population Census. Census of Jamaica. Volume II, Part A, Book 1. Table 4.
7. Estados Unidos Mexicanos. Dirección General de Estadística. VIII Censo General de Población, 1960. Resumen General. Table 18.
8. Census not available for inspection.
9. United States Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 79. Washington, D.C., 2 February 1958.
10. U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population: 1960 Volume 1, Characteristics of the Population, Part 1, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1964, Tables 70 and 111. Mother Tongue of the Foreign Born, Final Report PC(2)-IE, Washington, D.C., 1966.
11. Republica Argentina. Dirección Nacional De Estadística Y Censos. Censo Nacional De Población 1960. Volume 1, Table 35. The returns for major and minor civil divisions will be found in standard Table 35 of Volumes 2-9.
12. Census not available for inspection.

TABLE 3: Asia, Oceania, and USSR

Continent and Country	Date of Census	Religion			Ethnicity			Mother Tongue		
		Jews Number	Source	Content	Jews Number	Source	Content	Jewish Number	Source	Content
Asia										
Aden	7 July 1955				831	1	a, b, c			
Iran	1-15 November 1956	65,232	2	a, c, g, i						
Iraq	12 November 1957	4,906	3	x	1,932,357	4	a, b, c, d, g, i, j, l	100,120	5	a, i, j
Israel	22 May 1961									
Turkey	23 October 1960	43,926	6	a, c, f, i, o				19,399	7	a, c, f, i
Oceania										
Australia	30 June 1961	59,329	8	a, b, c, c, f, i, j, l, p						
New Zealand	18 April 1961	4,006	9	a, b, c, g, i, j						
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics										
USSR	15 January 1959				2,267,814	10	a, c, c, g, i	407,900	11	a
Byelorussian SSR	15 January 1959				150,084	12	a, c, c, g, i	142,143	12	a
Ukrainian SSR	15 January 1959				840,311	12	a, c, c, g, i	32,910	12	a

- Aden Colony. Census Report, 1955. Summary Table 8, p. 11.
- Ministry of Interior. Public Statistics. Teheran, Iran. National and Province Statistics of the First Census of Iran. Volume II. Social and Economic Characteristics of the Inhabitants of Iran and the Census Provinces. Tables 11 and 12.
- Census not available for inspection.
- State of Israel. Central Bureau of Statistics. Demographic Characteristics of the Population. Part I. Population and Housing Census. Table 1.
- State of Israel. Population and Housing Census 1961, Part 15. Language, Literacy and Educational Attainment. Part I, Table 1. (Language usually spoken Yiddish. The census also enumerated 24,095 persons whose mother tongue was Spanish, including Ladino.)
- Republic of Turkey. State Institute of Statistics. Census of Population 1960. Population of Turkey. Tables 17 and 18. (Publication No. 452.)
- ibid., Table 12. (Language usually spoken in the home: Ladino.)
- Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, Australia, Census of the Commonwealth of Australia. Volume VIII. Chapter 15, pp. 206-25.
- New Zealand. Population Census 1961. Volume 3, Religious Professions, Tables 1-8.
- Tsentralnoye Statisticheskoye Upravleniye pri Sovyete Ministrov SSSR, Itogi Vsesoyuznoy Perepisi Naseleniya 1959 Goda, SSSR: Svodniy Tom. (Results of the All-Union Census of Population of 1959, USSR: Summary Volume) Moscow, Gosstatizdat, 1962. Table 53.
- ibid., Table 55.

TABLE 4: *Europe*

Country	Date of Census	Religion			Ethnicity			Mother Tongue		
		Jews Number	Source	Content	Jews Number	Source	Content	Jewish Number	Source	Content
Bulgaria	1 December 1956									
Germany (Federal Republic)	6 June 1961	22,700	2	a, b, c, i, j	6,027	1	x			
Gibraltar	3 October 1961	654	3	a, b, i						
Ireland	9 April 1961	3,255	4	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, i, j, l						
Liechtenstein	1 December 1960	37	5	a, b, g						
Luxemburg	31 December 1960	643	6	x						
Netherlands	31 May 1960	14,503	7	a, c, d, e						
Norway	1 November 1960	841	8	a, d, g						
Romania	21 November 1956				146,264	9	a, c, g			
Switzerland	1 December 1960	19,984	11	a, b, c, f, i, n, q				34,337	10	a, c, g

1. Not available for inspection.

2. Statistisches Bundesamt Wiesbaden. Volks- und Berufszählung vom 6. Juni 1961. Heft 5: Bevölkerung nach der Religionszugehörigkeit, pp. 19, 32, 33.

3. Government of Gibraltar. Report on the Census of Gibraltar. Table 9.

4. Central Statistics Office. Census of Population of Ireland. Volume VII. Part I: Religions.

5. Not available for inspection.

6. Luxemburg. L'office de la statistique générale. Annuaire statistique: 1964. Table 13: Population suivant le culte.

7. The Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics. 13th Census of Population. Volume 7: Religion.

8. Central Bureau of Statistics of Norway. Population Census 1960. Volume VIII, Table 1.

9. Republica Populara Romina. Recensământul Populației din 21 Februarie 1956. Structura Demografică a Populației. Summary Table, p. XXXIV.

10. *ibid.*, Summary Table, p. XXXVI.

11. Switzerland. Eidgenössisches Statistisches Amt. Volkszählung 1960. Volume 27, Part I, Table 33.

NOTES

¹ R. Bachi, 'Recent Progress in Demographic Research on the Jews', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. VIII, no. 2 (December 1966), pp. 142-9.

² I acknowledge gratefully the assistance of my daughter, Barbara, in the preparation of the tabular material.

³ New York, United Nations, 1963, 1964, 1965.

⁴ Erich Rosenthal, 'Five Million American Jews', *Commentary*, vol. 26 (December 1958), pp. 499-507.

⁵ *Demographic Yearbook, 1963*, p. 41.

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 38.

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 39.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 40.

⁹ Seymour B. Liebman, 'Mexico', *The American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 66, 1965, pp. 352-3.

¹⁰ For a discussion of the accuracy of returns and a presentation of accuracy ratings see *Demographic Yearbook, 1963*, pp. 18-21.

¹¹ I used the special library of the Statistical Office of the United Nations in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs in New York.

¹² *Demographic Yearbook, 1963*, Table B, p. 4.

¹³ Office of Population Research, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University.

¹⁴ Sarah Hobbs, Reynolds Farley, and Halliman H. Winsborough, 'A Design for a Census Information Retrieval System', *Demography*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1967, pp. 331-40.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 331.

¹⁶ *Jewish Demography and Statistics: Bibliography for 1920-1960*, compiled and edited by O. Schmelz; Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, July 1961.

¹⁷ University of Texas. Population Research Center, Austin, Texas, 1965-7.

REVUE FRANÇAISE DE SOCIOLOGIE

Vol. X, No. 1. janvier-mars 1969

ARTICLES

- Pierre BIRNBAUM Théorie et société dans l'œuvre de Durkheim: l'exemple du *Socialisme*.....
- Jean-Claude COMBESSIE Education et valeurs de classe dans la sociologie américaine.....
- Richard F. HAMILTON Le fondement populaire des solutions militaires "dures". Le cas de la Chine en 1952.....
- Willem DOISE Perceptions et attitudes concernant les relations internationales dans cinq pays du Marché Commun

NOTE DE RECHERCHE

- Aline RIPERT Quelques observations sur le phénomène de la présentation à la télévision.....

BIBLIOGRAPHIE REVUE DES REVUES

Prix du numéro : 9 F

REDACTION
Centre d'Etudes sociologiques
82, rue Cardinet, Paris 17^e

ABONNEMENT
Editions du CNRS
15, quai Anatole France, Paris 7^e

Abonnement : 4 n^{os} trimestriels et 1 numéro spécial

FRANCE : 40 F ou 8\$

Editions du

CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE
CCP PARIS 9061-11

MIXED MARRIAGE IN AN ISRAELI TOWN

Erik Cohen

Introduction

THIS paper is based on a community study, carried out in 1966,¹ focusing on Jewish-Arab relations in a mixed town. I was not at the time especially concerned with mixed marriages, and became aware of their importance only after the field work was completed. The number of mixed unions was small—I encountered only about one dozen in a population of several tens of thousands. (Not all the couples were legally married; some were engaged in liaisons of such a permanent nature that the inhabitants of the town referred to them as 'marriages'.)

A discussion of these few cases, however, may help to throw some light on the more general problems of Jewish-Arab relations in Israel. These relations are in a state of perpetual, but usually covert, tension. There is a rift throughout the structure of Israeli society which has not been satisfactorily bridged in any of the State's institutional spheres. Jews and Arabs live lives apart and there are but few efforts to overcome their separateness. Even the term 'integration' is almost never used when Jewish-Arab relations are discussed. The term closest to 'integration' one encounters is 'co-operation'.

Neither Jewish nor Arab society is homogeneous; among the Arabs there are Muslims, Christians, and Druzes, while the Jews are divided into two very broad ethnic sectors: the Ashkenazim on the one hand, and the Sephardim and Orientals on the other. Although there are many rifts between the two Jewish groups, in the town under study as elsewhere, there is a widely prevalent assumption that the two sectors will ultimately merge and create a unified Jewish nation. One of the principal means by which such a merger is expected to be realized is intermarriage. The children of these marriages are said to be neither Ashkenazi nor Sephardi (though this is not necessarily true culturally, as they may, in fact, identify with one of the ethnic sectors). Such intermarriage is officially greatly encouraged, and an anxious eye is kept on the statistics in the hope that an Ashkenazi-Sephardi assimilatory trend may be emerging.

When we come to look at the problem of Jews and Arabs we note that assimilation is not officially encouraged, and indeed that few advocate it even unofficially. What is advocated is mutual accommodation of two consciously separate and distinct national entities; but it is one thing to advocate and another to achieve.

In theory, intermarriage between the Jews and Arabs might help to overcome the estrangement between the two communities; on the other hand, it might lead to additional strain if it is seen as a threat to national integrity and if the status of the children of the union becomes a matter of contention. Obviously, the actual effect of mixed marriages would depend largely upon the form they take, the motives and social status of the spouses, and the reaction of their close kin. These aspects will be dealt with below when I examine each case.

Jewish-Arab intermarriage in Israel

Very little is known on Jewish-Arab marriage in Israel. The subject does not appear to have been systematically studied, and the statistical data are scanty. Different sources (newspapers and well-informed officials) put the number of Jewish-Arab marriages at as few as 300 or as many as 1,000. This variation is due, in part, to disagreement about the definition of 'marriage'.

There is one aspect of these marriages which must be stressed: in all but a handful of cases the union is between an Arab man and a Jewish woman, and moreover the large majority of the Arabs are Muslims. The couple usually settle in an Arab community or in the Arab quarter of a town. Very few mixed couples live among Jews.

Jewish-Arab marriages are thus predominantly hypogamous: the women of the generally 'higher' national community marry the men of the generally 'lower' ethnic community. This means that the problem differs according to whether it is viewed from an Arab or a Jewish standpoint. The Jewish attitude to intermarriage is generally hostile. Before emigrating to Israel, only the Jews who had lived in the Middle East and North Africa had had any social relations with Arabs. Intermarriage was rare, and a Jewish girl who married an Arab was usually ostracized by her family and by the Jewish community. (Unions between an Arab girl and a Jew were almost unheard of.)

On the other hand, although Ashkenazim in their native Europe had no dealings with Arabs, they were familiar with the problem of Jewish-Gentile intermarriage. Generally speaking, they viewed such unions with less hostility than Sephardi and Oriental Jews had viewed marriage with Arabs.

In Israel, all Jews tend to see the Arabs not only as an out-group, a national and religious 'minority', but also as a hostile group, representative of the hostile surrounding Arab nations, and as such an eminently unsuitable source of marriage partners. Many Jews profess tolerance

MIXED MARRIAGE

towards the Arabs and some may even actively support Jewish-Arab co-operation and rapprochement; but very few will go further and justify—let alone encourage—Jewish-Arab intermarriage.

Arabs see intermarriage quite differently. First, there is no shameful loss of daughters to non-Muslim strangers; this is probably the main reason for the lack of hostility to these unions. Second, the large majority of Jewish women who marry Arabs also tend to accept, more or less, the Arab way of life; there are several large Arab villages in which about a score of Jewish women live with their husbands. Third, Islam traditionally accepts Jewish (and Christian) women as fit spouses for Muslim men.² Finally, some Arabs see marriage to a Jewish girl as a way of access into the 'higher' national group.

Some of the more modernized and educated members of the younger generation of Arabs probably wish to marry an educated girl but may not succeed in finding one who is an Arab. On the other hand, although there appears to be a wide selection of eligible Jewish girls, these girls rarely consider marriage with an Arab—however modernized and well-educated he may be. As we shall see below, the Jewish women who enter into permanent liaisons or marriage with Muslims are not the kind who would help to satisfy the social or personal aspirations of an educated Arab, or who would provide a bridge into the sectors of Jewish society which he might wish to penetrate.

One other aspect of the question must be noted. Some modern Arab nationalists are opposed to marriage with members of other religious groups, and in particular with Jews. For them, marriage with a Jewish girl is an act of treachery, an act which implies rejection of one's own ethnic group and its womenfolk.

Personal contact between Jews and Arabs was comparatively restricted in the first years which followed the establishment of the State of Israel. But gradually the Arabs were drawn into the Israeli economic and educational systems. Men from Arab villages started to work and sometimes to live in Jewish cities, and students went to heretofore exclusively Jewish universities. Arab girls usually remained in their communities of origin, secluded from contact with Jews. There was therefore more opportunity for Arab men to meet Jewish girls.

The question of real importance is *who*, what type of man, in the Arab community takes a Jewish wife; and of even greater importance is the question: who are the Jewish women willing to enter into such unions in spite of their community's strong opposition to intermarriage?

Types of Jewish-Arab intermarriage

There are various ways in which an Arab-Jewish marriage may be contracted. In Israel there is no legal way in which a Jew and an Arab may marry if neither becomes a convert. There is no civil marriage. Israeli law gives to the religious officials of each community (Jews,

Muslims, Christians, and Druzes) the right to determine the eligibility of marriage partners. Each community requires both spouses to be of the same religion. Thus, although inter-denominational marriage is not expressly forbidden by Israeli law, in fact no such unions can be legally contracted in the State. However, *de facto* inter-denominational marriages do exist.

Legal marriages can be contracted between Jew and Arab in Israel if either spouse is converted. It is rare for an Arab man to be converted to Judaism—however much he might wish to gain full access to the Jewish community. In the first place, quite apart from the intensity of his own personal belief in his own creed, conversion would alienate him from his community and from his family. In the second place, even if he is willing to integrate within Jewish society, he would find it very difficult to achieve this result: the fact that he has become converted to Judaism would not do away with the suspicion or hostility of the Jews among whom he would seek to live.

Moreover, the very process of conversion is truly formidable. Judaism is not a proselytizing religion, and rabbinical consent to a Muslim's (or any other Gentile's) conversion is not easily given; when at last it is granted, a proselyte must undergo prolonged religious preparations and examination. Jewish public opinion, furthermore, does not look with favour upon conversion which, in fact, is extremely rare.

Apart from conversion, one other way in which two residents of Israel of different religions might contract a legal marriage is to enter into a civil union abroad. Cyprus and England are favourite choices. On their return the couple register the marriage with the Ministry of the Interior in Israel, and the union is thus legally recognized as a valid marriage. There are Israelis who consider themselves to be Jewish but whom the religious authorities will not recognize as Jews; such persons, who wish to enter into marriage with a recognized Jewish partner, often find it easier to go abroad in order to marry than to engage in protracted rabbinical argument at home. (One disadvantage of civil marriage contracted abroad is that the partners may find it difficult later to obtain a divorce in Israel. Recently, a court refused to grant a divorce to a couple who were married by a civil ceremony abroad.)

The third means of contracting a legally valid marriage between Jew and Arab is for the Jewish partner to embrace Islam. This is fairly frequent; the Muslim religious authorities do not put serious obstacles in the way of the would-be convert. On the other hand, the Israeli Ministry of Religious Affairs, which is dominated by Jewish religious interests, does not look with favour upon the conversion of Jews to Islam; its officials try to persuade the people concerned to change their minds. As we saw earlier, the converts are usually Jewish women; and although the women, after conversion, may be accepted theoretically

MIXED MARRIAGE

as Muslims by the Arab community, in fact they often continue to be regarded as Jewish and to consider themselves as Jewish. (It seems that conversion to Islam was achieved by such a simple procedure that some of the wives concerned were not aware that they had become Muslims, although the local Arabs asserted that they had in fact been converted.)

Apart from these three types of legal marriage, there are common-law unions. These unions often result from the continuation of a temporary attachment between an Arab and a Jewish woman; neither wishes to become a convert and the couple cannot afford the expense (which they may consider unnecessary) of going abroad in order to marry by civil rites. Recently, common-law unions which have endured for seven years or longer have been considered legally valid by Israeli courts in matters pertaining to inheritance: thus, such unions now enjoy some semblance of legality. In the town which I studied, they were commonly regarded as 'marriages' by the local Arab population, who also included in the same category some cases of cohabitation by a prostitute and her pimp.

There are thus four types of Jewish-Arab marriage which can be arranged in the following order of legitimacy when seen from a Jewish standpoint:

1. Conversion of Arab spouse to Judaism; and Jewish marriage rites;
2. Civil law marriage;
3. Conversion of Jewish spouse to Islam, with Muslim contract of marriage;
4. Common-law union.

It is important to point out how these various forms of intermarriage affect the children of the union. Only in the first type, when the Arab spouse is converted to Judaism, are the children unambiguously Jewish. In all other cases, their religious status is not easily determined. According to Jewish tradition, the offspring of a Jewish woman are Jewish whatever the religion of their father, while according to Muslim tradition the children of a Muslim man are Muslims whatever the religion of their mother. When an Arab and a Jewish woman have been married by civil law, their children presumably could claim to be *both* Muslim and Jewish. In fact, the situation of such children is often subject to stress because the paternal Arab kinsmen try to claim them as Muslims while Jewish religious officials insist that they are Jewish. The problem becomes acute when the marriage breaks up through death or separation and matters of custody of the children have to be decided.

Cases of mixed marriage in the town

I was able to collect data on thirteen cases of mixed marriage between Arab men and Jewish women. The information was gathered from several sources: social workers, local leaders and officials (both Jewish

and Arab), and various others, particularly young Arabs in the town who were keenly aware of the problem. I visited the homes of several of the couples, although I did not discuss their marriage with them. (In one case, however, I did discuss the subject with the father of the Jewish wife of a local Arab.)

Although I was told by one of the social workers that there were about 25–30 mixed couples in the town, I believe that their number does not exceed a dozen or so. In fact, whenever I asked an informant to compile a list of mixed couples in the area, the same names would be mentioned as those the earlier informants had cited. This was so in spite of the fact that I gathered information from various sources. It can therefore be assumed that the cases about which I collected information account for the large majority of mixed marriages in the town. There were:

1. Conversion of Arab spouse to Judaism—1 case
2. Civil marriage —1 case
3. Conversion of Jewish spouse to Islam—3 cases
(plus 2 cases in the immediate past, but the couples had divorced before I embarked on my period of fieldwork)
4. Common-law union —5 cases
(plus one case: the husband died shortly before I came to the town)

a. Conversion of Arab spouse

This was an extraordinary case. The man was a member of a heterodox Muslim sect who had been converted to orthodox Islam before embracing Judaism. The local inhabitants told me that he was mentally disturbed, and he was generally despised by both Jews and Arabs. His conversion to Judaism was not taken seriously by the Jews, in spite of the fact that he went to great lengths to assert his Jewishness. He decorated the hall of his flat with pictures of Israeli political and military leaders—an extremely provocative gesture in an area inhabited exclusively by Arabs. At one time he used to go to Shabbat services in the synagogue, walking with his *talith* (prayer shawl) conspicuously spread over his shoulders. He used to boast that he had sent all his brothers to serve in the Israeli Army (Arabs do not normally serve in the Army). His marriage to a Jewish woman could be interpreted as a furtherance of his aim to be accepted into Jewish society. In this he failed, lamentably. The Jews did not accept him, while the Arabs ostracized him.

b. Civil marriage

There is only one case. The woman is a Sepharad from eastern Europe who married a Muslim semi-professional civil servant. She used to live

MIXED MARRIAGE

in a neighbouring city, where she first met the Arab, and they were married in Cyprus. Her family broke off relations with her for a number of years, but became reconciled when her first child was born; however, they remained reserved vis-à-vis the Arab son-in-law. Similarly, the wife's relations with her husband's family were not friendly. I was told that she looked upon them with condescension and that she expected her husband's mother and sister to wait upon her; in turn, they resented her attitude, and the couple became estranged from the husband's family. They are also isolated socially. The husband was eager to gain access to Jewish society and probably had hoped that his marriage would help him to achieve his ambition. In fact, this did not happen. According to one of my Jewish informants, the reason for this failure was that the woman was much inferior to her husband, both educationally and intellectually, and consequently she could not introduce him to the local intelligentsia with whom he yearned to associate. The husband is politically active in a left-wing party which sets great emphasis on Arab-Jewish understanding, but his ties with local Arabs have weakened and the household have moved into a predominantly Jewish district outside the old Arab town. He has registered his daughters as Jewish, and the eldest girl was about to attend a Jewish school. Nevertheless, he asserted that his children were both Jewish and Muslim and that he would let them decide on their religion when they grew up.

c. Conversion of Jewish spouse to Islam

There were three cases while I was in the town; there had been two earlier cases where the Jewish wife had become a Muslim, but the couples had divorced before I began my study. Two of the women were of Moroccan origin; one was an Ashkenazi; and the other two, who were sisters, were Sephardim from eastern Europe. These sisters lived in the town before they met their Arab husbands; they became converts to Islam in order to marry; one of them divorced and is now married to a Jew, and lives in another locality. The two sisters were themselves the children of a mixed marriage: their father is a Jew who married a Catholic woman in eastern Europe. When they came to settle in the town, the family lived in a neighbourhood which is almost exclusively inhabited by Arabs, and they continued to reside there for many years. The father maintains a lively interest in his country of origin, and claims to have been a senior official there and an active member of the Communist Party. He was one of the few Jews in the town who associated with the Arab Communist Party (Rakach), although he asserts that he is now no longer a Communist. The family appear to be wholly isolated from the Jewish community; the father says that all his relatives broke off relations with him when his daughter married an Arab. He himself actually approved of the marriage—he is the only Jewish parent I know of who welcomed an Arab son-in-law.

He claims to be a cosmopolitan and to take people on their merits, without reference to their religion or nationality. (His Catholic wife, on the other hand, was at first opposed to the marriage.)

The Ashkenazi woman married an Arab who is a lorry driver and a leading member of the Arab Communist Party. I was not able to gather data on that marriage.

The two Moroccan women are simple creatures; indeed, one of them is mentally retarded; she married a Muslim some years ago, then left him, turned to prostitution, and lived with a series of Arab males who were pimps. The other Moroccan girl has never engaged in prostitution, but her husband is said to have been a pimp on occasions, and to have employed the Moroccan girl mentioned above.

d. Common-law unions

There were five such unions when I began my study, and in a sixth case the husband died shortly before my arrival in the town. Five of the Jewish women were Orientals and one was from eastern Europe. All of them had been drifters before they were picked up by their partners after a prolonged period of instability. Four of them (the woman from eastern Europe and three of the Orientals) had engaged in prostitution in the past; and one of the three Orientals was still active as a professional prostitute. The eastern European woman had had a liaison with another Arab; when he died, she was taken over by her present 'husband', who was already living with another Jewish ex-prostitute—but the two women did not get on well in the same household, and the newcomer moved out; it is said that the 'husband' visits her regularly in her new home. The other two women in this group do not appear to have engaged in prostitution, although their sexual morals may have been lax before they entered into common-law unions. Both left the parental home at a young age, after quarrelling with their family. One of the girls married a Jew, but divorced him when (she claimed) he attempted to drive her to prostitution; eventually, she was picked up by an Arab fisherman, with whom she now lives. The other girl drifted into the town after she left home, and was picked up by an Arab who lived in the town but worked as a fortune-teller in the surrounding Arab villages. She had six children by him. Then he went to work on a distant development project, where he was killed in an accident. She still lives in the old city, in abject poverty in a hovel. She is now trying to regain a place in Jewish society, and she sends her children to Jewish schools. (She had previously had some of the children baptized by a priest in their father's native village in an attempt to get help from the missionaries.) The children react very angrily if they are referred to as Arabs, and procedure was set in motion for them to be legally recognized as Jews.

The women in this group have remained Jewish, and tend to assert

MIXED MARRIAGE

their Jewishness aggressively. They find themselves in an awkward situation, since they live among Arab Muslims. One of them was observed lighting candles on the eve of the Sabbath, and when a visitor expressed some bewilderment she retorted, 'Why do you find it odd? I'm Jewish, aren't I?' Another, the fisherman's wife, was always at pains to remind people that she was Jewish.

Discussion

It is clear that in nearly every case of mixed marriage in the town the Jewish woman had in some respect been marginal in Jewish society; some of the wives had left home at an early age, while others had engaged in prostitution or were mentally backward. They were almost outcasts in their own society, and were completely rejected (even by their close kin) when they went to live with an Arab. The only exception to this rule was when the daughter of a Jewish-Christian marriage married an Arab: her Jewish father, it will be remembered, approved of the union. (Her sister had also married an Arab, whom she later divorced.) It is significant that the girl grew up in a household which was isolated from the Jewish community in the town, and that she and her sister were the only wives who had been local residents; all the others had drifted to the area from other parts of the country.

Most of the other women have found some sort of refuge in Arab society, but they are fully aware that by so doing they have gone still further down in the social scale. Indeed, it is likely that they (in common with many other Jews) felt hostility towards Arabs before drifting into the town, and that they set up house with a Muslim with some misgivings. It was clear that they had feelings of insecurity and problems of personal identity; they behaved condescendingly towards Arabs, and they over-emphasized their Jewishness while living in an Arab environment.

We must now consider briefly the Arab partners. Most of them were also marginal men in their own community, while a few had made a deliberate attempt at assimilation into Jewish society, apart from marrying a Jewish woman. (But it will be noted that only one went so far as to seek conversion to Judaism.) Some of the other Arabs were either members of the underworld (pimps) or engaged in peculiar occupations—such as fortune-telling. However, there were also some conventional and law-abiding Arabs in the group: a carpenter, a fisherman, and a public employee.

The general marginality of the partners to mixed marriages effectively prevented them from performing an integrative function in the bi-national city. The fact that six out of the thirteen marriages were common-law unions and that several of the spouses had a connexion with prostitution, reduced even more the respectability of mixed marriages.

ERIK COHEN

The Jewish inhabitants of the town express concern about the existing unions between Arabs and Jews. These unions are deemed to be a serious social problem—although there are only about a dozen cases in a population of several tens of thousands. The Ashkenazi residents tend to voice their criticism in 'objective' terms: they argue that the children of mixed unions are bound to suffer because they will have no clear ethnic or religious identity. The Sephardim and the Orientals, on the other hand, use highly emotional language in their condemnation: they think that intermarriage is intrinsically bad, and that it is shaming and dishonourable for a Jewish girl to have intimate relations with an Arab. Since the majority of women married to, or living with, Arabs in the town are either Sephardi or Oriental, the latter are particularly aware of the danger.

On the other hand, these mixed unions have not, in fact, caused any disturbance or open conflicts in the town. It will be remembered that, with the exception of the Jewish-Christian household, all the women concerned came from outside the town so that the local Sephardi and Oriental families did not feel personally affronted in their family honour. Indeed, these families make active use of the mixed unions when they warn against attempts at closer relations between Jews and Arabs: they insist that fraternization will inevitably lead to 'Arabs taking our girls' with the poignant results seen in local households of mixed marriages.

If the cases of intermarriage in the town have not been a focus of friction between Arabs and Jews, neither have they served to bring the two communities closer. On the contrary, the result of these unions has been to warn against closer personal relations between Arabs and Jews, and to sharpen group solidarity, particularly within the Jewish community. The net outcome has been not more fraternization but more segregation.

NOTES

¹ This paper is one of a series of reports deriving from an anthropological study of a mixed Jewish-Arab urban community in Israel conducted in 1966. The study was made possible by a grant from the Eliezer Kaplan School of Economics and Social Sciences, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. The final

draft was written while I was with the Institute of Urban Environment, Columbia University, New York, in 1968-69. I am indebted to Dr. Y. Peres for his helpful comments and suggestions.

² But only a Muslim is a fit husband for a Muslim woman.

A NOTE ON ASPECTS OF SOCIAL LIFE AMONG THE JEWISH KURDS OF SANANDAJ, IRAN

Paul J. Magnarella

DURING the 1967-68 academic year at Harvard University I had the good fortune to meet a Jewish Kurd. Being a social anthropologist interested in the Middle East and realizing the extreme paucity of available information on the Jewish Kurds, I seized the opportunity to study them at a distance through a native informant. In the course of this paper, I set out some of the ethnographic information which I was able to collect as the result of many interviews with this interesting young lady and her knowledgeable husband.¹ My objective has been to construct a picture of the social life of Jewish Kurds in Sanandaj, Iran.

Parvaneh, my informant, is a 28-year-old native Kurd, who has spent about 24 years of her life with her family in the city of Sanandaj, which is located in Iranian Kurdistan near the Iraqi border. After receiving an elementary and high school education in Sanandaj, Parvaneh went on to study in a teachers' training college in Teheran. After receiving her degree, she returned to Sanandaj and assumed teaching duties in the government high school. She is at present residing in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Jewish Kurds in Iran

There are no statistics known to me on the Jewish Kurds of Iran. Parvaneh estimates their present number at between 3,000 and 4,000. During the early 1950s there was a fluctuation in their total, as some Jewish Kurds from Iraq sought refuge in Iran, and many Jewish Kurds of Iran emigrated to Israel. Parvaneh stressed that these people did not leave Iran for reasons of persecution; they went to Israel hoping to achieve a better standard of living. Many who left had formerly operated small businesses or had earned their living as itinerant pedlars. Some of them returned to Iran because their hopes had been unfulfilled, and because they especially disliked the agricultural occupations in which they had had to engage while in Israel. It appears that most of the

families that were economically well off had no desire to emigrate then, nor do they today.

The total population of Sanandaj is approximately 40,000, of which at least 90 per cent are Kurdish. The large majority of these inhabitants are engaged in the development and trade of agricultural products. The city is a combined administrative and market centre for the many surrounding Kurdish villages and transhumant tribes. Parvaneh reports that the Jewish Kurds in Sanandaj comprise about 200 families which continually intermarry. She states, however, that the members of this isolate consider themselves Kurds and that in their cultural and social patterns they do not vary greatly from those of the larger Kurdish society. Parvaneh also notes that relations between Jewish Kurds and the Sunni Muslim Kurds, who are predominant in Iranian Kurdistan, are amicable.

All these Jewish Kurds can speak Kurdish and Persian. The first language has long been the traditional idiom of the area, while the second is the official language of Iran. However, among Jewish Kurds these languages are mainly used for business and discourse outside the home. In Jewish households and Jewish gatherings the medium of communication is a language which they call 'Kurdish Jewish'. Parvaneh's husband, an American, describes its grammatical structure as basically Semitic, while its vocabulary is heavily influenced by Kurdish. Referring to the Jewish Kurds of Iraq, Fischel writes:²

... until today Jews as well as Christian Nestorians in Kurdistan speak an Aramaic dialect. This Aramaic is closely related to the Aramaic portions of the Bible (in the Books of Ezra and Daniel), and very akin to the Aramaic of the Targum and the Talmud.

Education and occupation in Sanandaj

There are two private Jewish schools in Sanandaj. One is for boys (classes 1-9), and the other is for girls (classes 1-6). This difference is indicative of the traditional desire to educate males more than females. These schools were the first to be operated in Sanandaj. They were founded in 1904 by l'Alliance Israélite Universelle.³ Today they are operated by the local community and the Alliance in accordance with the Iranian government's educational programme. Most, if not all, of the Jewish Kurdish children begin their education in these schools and then continue in the public schools which go up to class 12. For further education, all students, both Muslims and Jews, attend public universities in the large cities. Owing to their superior economic condition and the great stress which they place on education, the average Jewish Kurd attains a higher level of education than does the average Muslim in the area. Many of the Jewish Kurds who are in their twenties and thirties have had the advantage of education past class 12, and the proportion of

JEWISH KURDS OF SANANDAJ

this minority community which enjoys professional standing is great; illiteracy is probably non-existent.

No occupations or professions are prohibited to this minority. In Iran, all males are required to serve in the armed forces, regardless of their religious affiliation. It is estimated that about 70 per cent of the working Jewish Kurds of Sanandaj are employed in private family businesses, for example, in retail shops, peddling, or as rug dealers, cloth merchants, or doctors in private practice. Most of the remaining 30 per cent are employed in positions associated with the government, for instance, as pharmacists, doctors, officials, teachers, engineers, and clerks. On the average, the standard of living of Jewish Kurds is better than that of Muslim Kurds in the city.

Household, family, and domestic units

It could be said that the ideal household is extended-patrilocal. However, a number of other factors, such as economics and demography, play a part in determining the actual household arrangement. The ideal household consists of the patriarch and his wife, their unmarried daughters, and their married sons and their families. This group will function as a domestic unit, that is, pool resources, share expenses, and eat together, until the death of the patriarch. After his death, the sons will continue to occupy the same home, if its size allows; but when their sons marry, the members of the household discontinue operating as a single domestic unit. Instead, each brother with his wife and married sons will constitute a separate and distinct group within the same household. However, by this time the total group is often too numerous for the house and at least one domestic unit will leave to establish another home. Again, the determination of who leaves depends on a number of varying factors, for instance, the will of the original patriarch, the economic capacity of the family business, the size of the various domestic units, etc. Parvaneh explained that it is common for a father to will his house to his eldest son. But if he should die intestate, Iranian law requires that all sons share equally in the inheritance, the daughters receiving shares one-half the value of those going to sons.

In addition to these considerations, the actual household composition is always in flux, as it depends on a number of other external factors. Education, business, occupation, government assignment, and military service all play a role in keeping kin away from their home temporarily or for more prolonged periods of time.

Housing and social pattern

The Jewish Kurds tend to predominate in a special quarter of the city for residential and business purposes. However, some of their shops are interspersed with those of Muslims in the larger bazaars.

Sanandaj contains three synagogues which are attended to by two

rabbis, a father and son. It is interesting that the 200 Jewish families divide themselves into three relatively distinct groups for synagogue attendance. This division is formal in that the places in the synagogues are inherited patrilineally, from generation to generation. It is also noteworthy that the frequency of intragroup marriage appears to be greater than that of intergroup marriage. This indicates that this minority of 200 families has segmented itself into three cliques for certain religious and social purposes. Yet these segmental criteria which loom large on a lower level of social interaction are overridden and diminished on a higher level by factors such as common language, religious creed, educational facilities, and territorial association.

Proscribed and prescribed marriage

Islam has had a great influence on the formation of civil codes in the various Middle Eastern countries. In most of these states polygyny is still legal and occasionally practised. Parvaneh states that this is the situation in Iranian Kurdistan. Both Muslim and Jewish Kurds may take more than one wife. However, the practice is not common among the Jewish Kurds of Sanandaj. Parvaneh knew of only one polygynous marriage in this group. She thinks that such unions were also rare in the past.

When asked about kin with whom she considers marriage forbidden, Parvaneh gave the following information. A single male should not marry the following: mother, mother's sister, father's wife, father's sister, sister, brother's daughter, sister's daughter. Therefore, he may marry any female in his own generation except his real sisters. In addition, a married male should not wed his wife's mother, daughter, son's wife, or two sisters together. It is interesting to note that these are the proscribed marriage regulations of the *Koran*.⁴ Although Jewish law permits marriage between uncle and niece,⁵ it appears that the Islamic socio-cultural milieu has influenced some Jewish Kurds to regard this as an unfavourable union.

In regard to preferred marriage, it is a widely held generalization that all Middle Easterners, especially Muslims, prefer marriage with the patrilateral parallel cousin above all others. Anthropologists have often looked in vain for statistical evidence which they hoped would support this conclusion.⁶ Actually, statistical data rarely confirm the ideal decision models which people carry about in their heads. Goodenough has pointed out that observed statistical patterns of social action can vary widely under different demographic and ecological conditions, even when the principles upon which decisions are based remain constant.⁷ Therefore, an examination of statistical outcomes will seldom reveal how one should behave in a particular situation nor will it divulge the decision-making principles which form the underlying social structure. However, merely to state that there is a preference for the father's brother's child is also insufficient, because it tells us nothing

JEWISH KURDS OF SANANDAJ

about other categories of people with whom marriage is allowed. For instance, who is preferred when there is no father's brother's child?

With this problem in mind I elicited from Parvaneh two interesting and somewhat conflicting sets of culturally acceptable alternative courses of action or sets of rules for making appropriate choices under culturally possible combinations of circumstances. After Parvaneh explained that the traditional pattern is for the parents to select mates for their children, I asked her to explain the choice procedure that she as a mother would follow when selecting a mate for her child. (The procedure was the same regardless of the child's sex.) After stating her first preference, she was then asked: 'What if this is impossible?' She would then explain her second choice, which would be followed by the same question, and so on. This same procedure was again followed with Parvaneh imagining that she was the father of the family.

The two sets of choices in their order of preference are represented below. These should be understood as ideal or pure decision models. Many factors have been held constant. For example, all choices are assumed to be Jewish, and the preferences of the offspring are not taken into consideration. The reference point is the son or daughter to be married.

Order of parental preferences for offspring's mate

<i>Mother's preferences</i>	<i>Father's preferences</i>
1. Mother's Brother's child	Father's Brother's child
2. Mother's Sister's child	Father's Sister's child
3. Father's Brother's child	Mother's Brother's child
4. Father's Sister's child	Mother's Sister's child
5. Other kin	Other kin
6. Neighbour	Neighbour
7. Fellow townsman	Fellow townsman
8. Stranger	Stranger

As can be seen, the mother and father differ in the order of their first four preferences. Parvaneh said that this was typical of both Muslim and Jewish Kurds she knew. She stated that marriage choices often involve a 'fight' between parents. The ultimate outcome of this disagreement depends on many factors. Two that she mentioned are (1) the personalities of the parents (for example, a strong woman can 'convince' her husband), and (2) the composition of the household. If they are residing in a patrilocal extended household containing the husband's brother and/or the husband's father, then the wife is outnumbered and it is likely that patrilineal kin will have priority for the first two choices of the sequence.

It is interesting to note here that in an article which presented a reconstruction of the social life of Jewish Kurds from Iraq, Feitelson commented on the relatively high rate of marriage with matrilineal

cousins despite the stated preference for the father's brother's daughter.⁸ This somewhat surprising phenomenon can be partly explained in the light of the conflicting decision models presented above.

It should be stressed that the actual marriages are not arranged solely on the basis of these decision models. While the degree of parental control in marriage choices has traditionally been great, with males generally enjoying more influence in the selection of their mates than females, the trend in recent practice has been for the young to have more authority in the selection of their spouses.

As already noted, the Jews of Sanandaj have traditionally married among themselves. However, as a result of greater physical mobility and improved opportunities for university education, an individual's circle of acquaintance has become increasingly broader, and the percentage of marriages being contracted out of the Sanandaj minority group is now slowly rising. A few marriages with Muslims have taken place in recent years, but they are exceptional. Such unions are still regarded unfavourably by both sides.

Some components of the marriage contract

The marriage contract is the same for all ethnic groups in Iran. It is an official document prescribed by the Iranian government. In performing the nuptial ceremony, the rabbi acts in a dual capacity: as a religious figure and as a government official in the employment of the Ministry of Justice.

The *shir baha*, *jayhiz*, and *mehrieh* are three important elements making up the marital agreement. The *shir baha* is often a ritual gift of money or goods sent by the groom's family to the bride's father before the marriage. At present in Sanandaj, it is not of significant value and is given as a token of respect. The *jayhiz* may be called the trousseau. It is composed of those clothes, household items, and jewellery which the bride brings to the home of her new affines. The *jayhiz* is purchased for the bride, or given to her, by her own family. The value of these two components, i.e., the *shir baha* and the *jayhiz*, is recorded in the marriage contract along with the *mehrieh*, which is the amount of money that the groom is obliged to pay his bride in the event of his divorcing her some time in the future. It is computed in a standard way; it is set at three times the *jayhiz*, plus the *jayhiz*. For example, should the *jayhiz* be valued at 30,000 *toman*, the *mehrieh* would equal 3 times 30,000 *toman* plus 30,000 *toman*, or 120,000 *toman*. (7.5 *toman* equal \$1.00.) This two-step calculation denotes that the *jayhiz*, or its equivalent value, must be returned to the bride in the event of divorce.

In addition to the above, the expenses of the wedding celebration also fall on the groom's family. The extravagance of these festivities and the value of the *jayhiz* tend to vary directly with the wealth of the families allying themselves. The *jayhiz* has been known to range between 2,000

JEWISH KURDS OF SANANDAJ

*to*man and 80,000 *to*man. The *mehrieh*, being computed on the value of the *jayhiz*, varies accordingly.

Certain rites in the wedding ceremony are also shared by other ethnic groups. The brief mention of one incident in my informant's wedding demonstrates this. As Parvaneh's husband amusingly narrated, it took place at the end of the ceremony. As he was standing beside his new bride, attempting to become fully cognizant of the fact that bachelorhood was quickly becoming a memory, his thoughts were painfully punctuated by a sharp stamp on his foot. To his surprise his little lady had already taken the offensive. The relatives and friends all applauded and informed the limping groom that his home was to be a 'matriarchate'. This anecdote is paralleled in the nineteenth-century writing of a somewhat more experienced Persian Shiite from Isfahan. He explains that at the end of the wedding ceremony,

... as soon as I placed my hand on her head as a token of my protection to her in the future, she tried to place her foot on mine; but I dexterously avoiding it, gently placed my foot on her foot. This ceremony is necessary, and whoever of the two places his or her foot on the foot of the other, will, we believe, continue to rule for life.⁹

Conclusion

In the foregoing pages I have attempted to depict certain aspects of social life among the Jewish Kurds of Sanandaj. Although I had had the opportunity of meeting Kurds during a two-year residence in the Middle East (1963-65), I never enjoyed the fortune of working with the society described in this paper. Therefore, I have attempted to see it through the eyes of a very perceptive culture-bearer. Personally, I found the view rewarding. Yet, because the evidence utilized in this study was largely limited to the information supplied by one native informant, I fully realize the resulting limitations. It is to be hoped that in the near future a qualified anthropologist will conduct a study by participant observation in this part of Kurdistan that will enable him to acquire a variety of evidence with which to construct generalized models of the cultural code and observe the implementation of this code on the ground. However, owing to the absence of such studies to date, I have taken this occasion to share the above information with those who might be interested.

NOTES

¹ I wish to express my sincere thanks to my informant and her husband for making this study possible. Any errors which may appear in the course of this article are my responsibility.

² Walter J. Fischel, 'The Jews of

Kurdistan', *Commentary*, Vol. VIII, No. 6, 1949, p. 557.

³ For the history of these schools in Iran see André Cuenca, 'L'œuvre de l'Alliance Israélite Universelle en Iran', in *Les droits de l'homme et l'éducation*,

PAUL J. MAGNARELLA

UNESCO, Paris, 1960, pp. 227-239.

⁴ Cf. Mohammed M. Pickthall (trans.) *The Glorious Koran*, New York, 1953, Surah 4:23.

⁵ Erwin E. Scheftelowitz, *The Jewish Law of Family and Inheritance*, Tel Aviv, 1947, p. 74.

⁶ Cf. Raphael Patai, *Golden River to Golden Road*, Philadelphia, 1962, pp. 135-76.

⁷ W. H. Goodenough, 'Residence Rules', *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1956, pp. 22-37.

⁸ Dina Feitelson, 'Aspects of the Social Life of Kurdish Jews', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1959, p. 211.

⁹ P. M. Sykes, *The Glory of the Shia World*, London, 1910, p. 76.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION AMONG IRAQI-BORN JEWS

Hayyim J. Cohen

IN the course of research on the Jews of Asia and Africa, conducted by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, it became clear that the data on the education of Jews in those areas were startlingly inadequate. There is no accurate information (even about the position in the last few decades) for any Jewish community in the Orient. Such data as are available are scanty, while for some areas they appear to be non-existent. Moreover, the fact that the overwhelming majority of Jews from Asia and Africa have emigrated to various countries makes investigation of this scattered group very difficult. Admittedly, a large proportion of these emigrants now live in Israel; but it cannot be assumed that they are educationally similar to those who emigrated to Europe, America, or Australia.

In order to limit the investigation without impairing its aim, we confined ourselves to a survey of the development of higher education in a single country in the area, Iraq, as a preliminary.¹ We also gathered useful data on the whole primary and secondary school system in that country.

Iraqi Jewry has experienced numerous political, economic, social, and demographic changes in the past century.² The first modern school, for Jewish boys, was opened only in 1864, in Baghdad. The second, for Jewish girls, was opened in 1893. Both schools were established by the Alliance Israélite Universelle. State schools for boys were opened in 1869, and for girls in 1898. In the first few years of the present century, further Jewish schools for boys and girls were founded in Baghdad by the Jewish community, while the Alliance Israélite established other schools in the principal cities of Iraq. One of the first Iraqis to graduate from a university was a Jew, Sasson Hakham Heskeli, who became Iraqi Minister of Finance (1920-25). He graduated from the Faculty of Law in Vienna in or about 1886 after completing his secondary education in England. Other Iraqis graduated from institutions of higher learning only after the beginning of the present century; the majority (including Jews) studied in Istanbul.

The rate of establishment of primary and secondary schools and of institutions of higher learning increased in the 1920s. In 1938, 603

pupils of all religious affiliations completed secondary school; the number had doubled (1,209) by 1948. As for institutions of higher learning in Iraq, while 176 students graduated in 1938, 473 had done so a decade later. If accurate data were available on the number of Jewish pupils who completed their secondary education, it is likely that they would reflect a similar progress. In the 1940s there were three Jewish schools (two in Baghdad and one in Basrah) which had a full five-year secondary curriculum to prepare pupils for an examination equivalent to matriculation—that is, for entrance to university. The educational system in Iraq consisted of elementary schools (six years) and of secondary schools which had either a three-year curriculum (intermediate level) or a five-year curriculum (full secondary level). Some State secondary schools stopped at the intermediate level while others had a complete five-year course. Jews went to State schools of both types in the various towns of Iraq, and they also attended foreign-run schools.

The Iraqi Government does not publish figures of college graduates according to religious affiliation, and the official figures do not take into account Iraqis who completed their university education abroad. In the attempt to determine the proportion of Jewish students, use was made of the lists of pupils who graduated from institutions of higher learning in Iraq; these lists were published annually in the Baghdad Press. Several thousand copies of Iraqi newspapers have been examined, but unfortunately there is no complete set of an Iraqi paper available from the 1920s onwards. Moreover, it has not always been possible to ascertain the religion of the graduates from the names published. Some students preferred not to give their surname if it was a typically Jewish one; they gave their own first name and their father's first name only. (It is worth noting here that many Muslims do not have surnames and that it was customary for an Iraqi to give his own first name, followed by his father's first name.) Thus, the name Ibrahim Abdullah could equally be Jewish or Muslim, while Maurice Jacob might be Christian or Jewish. In the course of our research it became evident that a by no means inconsiderable number of Iraqi Jews went to study at universities abroad, in England, France, Turkey, Germany, India, Egypt, Switzerland, the United States, and in particular in the Lebanon at the American University of Beirut. It was difficult to obtain lists from these many universities of Iraqi-born Jewish graduates.

A brief questionnaire was sent to a number of graduates of Iraqi origin in Israel, in which they were requested to supply personal data, including the name used in Iraq, profession studied, year of graduation, and the university at which they had studied. They were also asked to furnish the names of fellow Jewish graduates of the same class, and finally, to add a list of names of friends and relatives born in Iraq who had graduated from a university in any period. Further questionnaires

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION AMONG IRAQI-BORN JEWS

were sent out to those named by the respondents, and the list of graduates was thus progressively augmented. In some cases all the Jewish graduates of a certain class were located, and they replied to the questionnaire.

The addresses of 450 Iraqi-born graduates were located by this method; 309 of these completed and returned the questionnaires. The response rate was therefore high—69 per cent. Three respondents attached lengthy lists of names of graduates known to them. The total number of names of Jewish graduates born in Iraq obtained from the respondents (together with those from lists appearing in various newspapers) amounted to 1,101.

Clearly, the figure of 1,101 graduates is incomplete, in particular since it appears that many Jews born in Iraq who graduated from universities in different parts of the world after 1951 have not been successfully located. It was therefore decided to limit the survey to 'university education among Iraqi Jews until 1951'.

The 1,101 graduates may be divided into the following four categories:

1. Those known to have graduated before 1951 who replied to the questionnaire	273
2. Those known to have graduated before 1951 who did not reply to the questionnaire	553
3. Those whose year of graduation is unknown	151
4. Those graduating after 1951 (including 36 who replied to the questionnaire)	124
	<hr/>
Total	1,101

It is possible that there are some in group three who graduated after 1951, and that some have been included twice—under the name used in Iraq and under that used in Israel. However, these duplications are unlikely to be numerous enough to affect the general picture. The investigation is based on the 977 graduates in the first three categories. First-hand information was obtained from 273 (about 28 per cent); while for a further 553 (57 per cent), information was obtained at second hand from two or more people with a personal knowledge of the graduate, although full details (such as place of birth) were not always available.³

We then had to decide whether to base the investigation on the first group only (who had responded to the questionnaire), or whether to include the second and third groups. We decided to use all three groups.

Subjects studied

The main fields of study of Jewish graduates born in Iraq were law,

HAYYIM J. COHEN

medicine, pharmacy, engineering, economics, and teaching. A few studied other subjects, such as history, languages, and agriculture.

Table 1 shows that law was the most favoured profession. About a quarter of the graduates studied law; about half qualified as doctors, pharmacists, and engineers; while the remaining quarter qualified mainly as economists and teachers.

TABLE 1: *Distribution of graduates according to profession*

Profession	Group 1		Group 2		Total Groups 1 and 2		Group 3		General Total for Groups 1-3	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Law	69	25.3	149	26.9	218	26.4	27	17.9	245	25.1
Medicine	62	22.7	116	21.0	178	21.5	27	17.9	205	20.9
Pharmacy	51	18.7	90	16.3	141	17.1	24	15.9	165	16.9
Engineering	40	14.6	83	15.0	123	14.9	31	20.5	154	15.8
Economics	21	7.7	69	12.5	90	10.9	2	1.3	92	9.4
Teaching	24	8.8	30	5.4	54	6.5	24	15.9	78	8.0
Miscellaneous	6	2.2	16	2.9	22	2.7	16	10.6	38	3.9
Total	273	100.0	553	100.0	826	100.0	151	100.0	977	100.0

There are several reasons why law headed the professions studied by Iraqi Jews. The Law Faculty was the earliest to be opened in Iraq; it was founded in 1909, and the first group of students graduated in 1913. Although closed down during the First World War, it was re-opened in 1921 and has continued to function since that date. The course of study was generally three years until 1934, when it was increased to four years; it was possible to study for the law degree in evening classes until the end of the 1930s. Most important, when the Iraqi authorities began (in 1935) to impose a *numerus clausus* on Jewish applicants to university, they exempted the Faculty of Law from this restriction. Nearly all Iraqi Jewish lawyers who graduated before 1951 studied in Baghdad; a few had gone to Istanbul before 1913, while two were Jerusalem graduates.

Schools of economics, pharmacy, and engineering were opened in the 1920s, but they were short-lived. Moreover, they cannot be said to have been institutions of higher learning since they accepted students with a total of nine years (six years' elementary and three years' secondary) schooling, and offered only a brief course of study.

The Royal Medical School was founded in 1927 in Baghdad. The course of study was five years, but those who enrolled in 1935 were required to study for six years.

An engineering school which used to have a three-year curriculum became an institute of engineering in 1934, when a four-year course of study was introduced for students who had matriculated; those enrolling in 1944 were required to study for a five-year period. In 1936 a School of Pharmacy was opened; it had a four-year curriculum, but from 1945 graduates were required to specialize during an additional year. A

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION AMONG IRAQI-BORN JEWS

School of Economics was opened in 1946, offering a four-year course. It was followed, in 1949, by a Faculty of Science.

As we saw earlier, there were no restrictions on the admission of Jewish students to the Faculty of Law; but in 1935 restrictions were imposed on the admission of Jewish students who wished to qualify in other professions. It is interesting to note that whenever a new institution of higher learning was established, no restriction was placed on the number of Jewish admissions in the first year or two. Both in 1940 and 1941, about half of the first groups of graduates from the School of Pharmacy were Jews. Jews also accounted for more than half of the first crop of graduates of the School of Economics in 1950. The distribution of professions studied by Jews changed after the opening of more institutions of higher learning in Iraq in the 1930s and 1940s (see Table 2). While until 1930 about half the Jewish graduates studied

TABLE 2: *Distribution of graduates according to period of graduation*

<i>Profession</i>	<i>Up to 1920</i>	<i>1921-30</i>	<i>1931-40</i>	<i>1941-46</i>	<i>1947-51</i>	<i>Date Unknown</i>	<i>Total</i>
Law	20	17	47	53	81	27	245
Medicine	9	3	65	53	48	27	205
Pharmacy	4	19	36	60	22	24	165
Engineering	1	5	48	33	36	31	154
Economics	—	1	14	14	61	2	92
Teaching	—	—	16	19	19	24	78
Miscellaneous	—	—	11	5	6	16	38
Total	34	45	237	237	273	151	977
of whom graduated abroad	19	13	62	43	42	46	225

law, between 1931 and 1946 only about a quarter qualified in this profession. The majority took up medicine, pharmacy, or engineering (62.2 per cent of the graduates), mainly owing to the good opportunities available to members of those professions in Iraq. This high percentage indicates a tendency among young Jews to study science and technical subjects. It should be noted that Jewish secondary schools in Iraq were biased in favour of mathematics and natural science, and occasionally included commercial courses in their curriculum. There was little emphasis on the humanities. During the 1940s the restrictions imposed by the government on Jewish entrants to the medical, pharmaceutical, and engineering faculties began to bear fruit: between 1947 and 1951 only 38.8 per cent of Jewish graduates qualified in those professions (in contrast to 62.2 per cent during 1931-46).

The Jewish population of Iraq increased from 87,000 in 1919 to about 130,000 in 1951. The number of graduates also rose—but much more spectacularly—during that period. Whereas a total of 45 Jews graduated in the years 1921-30, in 1950 alone the total was about 120;

and this figure might well have been higher but for the establishment of the State of Israel. Many Jewish students were arrested, while others emigrated to Israel before completing their studies, or even shortly before they were due to sit for their final examinations.

Although from the 1930s onwards, Jews were able to qualify for a variety of professions in Iraq, an appreciable number also went abroad to foreign universities. Before 1951 about 23 per cent of Jewish graduates had completed their studies abroad; the majority studied medicine (75) or engineering (70).

Distribution of graduates according to sex

The number of Jewish graduates rose not only as a result of the increase in secondary schools and institutions of higher learning in Iraq, but also because of the fact that more Jewish girls were going to secondary schools and to university. As noted, above, the first elementary school for Jewish girls in Iraq was opened in 1893. However, it was not until the 1930s that a few Jewish girls enrolled for a full five-year course of secondary education. The first Jewish female graduate qualified about 1940 (we cannot be certain of the exact year because she has not been directly located). It was only in the 1940s that women students began to qualify as doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, or school teachers. Until 1951, there was not a single Jewish woman who graduated in engineering. (After that date, a handful of Muslim women began to study engineering in Iraq.)

Until the late 1930s there was neither a State-run nor a Jewish school for girls in Iraq which provided a full secondary education. However, the Shamash Jewish School (for boys) accepted a limited number of female pupils and in this way some girls were able to obtain their matriculation and to enter university. When, eventually, secondary schools for girls offering a full five-year course were opened, it was only the main towns in the country which benefited. Moreover, at the graduate level, Iraqi Jewish girls had to overcome yet another handicap: their families did not usually permit them to study abroad. Until the 1940s, Iraqi Jews generally felt that an unmarried girl must live under the protection of her parents to preserve her good name. Up to 1951, there were 225 Iraqi Jews who graduated from universities abroad; only 5 of these were women.

There were two senior teacher-training institutes in Baghdad, one mixed and the other for females only (named after Queen Alya). The majority of Jewish women graduates were teachers, probably because they were able to study in the Queen Alya College without associating with male students.

Table 3 shows that teaching and medicine were the professions most favoured by Jewish women. A point of particular interest arising from this table is the number of Jewish women who graduated as lawyers:

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION AMONG IRAQI-BORN JEWS

TABLE 3: *Distribution of graduates according to sex*

<i>Profession</i>	<i>up to 1940</i>		<i>1941-51</i>		<i>Unknown</i>		<i>Total</i>		<i>Percentages</i>	
	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Law	84	—	122	12	27	—	233	12	25.6	17.9
Medicine	77	—	85	16	26	1	188	17	20.7	25.4
Pharmacy	59	—	74	8	23	1	156	9	17.2	13.4
Engineering	54	—	69	—	31	—	154	—	16.9	—
Economics	15	—	69	6	2	—	86	6	9.4	8.9
Teaching	16	—	24	14	18	6	58	20	6.4	29.9
Miscellaneous	10	1	10	1	15	1	35	3	3.8	4.5
Total	315	1	453	57	142	9	910	67	100.0	100.0
Percentage by sex	96.9	3.1	88.8	11.2	94.0	6.0	93.1	6.9		

twelve. Until 1951 no woman (either Jewish or non-Jewish) is known to have practised law in Iraq. It may be that Jewish girls studied law because there were no restrictions on the admission of Jewish students to this profession, and that when they did graduate, they were unable to obtain employment as practising lawyers.

Distribution of graduates according to birthplace

In the first half of the present century the Jews of Iraq were scattered in numerous communities, especially in the region of Kurdistan in the north of the country. The 1947 population census taken in Iraq stated that there were 118,000 Jews in the country. The census revealed that about 51 per cent of Iraqi Jewry lived in Baghdad, about 8 per cent in Basrah, 1 per cent in Amarah, and 1 per cent in Hillah, while about 20 per cent lived in the towns and villages of southern and central Iraq. On the other hand, 4.7 per cent lived in Mosul, and a further 12.1 per cent in the rest of the towns and villages in northern Iraq.

In view of the subsequent dispersion of Iraqi Jewry, it is interesting to examine the areas from which Jewish graduates originated. The questionnaire therefore asked the respondents to name their place of birth. In three cases where they had indicated that their birthplace was Baghdad it transpired in subsequent interviews that they had been born in towns in southern Iraq. It seems that they stated Baghdad to have been their native town because they had done so, for various reasons, in their declarations on arriving in Israel. In fact, although they had been born elsewhere in Iraq, they had moved to Baghdad at an early age. The relevant three questionnaires were amended, but it is possible that there were other such instances (although it is unlikely that they amounted to many).

Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain information about the birthplace of 385 (about 40 per cent) of the graduates. Of the 592 for whom we had the data, 439 (about 74 per cent) were natives of Baghdad, 60 (about 10 per cent) were natives of Basrah, 26 (about 4 per cent)

were natives of Hillah, 17 (about 3 per cent) were natives of Amarah, and 10 (1.7 per cent) were natives of Mosul. The remaining 40 graduates were born in other localities in Iraq.

One of the most remarkable facts to emerge is the small number of Jewish graduates who were born in northern Iraq: of all the respondents whose birthplace has been ascertained, only two were born in the Kurdistan area—one in Erbil and one in Sulaimaniya. It should be remembered with regard to Kurdistan that the majority of Jews in the area used to live in villages where there were often no schools of any description whatsoever. Another interesting feature worth noting is that until 1930, nearly all the graduates whose birthplace was known were born in Baghdad—45 out of a total of 53. Eventually, Jews whose birthplace was elsewhere than the capital city began to go to university until, among those graduating in the period 1947–51, 19 were born in Basrah, 6 in Hillah, 7 in Amarah, 3 in Mosul, and 6 in other areas in south and central Iraq. However, in that same five-year period, there were 130 graduates who were natives of Baghdad.

Until 1951, all but four of the Jewish women graduates were born in either Baghdad or Basrah; of these four, one was a native of Amarah and three were natives of Hillah. Outside Baghdad and Basrah, there were insufficient schools for preparing young men to enter university, while girls' schools beyond elementary or intermediate level were even scarcer. The Jewish women from Hillah and Amarah who graduated from Baghdad University had moved to the capital city at an early age; there had been at the time a wave of Jewish migration to Baghdad from these two cities.

Conclusion

Iraqi Jews were quick to take advantage of opportunities for secondary and higher education. As was the case in other countries of the Orient, it was the population of the capital city which was most favoured. It is not surprising, therefore, that about three-quarters of the graduates whose birthplace was ascertained were natives of Baghdad.

When they emigrated to Israel, Iraqi Jews from Mesopotamia tended to settle in urban areas, while those from Kurdistan went to live in villages or development towns. There are no adequate data, as yet, on the comparative educational achievements of these two groups. We do know, however, that an increasing number of Iraqi students are graduating from Israeli universities.

NOTES

¹ The preparation of this article was made possible by a grant from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, New York.

² See my 'Note on Social Change

among Iraqi Jews, 1917–1951' in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. VIII, no. 2, December 1966, pp. 204–8.

³ The group of 553 graduates includes those no longer living.

AUSTRALIAN JEWRY IN 1966

Walter M. Lippmann

MY earlier analysis, 'The Demography of Australian Jewry',¹ based upon the 1961 Census, concluded with the observation that

. . . Jewish life in Australia has reached a peak. However, below the surface of the vitality of the committed and involved, the alluring pressures of the free society are causing a steady drift of the uninterested, if not disaffected, away from Jewish communal life . . .

In the years ahead, numbers, emotional motivation, and intensity of involvement are likely to decline as second and third generation attitudes replace those of the closely-knit communities deriving their current vitality largely from the impetus of first generation immigrants . . .

The 1966 Commonwealth Census has now offered a welcome opportunity to test these conclusions against the changes and trends disclosed by the previous quinquennial census. As a result, a series of observations emerges clearly enough to enable us to conclude that:

1. the spectacular growth of Australian Jewry since the Second World War has slowed down and been almost arrested;
2. the birth rate of Australian Jewry is declining and is insufficient to maintain present numbers;
3. Australian Jewry, which I described in my earlier article as a predominantly first-generation immigrant community, is losing its immigrant character and, following the pattern of American Jewry,² is rapidly changing into one in which the native-born generation will outnumber its immigrant forebears; and
4. though detailed statistics of the religions of marriage partners are not yet accessible, an analysis of such particulars as are available points to a marked increase in the number of Jews who choose their spouses outside the Jewish community.

These conclusions will undoubtedly be disturbing to those who saw in the great progress made by Australian Jewry during the past two decades the emergence of a new and vital force in Jewish life. This paper is designed to examine in detail the evidence upon which my assessment is based.

The total number of persons declaring their adherence to the Hebrew

TABLE 1. *Jewish population of Australia*

	1966		Total	1961 Increase Number	1961-66 Percentage	General Population Growth 1961-66	1966 Proportion of Population
	Male	Female					
Victoria	15,456	15,602	31,058	1,126	3.6	9.88	0.96
N.S.W.	12,627	13,286	25,913	1,887	7.8	8.09	0.61
Western Australia	1,510	1,486	2,996	214	7.7	13.43	0.36
South Australia	622	627	1,249	264	26.0	12.52	0.11
Queensland	839	790	1,629	295	22.1	9.54	0.10
A.C.T.	118	85	203	92	82.9	63.21	0.21
Tasmania	119	88	207	71	34.3	6.02	0.06
N. Territory	10	6	16	-7	dec.		0.05
AUSTRALIA:	31,301	31,970	63,271	3,942	6.55	9.92	0.55

religion in the 1966 census was 63,271 (59,329 in 1961)—an increase of 6.65 per cent for the five-year period. This compares with an increase of 51 per cent in the seven-year period 1947-54 and 18.4 per cent between 1954 and 1961. However, during the five years under review (1961-66), 3,778 Jews are known to have migrated to Australia. (The nature of records kept in this regard is such that the true number of Jewish immigrants can be assumed to have been greater: the Australian Government does not classify immigrants according to religion; and the figure of 3,778 does not include the Jewish immigrants who came to Australia at their own expense and did not contact a Jewish welfare society for information or assistance.) As a result, one is led to the inevitable conclusion that the natural growth (surplus of births over deaths and defections) of Australian Jewry is minimal and that the 1971 census may reveal a decline in the overall number of Jews in Australia.

Table 1 pinpoints the changes recorded in the various States and indicates that, for the first time since 1933, the growth in Victoria, home of the largest number of Jews in Australia, has been proportionately the smallest in all States. Even if the figures were adjusted to allow for the fact that disclosure of religion in the census is voluntary, this conclusion would not materially be affected since the rate of 'no reply' has varied only slightly between the various States (from 9 per cent in New South Wales to 10.8 per cent in Western Australia). Such tests as have been made (for instance, *Sociological Study of the Jewish Community of Melbourne, 1967*)³ have shown that the Jewish rate of non-disclosure follows closely that of the general population. We can therefore arrive at an adjusted Jewish population figure for the whole of Australia in 1966 of 69,481 (as against the 1961 adjusted total of 65,985).

The increase in the number of Jews in Tasmania is worth noting. Although the overall numbers of Jews in Tasmania is small, and Tasmanian Jewry has been regarded as a 'dying' community, this accession of mainly Australian-born Jews (142 in 1966 as against 61 in 1961) appears to have been due to an internal migration from other States of some younger families with children.

An examination of the age distribution of Australian Jewry (Tables 2 and 3) shows that the major growth has not taken place in the age group 0-5 where it would indicate the natural growth factor, but rather in the middle age groups as well as in the age groups 10-19, indicating the continuing influx of migrants with children as the main source of strength. The age groups 55 years and over disclose the expected losses through death. Of overriding importance, however, is the fact that the number of children in the 0-4 age group is significantly smaller in 1966 than it was in 1961 (3,990 in 1961; 3,435 in 1966; a drop of almost 15 per cent). In 1966 the Jewish fertility ratio (children aged 0-4 as a percentage of females aged 15-44) in Australia dropped

TABLE 2. Numbers of Persons who stated 'Hebrew' in answer to the religious question by age * (grouped ages):
Australia—Census, 30 June 1966

	Age last birthday (years)														90 and over	Total all ages				
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69			70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89
Males	1,765	2,168	2,689	3,122	1,976	1,268	1,368	1,628	2,373	2,484	2,756	2,810	1,931	1,328	846	508	235	86	20	31,301
Females	1,670	2,172	2,510	2,973	1,885	1,335	1,349	1,964	2,844	2,538	2,640	2,263	1,810	1,571	1,031	723	440	151	41	31,970
Persons	3,435	4,340	5,199	6,095	3,861	2,603	2,657	3,592	5,217	5,022	5,396	5,073	3,741	2,899	1,877	1,231	675	237	61	63,271

* Recorded ages adjusted by the distribution of ages 'not stated'.

AUSTRALIAN JEWRY IN 1966

TABLE 3. *Variation in age distribution of Australian Jewry*

	<i>1961 figures projected by 5 years</i>	<i>Actual 1966</i>	<i>Variation + or -</i>
0-4		3,435	-555
5-9	3,990	4,340	+ 50
10-14	4,758	5,199	+441
15-19	5,699	6,095	+396
20-24	3,832	3,861	+ 29
25-29	2,510	2,663	+153
30-34	2,504	2,657	+153
35-39	3,381	3,592	+111
40-44	4,854	5,217	+363
45-49	4,780	5,022	+242
50-54	5,232	5,396	+164
55-59	5,126	5,073	- 53
60-64	3,882	3,741	-141
65-69	3,220	2,899	-321
70 and over	5,561	4,101	-1,460

to 27.7 (general population 48.3), a rate somewhat half-way between those recorded in 1933 (23.3) and 1921 (35), and significantly lower than that of 1954 (39.4) or 1961 (35.3). The larger number of 15-19-year-olds may hold some promise of increased fecundity in the near future, but the sharp drop in the number of younger children indicates that, even should this materialize, it will be only a very temporary respite from the general low birth-rates.

Finally, the lower birth-rate and possibly also the longer expectation of life are reflected in the fact that 33.6 per cent of the community is aged 50 and over, compared with 22.6 per cent of the Australian nation as a whole; while 30.1 per cent of the Jewish community is under 20 years of age compared with 38.5 per cent of the Australian general population.

An overall analysis of net changes in the Jewish population by country of birth between 1961 and 1966 shows (see Table 4) that there has been a marked increase in the number of Australian-born persons (2,925). In contrast to the earlier post-war pattern, the United Kingdom is now emerging as the major country from which immigrants join the Australian Jewish community (net increase 561), while Asia (primarily Israel) follows with a net increase of 341.

The 1966 Census has also revealed that, with the exception of Victoria, all the States of the Commonwealth now have a majority of Jews born in Australia and the United Kingdom. Even in Victoria, the Australian-born component has risen from 37.5 per cent in 1961 to 40.3 per cent in 1966, while the percentage of those born in the United Kingdom has not diminished: 6.8 in 1961 and 6.9 in 1966.

Table 4 also shows that although there has been an increase in the total number of Jews born in continental Europe, the percentage of

WALTER M. LIPPMANN

TABLE 4. *Origin of Australian Jewry*

	1966		1961	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Australasia	26,133	41.3	23,208	39.1
United Kingdom	5,754	9.1	5,193	8.8
Western and Central Europe ¹	12,247	19.4	11,588	19.5
Southern Europe ²	194	0.3	167	0.3
Eastern Europe ³	13,533	21.4	12,712	21.4
Other Europe	93	0.1	1,908	3.2
Total Europe	26,067	41.2	26,375	44.4
Israel	1,787	2.8		
Other Asian	1,517	2.4		
Total Asian	3,304	5.2	2,963	5.0
Africa	1,555	2.5	1,273	2.2
America	437	0.7	302	0.5
Unspecified	21		15	
Total	63,271	100.0	59,329	100.0

¹ Western and Central Europe includes: Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland.

² Southern Europe includes: Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Spain.

³ Eastern Europe includes: Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia.

that component in the total Jewish population has in fact decreased from 44.4 in 1961 to 41.2 in 1966. (Some States show a net loss in the number of Jews born in continental Europe: Western Australia, Tasmania, the Northern Territory, and Victoria in particular where the loss amounted to 488. Other States record increases: New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, and the Australian Capital Territory.)

To sum up. The spectacular post-war growth of the Australian Jewish community has clearly been arrested and, failing further immigration, the future of the community rests precariously upon the generation of young people currently aged 10-20. Only if this relatively small group (5,811 males and 5,483 females) marry Jewish partners will Australian Jewry have a prospect of surviving in some strength. However, assimilatory trends and disaffections from the community of many young people point to only a proportion of them remaining within Jewish society. The pattern of intermarriage previously noted⁴ will probably continue to aggravate the imbalance of the sexes, thus causing us to conclude that, unless a remarkable consolidation and revival of Jewish identification and loyalties occur in the next few years, Australian Jewry will have passed the peak attained during the past two decades.

AUSTRALIAN JEWRY IN 1966

NOTES

¹ W. M. Lippmann, *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. VIII, No. 2, Dec. 1966, pp. 213-39.

² Jacob Marcus, 'Background for the History of American Jewry', in Oscar I. Janowsky, ed., *The American Jew*, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1964, and *Community Survey Reports*: San Francisco, 1959; Providence, R.I., 1964;

Rochester, N.Y., 1961; Greater Washington D.C., 1957; and Los Angeles, 1968.

³ Unpublished manuscripts by R. Taft and Walter M. Lippmann. The Jewish Social Service Council of Victoria sponsored this study, which was directed by the authors in 1966-67.

⁴ Lippmann, *op. cit.*

RACE

A Journal of Race and Group Relations

The Institute of Race Relations, 36 Jermyn Street,
London, S.W.1

The journal provides contributions to the study of race relations from a wide range of academic and applied disciplines. The reader will thus find material within his own field and also authoritative and intelligible statements from other fields that supplement his work. As well as articles, each number includes 'Quarterly Forum' which carries shorter items and reports on conferences and institutes, and there are also reviews of the current and relevant literature.

VOLUME X APRIL 1969 NUMBER 4

J. S. Western · *The Australian Aboriginal: What White Australians Know and Think about Him: A Preliminary Survey*

M. Le Lohé · *Race in Local Politics: The Rochdale Central Ward Election of 1968*

Franklin J. Henry · *The Measurement of Perceived Discrimination: A Canadian Case Study*

Julian Pitt-Rivers · *Mestizo or Ladino?*

Y. Peres & Z. Levy · *Jews and Arabs: Ethnic Group Stereotypes in Israel*

Philip Mason · *A Democratic Dilemma: Consensus and Leadership*

Quarterly Forum · Reviews

quarterly 50s or \$7.25 a year

15s or \$2 single copies

Oxford University Press
Press Road, Neasden Lane, London N.W.10

THE EDGWARE SURVEY: OCCUPATION AND SOCIAL CLASS

Ernest Krausz

DATA presented here from the Edgware survey¹ concern the occupational and industrial distribution and the stratification and social mobility of Jews in the district. They are systematically analysed and compared with relevant information concerning the general population and other Jewish communities. Figures for the general population of Edgware were provided for me in the form of special Census tabulations² for Edgware Ward which were based on the 10 per cent sample enquiry carried out at the 1961 Census. This and information gained from my sample survey of Jews in Edgware provide the comparative data in Table I.

Occupation

Table I, based on the sixfold classification used in the Census tabulations and followed in the Jewish sample, shows that Jewish men concentrate heavily in the first three groups of professional, managerial, skilled and own account workers, being few in the non-manual, semi-skilled, and unskilled categories, while the reverse is true of the general

TABLE I. *Occupational distribution (Edgware Jewish³ and general populations) of economically active and retired males*

Socio-Economic Groups Scale D	General population 10% sample—Census 1961				Jewish population 16% sample—survey 1963			
	Occup.	Retired	Total	%	Occup.	Retired	Total	%
Professional occupations	57	5	62	9.5	64	1	65	16.2
Employers and managers	178	14	192	29.9	158	6	164	40.8
Foremen, skilled manual and own account	163	4	167	25.8	123	6	129	32.1
Non-manual workers	116	11	127	19.6	26	2	28	6.9
Personal service and semi- skilled manual	58	3	61	9.4	12	4	16	4.0
Unskilled manual and remainder	32	6	38	5.8	1	—	1	
Total	604	43	647	100.0	384	19	403	100.0

ERNEST KRAUSZ

population of Edgware. Thus 57 per cent of Jewish men, but only a little over 39 per cent of the men in the general population, are in the professional or managerial categories.

In another respect figures for the Jewish community in Edgware and those applying to the general population, both in Edgware and the United Kingdom, suggest certain divergences in occupational trends. Thus, out of a total population of 1,290 the 490 economically active Jews in Edgware represent 37.9 per cent, while the 10 per cent sample for the general population of the district shows 927 economically active persons out of 1,961, which is 47.3 per cent. This last figure is in fact very near to the figure for the general population of the United Kingdom, which is 47.8 per cent.⁴ Considering the differences in the age composition of the total populations⁵ to which the economically active have been related, we might argue that with the greater preponderance of young people (many of school age) in the Jewish population, the lower Jewish percentage is not surprising. Hence it would be more realistic to relate the economically active to those aged 15 and over, as in Table II below.

TABLE II. *Economically active Jewish and general population in Edgware and the United Kingdom*

		<i>Edgware Jewish sample 1963</i>	<i>Edgware gen. 10% Census 1961</i>	<i>Anglo-Jewish sample 1950-1952</i>	<i>U.K. Census 1951-1% sample</i>	<i>U.K. general (June) 1962 (thousands)</i>
Populations 15 and over	Tot.	958	1,510	3,977	37,854	41,005
	M	483	692	1,992	17,817	19,542
	F	475	818	1,985	20,037	21,463
Economically active	Tot.	490	927	1,813	22,133	25,486
	M	384	604	1,586	15,336	16,861
	F	106	323	227	6,797	8,625
Economically active: Percentages	Tot.	51.1	61.3	45.6	58.4	62.1
	M	79.5	87.2	79.6	86.0	86.2
	F	22.3	39.6	11.4	33.9	40.1

Tot. = Total
M = Male
F = Female

Sources. A.J.S.2, Sample: see H. Neustatter in M. Freedman, ed., *A Minority in Britain*, London, 1955, p. 123. *Special Census Tabulations Scale D*, Edgware Ward (10 per cent sample). Edgware Survey (Jewish): see my unpublished Ph.D. thesis, *A Sociological Field Study of Jewish Suburban Life in Edgware 1962-63*, University of London, 1965. *Annual Abstract of Statistics, 1963*, Table 8.

We see from the figures above that the differences between Jews and the general population economically active⁶ still persist. It is obvious that the main reason for the overall difference is the fact that fewer Jewish women in Edgware go out to work.⁷ The fewer Jewish women working may at least partly be due to the age composition of the Jewish population (that is, the greater number of young married women),

THE EDGWARE SURVEY

although the low percentage for Anglo-Jewry in general does not support this argument. In fact, H. Neustatter, commenting on the Anglo-Jewish survey, suggests that the small percentage may be due to the traditional Jewish view, still prevalent, that the woman's place is in the home.⁸ Another cause of the small number of gainfully occupied Jewish persons (and this probably explains the difference with regard to the male population of 15 and over) may be the relatively greater number of Jewish young people staying on at school after the age of 15 and subsequently entering university. Thus, it has been estimated that Jewish students make up 3 per cent of the total number of students in Britain, although Jews generally account for less than 1 per cent of the total population of the country.⁹ This holds true even more strongly in Edgware where, as we have seen, Jews bulk more heavily than the general population in the higher socio-economic groups. Again, it will be shown later how strong the surge to the professions is among the young generation, and how actively the Jewish parental generation in Edgware encourages its children to attend university or college.

Looking again at Table II we see that it provides comparative figures for Anglo-Jewry of the 1950s which show that in one respect the similarity between Edgware Jews and the whole Jewish community is remarkable: almost exactly the same percentages of the male populations of 15 and over are economically active in both cases. That the figures for Edgware in 1963 were the same as for Anglo-Jewry in 1950-52 suggests that there have been no changes in the last decade as regards the proportions of economically active men; and the same is suggested by the figures for the general population of the United Kingdom (see Table II). On the other hand, in 1963 there were 22.3 per cent of Jewish women economically active in Edgware as against only 11.4 per cent in Anglo-Jewry in the early 1950s. This difference is in accord, however, with trends in the general United Kingdom population in which economically active women accounted for only 33.9 per cent in 1951 as against 40.1 per cent in 1962. Finally, from the figures for the general populations of Edgware and the United Kingdom (see Table II), it appears that there is little difference between this suburb and the country as a whole in respect of the proportions of those who are economically active. We have no evidence to shed light on the situation in the Jewish population except the present survey (1963) and the Anglo-Jewish survey which was carried out between 1950 and 1952.¹⁰

To turn to the industrial distribution of Jews in Edgware, a comparison with the general population of the United Kingdom is provided in Table III.

The figures below show the very high concentration of Edgware Jews in the clothing and footwear industries, in contrast to the very small percentage of the general population of the country, engaged in these sectors. In distributive trades, textiles, and even finance, the

ERNEST KRAUSZ

 TABLE III. *Industrial distribution: Edgware Jewish and United Kingdom general population*

Industry	1962		1963	
	Gen. pop.,	U.K.	Jewish pop.,	Edgware
	No. (thousands)	%	No.	%
Clothing and footwear	607	2.5	119	27.4
Distributive trades	3,439	13.9	81	18.6
Professional and scientific services	2,362	9.6	64	14.8
Miscellaneous	2,363	9.6	55	12.7
Other manuf. inds. (e.g., engineering, chemicals)	6,408	26.0	36	8.2
Textiles	859	3.5	17	4.0
Timber and furniture	311	1.3	14	3.2
Leather, leather goods, fur	67	0.3	16	3.7
Insurance, banking, finance	602	2.4	20	4.6
Remainder (e.g., food, printing, etc.)	7,620	30.9	12	2.8
Total	24,638 ¹¹	100.0	434 ¹²	100.0

Sources: *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, 1963, Table 131, p. 104, and Edgware Survey (Jewish).

difference between Jews and the national pattern is not as great. The differences are very much greater, however, in timber and furniture and the leather and fur industries, in which Edgware Jews seem proportionately to have an important stake, while in manufacturing industries such as engineering and chemicals the Jews of Edgware figure insignificantly when set against the national pattern. If we look at the figures in a broader perspective, the important difference that emerges is that while 73.5 per cent of Edgware Jews are in the categories of clothing and footwear, distributive trades, professional, scientific, and other services, only 35.6 per cent of the general population of the country are in these categories. On the other hand, while 56.9 per cent of the general population work in manufacturing industries (including engineering, chemicals, printing, construction, and food), only 11 per cent of Edgware Jews are engaged in these occupations.

On the whole the pattern of industrial distribution of Jews in Edgware follows that of Anglo-Jewry in general. Thus, it has been shown that in the entrepreneurial field Jews are prominent in the manufacture of clothing, furniture, and footwear, in the distribution of these and other consumer goods, and property development, and that their participation is insignificant in the basic and heavy industries, in agriculture, and in many important fields such as ship-building, or the aircraft and motor-car industries.¹³ As far as the Jewish wage and salary earners are concerned there has been an exodus from the principal immigrant occupations of tailoring and cabinet-making; the new lines taken up are mainly service trades, white-collar jobs, and professional work.¹⁴

THE EDGWARE SURVEY

We now take a closer look at the Jewish sample findings which relate to the 382 heads of households who were interviewed. Table IV gives their occupational distribution.

TABLE IV. *Occupational distribution of Edgware Jewish heads of households (Scale D)*

	No.	%
Professional occupations	59	15.5
Employers and managers	161	42.2
Foremen, skilled manual, and own account	124	32.5
Non-manual workers	22	5.7
Personal service and semi-skilled manual	6	1.8
Unskilled manual and remainder	1	
Not applicable (NA) and no response (NR)	9	2.3
Total	382	100.0

Although only 15.5 per cent were classified as belonging to professional occupations, 82 heads of households (that is, 21.5 per cent) were found to have professional qualifications.¹⁵ Some of those with professional qualifications, however, were employers or managers not always using their professional qualifications; hence they were classified in category 2 of Scale D.

The important point to be noted here is that although Edgware Jews have a higher percentage than the general local population in professional occupations—16.2 per cent against 9.5 per cent (see Table I)—they seem to exhibit trends similar to the general population with regard to the kind of professions taken up. Thus, only 22 per cent of the householders with professions were qualified in the higher professions (that is, medicine and law); the rest were engineers, accountants, industrial chemists, etc. Carr-Saunders, Jones, and Moser show that while 'few of the higher professions have increased their numbers (at any rate regarding men) to any striking extent between 1931 and 1951' there has been a 'great increase in the size of the lesser professions'.¹⁶ The figures for Jews in Edgware seem to be in line with this trend.

Another important point to be considered is the extent to which Jews in Edgware work on their own account. Several categories are here embraced, namely, employers with large or small numbers of employees, professional men with possibly a few employees, and workers who work alone on their own account.¹⁷ Many Jews strive to work on their own account either because they think they have been discriminated against by employers, or because they fear that such discrimination might occur when applying for a job or when seeking promotion. The disparity in this respect between Edgware Jews and the general population of the country is enormous: 66.7 per cent (255 of the 382 respondents) in the Edgware sample worked on their own account while the figure for the general population was 7.4 per cent.¹⁸ On the other hand, although we have no figures for the Edgware general population regarding the number who are self-employed, the fact that

9.5 per cent belong to the professional group against 3 per cent in the country as a whole, and 29.9 per cent are employers and managers against the national figure of 5.8 per cent, suggests that the percentage of self-employed in the Edgware general population is likely to be much higher than in the country as a whole.¹⁹ Furthermore, according to a conservative estimate for Anglo-Jewry at the end of the Second World War, only 15 per cent worked on their own account,²⁰ although another estimate, some years later, put it at the very much higher figure of 69 per cent.²¹ It is probably true that in certain districts in large cities, and on the whole in the smaller communities, the percentage of self-employed among Jews is very high. But at the same time the lower estimate is probably more nearly correct for the larger Jewish communities in general, and it was in these larger Jewish communities that the survey putting the self-employed at 15 per cent was carried out.²²

I also tried to find out in the survey to what extent those who were employees wished to become self-employed. Of the 116 respondents (that is, 30 per cent of the 382 respondents)²³ who were employees, 44 or nearly 38 per cent said they wished to become self-employed, 53 or more than 45 per cent indicated they had no such desire, and the rest were undecided. It is also interesting to note that of the 44 who wished to become self-employed, only 8 gave as their reason a desire to earn more, while 26 said they sought self-employment in order to have more independence, and the remaining 10 so as to have a better status. Certainly the seeking of more independence may have something to do with fear of discrimination, a possible factor accounting for the high percentage of self-employed mentioned above. It seems, therefore, that there is at least a slight indication that the chief reason for working on 'own account' is not simply the quest for money and material things.²⁴ Prestige and independence play an important part in the drive for self-employment.

Another aspect investigated was the extent to which Jews in Edgware, whether self-employed or employees, tended to work with other Jews. The figures show that 12.7 per cent work mainly with Jews, 49.6 per cent mainly with non-Jews and 24.5 per cent with mixed company. (The question did not apply to 13.2 per cent who worked alone, such as taxi drivers.) The fact that only 12.7 per cent of respondents in Edgware work mainly with other Jews shows that a good deal of integration is taking place in the economic sphere. The situation is very different from that which existed at the turn of this century, when Jewish immigrants tended to flock to Jewish workshops in a few staple trades.

In the boot and shoe trade, for example, L. Gartner describes how 'skilled Jewish home lasters and finishers took unskilled "greeners" [Jewish immigrants] as assistants and made of their homes . . . workshops'.²⁵ Similar situations existed in such other trades as tailoring and furniture-making, and held in London as well as in the larger provincial

immigrant communities.²⁶ Consequently, as Gartner says, 'for the first decades . . . there was no alternative to distinct Jewish unions because of the social and cultural gulf between Jewish and English workers and the separateness of the Jewish sectors in the main immigrant trades of garment and boot and shoe making.'²⁷ By the Second World War the abandonment of the immigrant trades by Jewish workers had set in and its result was the virtual disappearance of Jewish trade unionism.²⁸ There were 22 Jewish labour and trade unions in London during the first decade of this century, but only four remained by 1938.²⁹

To maintain that nowadays Jews come into contact with more non-Jews at the work place and that generally the economic life of the two groups is more integrated, as argued above, does not necessarily contradict our earlier findings that there is still a great deal of concentration by Jews in certain industrial spheres (see Table III) and in certain occupational categories. For it should be fairly obvious that being a professional man or a manager, or being occupied in scientific services, the distributive trades, or the clothing industry, does not *ipso facto* mean that Jews will work mainly with other Jews. Thus, the Jewish manager in the distributive trade may have moved out of a Jewish wholesale firm and into a non-Jewish department store. Again, the Jewish clothing manufacturer may employ mainly non-Jewish workers, while the Jewish professional man may well have a non-Jewish partner. But integration is not to be regarded as synonymous with diversification in the occupations taken up by Jews.³⁰ The following information yielded by my Edgware survey further indicates the trend towards integration. Of the 116 respondents who were employees, 65 (or 56 per cent) had Jewish employers, but of these only 6 (10.6 per cent) said that this was because they preferred a Jewish employer, while 18 (27.7 per cent) put it down to the great number of Jewish employers in their trade, and as many as 40 (61.5 per cent) said that they had a Jewish employer by chance.³¹

The phenomenon of integration with non-Jews at work has an important bearing on the process of 'identification' of the Jew with his minority community. The immigrant Jew who when at work was primarily in the company of other immigrants with cultural and social backgrounds similar to his own had little chance to assimilate the ways of the native Englishman, quite apart from the fact that many a distinctively Jewish movement, such as that of the Labour Zionists, arose directly out of the environment of the Jewish workshop. Thus, this channel of Jewish identification, the work place, was effective through the isolation of the Jewish from the non-Jewish worker, as well as through the creation of specifically Jewish organizations which would aid the individual's identification with his minority group. Today, however, with the virtual elimination of the predominantly Jewish workshop, and the numerous contacts between Jews and

non-Jews in work and business, economic activities have ceased to take place in an atmosphere in which Jewish indentification is encouraged.

Turning to a comparison of my study with the occupational data for Jewish communities in other Western countries we may note first that several of the studies in the United States, such as those by Seligman³² and Rubinstein,³³ come to the same general conclusions. These conclusions are best summarized in an article by A. Chenkin in which there are occupational data for six Jewish communities in the United States. He says: 'The difference between the occupational distribution of the total white urban population in 1960 and that of the Jewish populations in the enumerated communities confirms the findings of earlier studies. On the whole, all of the studies have shown the Jewish population to be represented in moderately larger proportions in the professional and semi-professional classifications than the total white urban population and in substantially larger proportion in the category of managers and self-employed.'³⁴ Taking the average of the comparative percentages in Chenkin's occupational table we find that the top groups mentioned above contain 60.8 per cent of the Jewish working population (in the six communities) against 24.6 per cent of the white urban working population of the United States. The same sort of Jewish over-representation in the professional and managerial groups exists in Edgware (see Table I above).³⁵

Further similarities can be found between my study and American studies. Thus, Seligman points out that generally 'smaller proportions of total Jewish populations are part of the labor force than is the case in the general population'.³⁶ For New York the figure of 51.3 per cent³⁷ for the total Jewish persons in the labour force is remarkably close to our own findings (51.1 per cent: see Table II above) and, similarly, attention is drawn to the fewer Jewish women at work (as in our case).³⁸ Again, the greater representation of Jews in the employer and self-employed classes is pointed out.³⁹ A similar situation obtains in the Canadian Jewish community where 42.1 per cent of all heads of households in 1951 were either self-employed or employers, the comparative figure for the general population being 24.4 per cent.⁴⁰ As far as industrial distribution is concerned a remarkable similarity exists in all the studies we have compared: my own Edgware survey, the Anglo-Jewish surveys, the American and Canadian studies, and one survey on the European continent.⁴¹ In all cases large clusterings are found around the clothing and textile industries, distributive trades and light industries, and to an increasing degree around professional services and administration in general. There appear to be common occupational and industrial trends among Jews in the urban environment of Western industrialized society.

Social mobility

Social mobility, the 'movement in social status or social position by individuals of diverse social origins',⁴² was the subject of a major investigation carried out in Britain by D. V. Glass and others during the first post-war decade. In my study of Edgware I compared the group of householders now living in the district with their fathers and children in respect of 'achieved' social status. It is important to state clearly the assumptions as well as qualifications we have to make when analysing this kind of inter-generational mobility. First, I assume that Jewish society, including present-day Edgware, has 'a hierarchy of social status',⁴³ and that 'there are criteria which may be used to indicate the status level, or position in the hierarchy, of an individual or a group'.⁴⁴ While recognizing the difficulty of choosing a criterion, or a number of criteria, which indicate the social status of an individual, I accept occupation as the most important single criterion and most useful index of social status. As Glass points out, 'in our society . . . occupation reflects the combined influence of a number of factors linked with social status.'⁴⁵ There is also wide agreement about the choice of occupation for the measurement of social mobility (see, for example, D. Lockwood⁴⁶ and S. M. Lipset and R. Bendix⁴⁷). Nevertheless, it is generally admitted that occupation as a criterion has its drawbacks and that other criteria should also be applied in trying to analyse social mobility. In the Edgware study, therefore, firstly occupation was applied as a criterion and then another criterion indicating social mobility was taken, namely, residential movement.

The categories in Table V are those of the special Census tabulations Scale D, and differ from the seven-fold Standard Classification in the Glass study, particularly in the middle ranges.⁴⁸ Later on I use a condensed form of the Standard Classification (see Table VI). As in the Glass study I focus attention on inter-generational trends, attempting in fact to present a picture extending over three generations. There are, however, a number of problems. First, it is somewhat arbitrary to apply a single status scale to a period covering three generations. Second, I have ascertained only the last occupation for members of each generation. Quite apart from the fact that this prevents us from gleaning anything about intra-generational movement, (a) it is impossible to infer the children's last status from the achieved status at a young age, and (b) this problem exists, even for the respondents (that is, adult heads of households), for with the increase of the length of a man's working life it becomes speculative to infer his final status from his achieved status,⁴⁹ particularly in a sample like mine which contains a large proportion of younger people (see my 'The Edgware Survey: Demographic Results'). To overcome this I should have had to whittle down my sample to the extent of rendering a meaningful analysis of social mobility impossible. As it is, I cannot present a refined and precise analysis, but can use my

ERNEST KRAUSZ

data to suggest the main trends and even to provide some comparison with other groups. Finally, there is the problem of the two different factors leading to social mobility: (a) the alteration of the occupational structure due to technological and social changes; and (b) mobility due to an individual's personal and social characteristics. This leads to the question of whether 'more or less occupational mobility takes place than can be accounted for by the concurrent changes in the occupational structure'.⁵⁰ I shall not deal with this question, however, for it matters little to the individual *why* he is moving up the social scale: his main concern is *whether* he can enhance his social status.⁵¹ While bearing in mind the problems mentioned above, let us look at Table V which presents the inter-generational social mobility figures produced by my sample enquiry.

The figures in Table V show that in the parental generation few were in professional occupations, and a substantial number were employed

TABLE V. *Inter-generational social mobility, Edgware Jewish sample*

Scale D categories	Respondents' fathers		Respondents		Respondents' children aged 15 and over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professional occupations	15	3.9	59	15.5	75	24.6
Employers and managers	83	21.8	161	42.2	25	8.2
Foremen, skilled manual and own acc.	195	51.0	124	32.5	51	16.8
Non-manual workers	18	4.7	22	5.7	41	13.4
Personal service and semi-skilled	65	17.0	6	1.8	17	5.7
Unskilled workers and remainder	—	—	1		3	1.0
DK and NR	6	1.6	9	2.3	94	30.3
Total	382	100.0	382	100.0	306	100.0

in personal service and semi-skilled work. The reverse was true of the present heads of households, among whom the proportion of employers and managers was double the proportion of fathers in that category. As for the respondents' children, trends cannot be seen clearly, particularly in view of the large percentage of those who have not yet decided what occupation they will follow. Nevertheless, the professional occupations show a tremendous increase. The small proportion of respondents' children in the employer-manager category is not surprising as entry into the latter is usually achieved at a more advanced age. Similarly, the many non-manual workers are made up of the younger age groups flocking to office work or becoming salesmen. Table V does not give us a clue to the differences in self-recruitment in the various categories, but we do learn from it that there has been a very large shift to higher status categories. The shift has been most accentuated towards the professional category.

Despite the difficulty, mentioned above, of comparing the 'achieved' status of our respondents with the 'last' status of their fathers, in order

THE EDGWARE SURVEY

to gain some idea of self-recruitment, I present in Table VI the distribution of respondents according to their own status and that of their fathers. I use a condensed form of the Standard Classification in the study by Glass.⁵²

Table VI shows that self-recruitment among Jews in Edgware was somewhat high in the upper categories. At the same time only 20.9 per cent of respondents whose fathers were in the lowest categories themselves remained in these low-status positions. The situation in the general population is not similar. Thus, in the investigation by Glass, covering Britain as a whole, a substantial degree of constancy between paternal and filial status is shown in category 5, where 47.3 per cent of the men whose fathers were in category 5 were themselves in that category.⁶⁴ For a similar category Willmott and Young⁵⁵ also show a higher degree of self-recruitment in the suburb of Woodford than seems to be the case

TABLE VI. *Distribution of Edgware Jewish heads of households according to their own and their fathers' status category*

Status category of fathers*	<i>Status category of respondents</i>						Totals	
	1 and 2		3 and 4		5, 6, 7			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 & 2	(68)	79.0	(15)	17.5	(3)	3.5	(86)	100.0
3 & 4	(45)	52.3	(33)	38.3	(8)	9.4	(86)	100.0
5, 6, 7	(100)	51.0	(54)	28.1	(42)	20.9	(196)	100.0
Total	213		102		53		368 ⁵³	

* Standard Classification: 1. Professional and high administrative. 2. Managerial and executive. 3. Inspectional, supervisory, and other non-manual high grade. 4. Inspectional, supervisory, and other non-manual low grade. 5. Skilled manual and routine non-manual. 6. Semi-skilled manual. 7. Unskilled manual.

among Jews in Edgware. Similarly, both in Britain as a whole and in Woodford self-recruitment in the upper categories is not as great as it is among Jews in Edgware.⁵⁶ This suggests that in the Edgware Jewish group while of those born into higher status categories more manage to stay there than is the case in the general population, at the same time proportionately greater numbers in the Jewish group are successful in moving from low-status to high-status categories.

It is true that overall figures, that is, of movement both up and down, show that there is slightly less mobility in the Edgware Jewish group than in the general population. Thus, in the latter, according to the Glass study, 64.9 per cent of the subjects moved to a status category different from that of their fathers.⁵⁷ Calculations based on Table VI show that in the Edgware Jewish group just over 61 per cent of respondents moved to a status category different from that of their fathers, but on the other hand, while in the Jewish group in Edgware of those who have moved, 90 per cent⁵⁸ moved *up* the scale, in the general population

of Britain the Glass study shows that those who moved up constituted only 39 per cent⁵⁹ of the total who had been mobile.

Although it is the case that Jews in general have shown a high degree of upward mobility which may be explicable by their being more thoroughly urbanized and having to overcome minority status,⁶⁰ the very high degree of upward mobility found in Edgware may be partly explained by a process of self-selection: the individuals who are more upwardly mobile may move to more expensive suburbs such as Edgware. If a comparative study were to be made of a less expensive suburb⁶¹ favoured by Jews, such as Ilford, one could test the hypothesis of self-selection. The district of Ilford would also be more appropriate for a comparison with Woodford. The last few points indicate the difficulties involved in trying to compare social mobility in different groups or districts. From one point of view, however, comparisons between Jews and non-Jews can be made validly. For although at present the socio-economic composition of the two groups is different (see Table I above), their starting points about two generations ago were not very dissimilar: the majority of Jews as well as Gentiles were then unskilled or semi-skilled workers.⁶²

I now consider another index of social mobility: movement not into another occupation but into a different district. The Duncans have demonstrated for Chicago that there is 'a close relationship between social distance and spatial distance'⁶³ and in a later study in Cleveland 'the results suggest that changes in residential pattern tend to occur for groups whose relative socio-economic status is changing'.⁶⁴ The ecological aspects of social differentiation in urban areas have in fact been stressed for some decades by both British⁶⁵ and American sociologists. Table VII presents the facts regarding the residential mobility of our respondents in Edgware.

TABLE VII. *Residential mobility, Edgware Jewish Sample*

	<i>Place of birth</i>		<i>Previous place of residence</i>	
	<i>Nos.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Nos.</i>	<i>%</i>
East End (incl. City)	200	53	68	18
West End	20	5	26	7
North London	39	10	84	22
North-West London	17	4	154	40
South London	6	1	7	2
Provinces	21	6	32	8
Abroad	79	21	11	3
Total	382	100	382	100

The information shows clearly that the most important move was out of the East End (where 53 per cent of the respondents were born, and

THE EDGWARE SURVEY

which is a low class former 'ghetto' area), and into North and North-West London (better residential areas), where 62 per cent resided before coming to Edgware. Even in the parental generation the move away from the East End and into North-West London was quite substantial. Thus only 8 per cent of the respondents' parents who were alive at the time of the enquiry lived in the East End, and 29 per cent lived in the North-West London areas. Of those respondents' parents who were not alive 21 per cent had as their last residence the East End and 4 per cent North-West London. These figures also reflect, however, the sequence of generations, in that the parents who are still alive belong on the whole to a younger generation who had a greater chance of moving out of the older areas of immigrant settlement. Of the parents alive none lived in eastern Europe, while of those not alive only 5 per cent had eastern Europe as their last residence. At the same time 65 per cent of the fathers and 55 per cent of the mothers of respondents were born in eastern Europe⁶⁰ and the respective figures for respondents' parents born in the East End are 22 and 25 per cent. Tracing, therefore, the socially ascending residential route over two generations, we move from eastern Europe to the East End of London, from there to some of the North and North-West areas of London, and finally to the suburb of Edgware.

The survey has also produced figures which suggest that there is a link between a respondent's occupational category and his background, that is, his own and his father's place of birth. Thus, there are substantially fewer eastern European-born respondents or eastern European fathers of respondents among professional people than among the other categories. Only 44 per cent of professional respondents had fathers born in eastern Europe against 73 per cent of employer-manager respondents. Again, only 2 per cent of professional respondents were themselves born in eastern Europe and 42 per cent in the East End, while 17 per cent of employer-managers were born in eastern Europe and 52 per cent in the East End. Conversely, 12 per cent of professional people had fathers born in other parts of London and the provinces, and 48 per cent of the professionals themselves were born in England outside the East End. The respective figures for employer-managers are 2 per cent and 25 per cent, and for 'the rest' 3 per cent and 22 per cent. The employer-managers seem, however, to show a preponderance of eastern European-born fathers and proportionately more of them (respondents) are eastern European than is the case in the rest of the lower categories. It is likely that while an eastern European background may to some extent be conducive to success in the business world, such a background, or even the background of the East End, is not very advantageous for rising to a professional occupation. Residential background and place of birth, as discussed here, are of course closely linked with immigrant status or first generation status, factors that may account, at least partly;

for a person's occupational and social status. As we have seen, however, the moves to better residential districts and to higher occupational categories have proceeded swiftly and have occurred concurrently. At the same time the shedding of immigrant status has helped further the upward social mobility of the Jew. All these factors have reinforced one another to hasten the ascent of the individual on the social scale.

Another factor which is stressed in studies of social mobility is education. One of the aspects investigated is often that of the educational opportunities available to the various sections of the community and the effect of such opportunities on mobility. This is seen, for example, in studies by J. Floud and H. T. Himmelweit.⁶⁷ As far as the Jewish group is concerned the aspect more often investigated is that of the attitude of Jews to education. Some studies have pointed to an emphasis on learning stemming from historical-cultural traditions⁶⁸ and have regarded this as an important contribution to the speedy upward mobility of the Jew. The results of the Edgware survey certainly show that the respondents interviewed displayed a very great desire for their children to acquire a university or college education. Thus, of the 200 respondents with children below the age of 15, 170 (or 85 per cent) indicated that they intended their children to go to a university or college. The great interest shown by respondents in the higher education of their children can be seen equally well from figures giving information not about mere 'intention' but about actual attendance at university or college and active preparation⁶⁹ to attend. Of a total of 306 children aged 15 and over, 75 (or 24.5 per cent) had attended or were attending university or college and 39 (or 12.7 per cent) were preparing to do so.

This is a most noteworthy achievement even if we remember that in this group over 15 per cent of the heads of households were professional people and 42 per cent were employers and managers (see Table IV above). Moreover, the fact that 85 per cent of respondents with children below the age of 15 had a positive attitude to university or college education indicates that the large majority of children in the sample had a home background favouring higher education. Such a background can have important repercussions on actual educational attainments⁷⁰ and must be regarded as an important factor in social mobility.

It is clear that the Edgware group has a very high upward mobility. This can be seen from the inter-generational occupational movements as well as from the residential shifts. I used these two criteria in order to learn something about the degree of such mobility. At the same time I looked at the attitudes of respondents to higher education to tell us something about one important factor—parental and home background—in social mobility. This is not to ignore other factors conducive to social mobility which exist in our group and which should also be mentioned—namely, a high degree of urbanization and the immigrant or the minority status of the members of the group.

THE EDGWARE SURVEY

Social class

In discussing social mobility I was concerned with the movement of individuals between various social positions. This certainly implied, although it was not clearly stated, that such movement could be regarded as taking place from one aggregate of individuals with certain social positions to another aggregate. These aggregates are in fact social classes⁷¹ and I now consider the social class structure of the Edgware sample. My investigation suggests that Jewish society in Britain follows a pattern similar to that of the general society so far as social classes are concerned. It will be difficult to accept, therefore, the conclusion reached by H. M. Brotz in his study of social stratification of a Jewish community in North-West London, that Jewish society is still essentially stratified into two social classes, the old elite and the rest.⁷² I shall return to this point in somewhat greater detail, but first let us consider the actual findings regarding social classes in the Edgware group.

Many sociologists have pointed to the possibility of investigating the social class system of a society by means of either objective criteria or subjective ones. The criteria may be 'relation to the productive process, source of income, and occupation' and 'may be observed and measured with some degree of objectivity'.⁷³ In the earlier part of this paper I have in fact applied in the main the objective criterion of occupation and have found a certain hierarchy (for instance, in Tables I and IV) which can be regarded as the class ordering of Jewish society in Edgware. On the subjective side the criterion may be one where we say that 'a person's class is simply what that person supposes it to be, or declares it to be when he is asked'.⁷⁴ I have used this latter criterion in Edgware, in addition to the objective approach. I now present my findings based on the question of 'what social class do you think you belong to?' and then correlate them with occupational distribution.

TABLE VIII. *Social class self-ranking, Edgware Jewish heads of households*

	No.	%
Upper	2	0.5
Upper middle	166	43.4
Middle	43	11.2
Lower middle	102	26.7
Working	31	8.2
DK	35	9.2
NR	3	0.8
Total	382	100.0

It is useful to compare these results in Edgware with those of a survey carried out in 1950 in Greenwich and Hertford.⁷⁵ In both cases (that is, Greenwich-Hertford analysed by P. M. Martin, and my own survey), high percentages of respondents attempted a self-assessment. In Greenwich-Hertford 96.1 per cent ranked themselves; in Edgware 90 per cent

did so. In both cases, despite the differences in the districts, only two persons assessed themselves as belonging to the upper class. As far as Edgware Jews are concerned this is not surprising despite the relative affluence of the group. Our survey confirmed the findings of Brotz in a study of another North-West London Jewish community, according to which the term upper class is reserved for a very small number of people regarded as forming the old elite or Jewish aristocracy: the families who were the leaders of Anglo-Jewry before the mass influx from eastern Europe.⁷⁶ Brotz also maintained that a high degree of egalitarianism exists among 'the rest', that is, those who do not belong to the old elite. This majority constituting 'the rest' have very similar backgrounds in both Brotz's and my own study—mainly Jews of eastern European origin who lived in the East End and moved through North London to the North-West areas of London; they have a similar occupational and religious background. At the same time Brotz pointed out that a process of incipient differentiation was developing. As far as the Edgware group is concerned there is limited evidence that this process of differentiation has reached a more advanced stage.⁷⁷ Although some of my respondents were more certain about the classes they thought they did *not* belong to, most of them displayed quite definite views and in the vast majority of cases were able to plump for one class or another (see Table VIII above). Many respondents, for example, who assigned themselves to the lower-middle class pointed out the differences between themselves and those they thought belonged to the upper-middle class. Not only did they think that the latter lived in different streets of the district or in larger houses, but they also pointed out that those people could acquire more prestige and attain positions of leadership in the local community. At the same time they often voiced their disapproval that money placed individuals into the higher positions, and the great stress put on character and behaviour and education as factors that should be the criteria of social class (see Table IX below) shows that there is resistance to the acceptance of wealth as a criterion of higher social status.

It is important to stress that the self-assignments and attitudes to social class were expressed within the framework of the Jewish group. The results and general picture gained might have been entirely different had our respondents been asked about the social class they belonged to within the framework of the general society in which they lived. For minority status, for example, may have a different effect on self-allocation to social class according to whether the individual sees himself in the perspective of the minority group or of the general society in which the minority is located.

When I compare my results with those of Martin's study, the essential difference that emerges is that in Edgware a much greater percentage of people assigned themselves to the middle classes. Thus, of Edgware Jews 81.3 per cent regarded themselves as belonging to the middle

THE EDGWARE SURVEY

classes and only 8.2 per cent said they belonged to the working class. In Martin's study the respective figures were 42.5 and 36.6 per cent.⁷⁸

If we look at the way my respondents assigned themselves to the various classes according to the occupational groups to which they belonged, we once again find similarities with Martin's results.⁷⁹ Namely, there is a gradual reduction, as we pass down the occupational scale, in the percentages who allocate themselves to the upper-middle class, and this is also generally true of the middle class. At the same time there is a corresponding increase in the percentages allocating themselves to the lower-middle and working classes. Again, as in the Martin study, while we find great unanimity of self-assessment by the professional group, the picture is not so clear when we consider the occupational group consisting of foremen, skilled, and own-account people. In the latter group 40.3 per cent assigned themselves to the upper-middle and middle classes and 47.6 per cent to the lower-middle and working classes. In the lowest occupational categories, however, there is greater unanimity, although not to the high degree found by Martin in Greenwich-Hertford,⁸⁰ where 51.7 per cent ranked themselves as lower-middle or working class and only 27.6 per cent as upper-middle and middle class.

Finally, I consider the attitudes Edgware Jews displayed regarding the factors they thought should place individuals into higher social classes.

TABLE IX. *Edgware Jewish heads of households indicating factors that should determine membership of a higher social class*

	<i>Nos.</i>	%
Ancestry	15	4.0
Money	21	5.5
Occupation	14	3.4
Leadership in the community	49	12.9
Character and behaviour	141	37.0
Education	92	24.1
Other factors	11	2.8
DK & NR	39	10.3
Total	382	100.0

As can be seen in the table, very little importance was attached to ancestry or money in the way of what respondents thought *should* ideally determine membership of the higher social echelons. Most respondents, however, said that in practice money plays the most important role in determining social class. It is rather surprising that they attached little importance to occupation. The three top places occupied by the factors of character and behaviour, education, and leadership, in that order, show that the norms which arose generally in traditional Jewish communities exist also in Edgware. The great importance attached to the first factor must be seen in the light of the minority status of the respondents. As Brotz points out, his subjects in North-West London looked up to those who knew how to behave and were generally refined.⁸¹ This is probably

linked with a wish to safeguard the good name of the minority.⁸² Education is a strong second choice and this is connected with the traditional respect for learning that Jews generally display. The importance attached to leadership in the community may have some bearing on the wish to safeguard the survival of the minority group; survival may depend on the kind of leadership that is available.

The results concerning the attitudes to social class determination analysed by occupational groups show that it was among the professionals that education received the highest percentage score, while leadership in the community had a higher percentage among employers and managers than in any other group. It may be simply that his training and practical tasks in these occupations orient the individual towards the kind of attitude which stresses education on the one hand and leadership on the other. We have no way of telling to what extent respondents gave the replies which they thought would fit the occupational groups to which they belonged. On the other hand 'character and behaviour' received an all-round high score—in all but the professional group it topped the list of factors. Of the entire sample, well over a third of the respondents thought that this factor should determine the social class to which an individual belongs.

Conclusion

A number of important points emerge. First, the Jews of Edgware have substantially larger proportions in the professional and managerial occupations than the general population of their suburb; 57 per cent are found in these two upper categories and 54·6 per cent rank themselves as upper-middle or middle class (43·4 per cent as upper-middle). The attainment of high socio-economic position as the objective criteria show, and of high social class as the respondents' subjective self-assessments show, are the most likely explanations for the smaller number of economically active people among men aged 15 and over. In other words high socio-economic position of parents is an incentive, both materially and spiritually, for children not to enter employment for some years after school but to study at college or university.

While a rapid rise up the socio-economic ladder has taken place, figures for industrial distribution show that to a large extent Jews have remained in the spheres in which they have traditionally thrived in this country. Thus, apart from an increase in their numbers in the professional and scientific fields,⁸³ the bulk is still to be found in the clothing industry, and in the distributive and service trades. As many as 73·5 per cent are in these categories (including professional service). Such concentration does not, however, prevent greater integration at work between Jews and non-Jews. The figures suggest that such integration has in fact taken place: of the heads of households who were economically active, 49·6 per cent worked mainly with non-Jews and only 12·7 per

THE EDGWARE SURVEY

cent with Jews. It is true that there is no simple assumption that we can make about the whole sample. Thus, on the one hand, the ratio of Jews to non-Jews in the country being very small (less than 1 per cent of the total population of Britain is Jewish)⁸⁴ one would expect Jews to be likely to work mainly with non-Jews. But, on the other hand, the large concentration of Jews in a few industries and trades⁸⁵ brought about a greater likelihood of finding Jews working with other Jews. The survey figures show that a factor conducive to Jewish identification, that is, segregation at work, has weakened in the case of the Jewish population of Edgware.

NOTES

¹ The first report, entitled 'The Edgware Survey: Demographic Results', was published in this *Journal*, Vol. X, No. 1, June 1968, pp. 83-100.

² *Special Census Tabulations, Scale D* for Edgware Ward in Hendon M.B., were supplied by the General Register Office, Census Branch, on 23 March 1964. Scale D is based on the 1960 Classification of Occupations.

³ The total number of Jews in Edgware is 7,000; my sample covered 1,290 persons living in 382 households; hence it constitutes a sample of 16 per cent.

⁴ This is based on the figure for the economically active population of the UK (1962) given in Table II and on a total UK population (1962) of 53,301,000. See for both figures the *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, No. 100, 1963, H.M.S.O.

⁵ See my 'The Edgware Survey: Demographic Results', *op. cit.*

⁶ The Census definition of 'economically active' is one that includes those out of employment. The Edgware Jewish figures, however, do not contain those out of employment. Similarly, the figures would be a little higher but for the exclusion of relatives living in the 382 households whose occupations were not ascertained. These deficiencies result only in a slight error as few people in Edgware as a whole are unemployed (the 10 per cent Census sample gives only 11 persons out of work in a working population of 927). Again most of the relatives, many of whom were elderly people, were retired. For these reasons the usefulness of the comparisons in Table II is maintained.

⁷ Of the 106 Jewish women in Edgware who are economically active, 17 (16 per cent) work part-time only.

⁸ See H. Neustatter in Freedman, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁹ See E. Krausz, 'Occupation and Social Advancement in Anglo-Jewry', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. IV, No. 1, 1962, p. 83.

¹⁰ See Neustatter in Freedman, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 125 ff. Furthermore, Neustatter states that the Anglo-Jewish survey was rather less reliable regarding occupational data than regarding information on vital statistics; see p. 124, *ibid.*

¹¹ Total in civil employment.

¹² Total employed excludes wives of heads of households and relatives. Few of the relatives, many of them widows, were in employment. Of the 36 wives of heads of households, the 17 in part-time employment and many of the 39 in full-time employment were 'helping' their husbands mainly in offices and shops. Incomplete information regarding the occupations of these groups necessitated their exclusion from Table III and the exclusion of male relatives from Table I.

¹³ See E. Krausz, 'The Economic and Social Structure of Anglo-Jewry' in S. J. Gould and S. Esh, eds., *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, London, 1964; N. Barou, *The Jews in Work and Trade*, Trades Advisory Council, London, 1945; and V. D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*, London, 1954, pp. 172-75.

¹⁴ See Krausz, *ibid.* See also V. D. Lipman, 'Trends in Anglo-Jewish Occupations', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. II, No. 2, 1960.

¹⁵ In the 1950-52 survey of Anglo-Jewry 21.4 per cent were found in the professions and the rest in trades (388 persons out of 1,813 in the sample). This figure is somewhat high, considering that

one expects to find a larger proportion of professional people in an upper-middle class suburb like Edgware than in the overall Jewish community in England. See Freedman, ed., op. cit., p. 125.

¹⁶ Carr-Saunders et al., *Social Conditions in England and Wales*, Oxford, 1958. The authors recognize the difficulty of finding a simple definition of a 'profession'. The difficulty is even greater when dividing the professions into 'higher' and 'lesser' categories. The authors, however, do make such a distinction and assign to the 'higher' group the medical and legal professions and to the 'lesser' group professions connected with industry and those which are auxiliary to the 'higher' professions. See pp. 107-108.

¹⁷ It must also be noted that directors of public companies were regarded as working on their own account.

¹⁸ See Carr-Saunders et al., op. cit., pp. 112-16, Table 9.5, p. 112.

¹⁹ See Table I above, and Carr-Saunders et al., *ibid.*

²⁰ See Barou, op. cit., p. 7.

²¹ See Neustatter in Freedman, ed., op. cit., p. 126.

²² See Barou, op. cit., p. 5.

²³ Of the 382 respondents, 255 worked on their own account, 116 were employees, and 10 were not employed (e.g., widows-heads of households); one respondent did not answer the question.

²⁴ See also Table IX.

²⁵ L. P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914*, London, 1959, p. 77.

²⁶ See Gartner, op. cit., pp. 90-93, and Lipman, *Social History of the Jews*. . . op. cit., pp. 106-108.

²⁷ Gartner, op. cit., p. 102.

²⁸ See Krausz, 'The Economic and Social Structure of Anglo-Jewry' in Gould and Esh, eds., op. cit.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ There is some evidence of a slight trend towards diversification of occupations among the younger generation of London Jews. See Krausz, *ibid.*

³¹ One respondent did not answer this question.

³² B. B. Seligman and A. Antonovsky, 'Some Aspects of Jewish Demography', in M. Sklare, ed., *The Jews*, Glencoe, Ill., 1958, pp. 70-73, 93; and B. B. Seligman 'The Jewish Population of New York City, 1952' in Sklare, ed., op. cit., pp. 101-104.

³³ A. Rubinstein, 'The Jewish population of the New York Area 1900-1975',

In The Dispersion, No. 3, Winter 1963-64, pp. 74-77.

³⁴ A. Chenkin, 'Jewish Population in the United States', in *American Jewish Year Book 1963*, Vol. 64, the American Jewish Committee, New York, 1963, p. 67.

³⁵ Using the Census social class classification I found that in Edgware 68 per cent of Jewish heads of households belonged to the professional and intermediate categories, the respective figure for England and Wales being only 18 per cent (see Carr-Saunders et al., op. cit., p. 116).

³⁶ Seligman and Antonovsky, op. cit., p. 70.

³⁷ Seligman, op. cit., p. 101.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁴⁰ L. Rosenberg 'The Demography of the Jewish Community in Canada', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. I, No. 2, 1959, p. 228.

⁴¹ C. Roland-Lowenthal, 'The Jews of Basel', *Sociological Studies Series*, Communauté, Paris, June 1963, pp. 31-33.

⁴² D. V. Glass, ed., *Social Mobility in Britain*, London, 1954, p. 5.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴⁶ D. Lockwood, 'Social Mobility', in A. T. Welford et al., eds., *Society*, London, 1962, pp. 509-20.

⁴⁷ S. M. Lipset and R. Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*, Berkeley, 1959. See also, for example, 'Jobs and Occupation: A Popular Evaluation', A Study by the National Opinion Research Center,' in R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, eds., *Class, Status and Power*, Glencoe, Ill., 1953, p. 411.

⁴⁸ See Glass, ed., op. cit., p. 182.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

⁵⁰ See N. Rogoff, 'Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility', in Bendix and Lipset, eds., op. cit., p. 444.

⁵¹ See Glass, ed., op. cit., pp. 188-89.

⁵² See Glass, ed., op. cit., p. 182 and Ch. II.

⁵³ The total of 368 excludes respondents in whose cases there was no information about their own or their fathers' occupation.

⁵⁴ See Glass, ed., op. cit., p. 182.

⁵⁵ See P. Willmott and M. Young, *Family and Class in a London Suburb*, London, 1960, p. 161.

⁵⁶ See Willmott and Young, *ibid.*, and Glass, ed., op. cit., Table 2, p. 183.

⁵⁷ See Glass, ed., op. cit., Table 3, p. 184. It should be noted that in the suburb of Woodford general mobility was rather low compared with the Edgware Jewish group or with the general population. In Woodford only over a third of the people have moved up or down the scale compared with their fathers' (Willmott and Young, op. cit., p. 82).

⁵⁸ The percentage is based on figures which exclude categories 1 and 7, from which movement in one direction only is possible.

⁵⁹ Glass, op. cit., Table 4, p. 184.

⁶⁰ Krausz, 'Occupation and Social Advancement in Anglo-Jewry', op. cit., p. 86.

⁶¹ In determining the relative 'expensiveness' of a suburb I use the criterion of the price of dwellings.

⁶² See Krausz, 'Occupation and Social Advancement in Anglo-Jewry', op. cit., p. 82.

⁶³ O. D. Duncan and B. Duncan, 'Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LX (March 1955), pp. 493-503.

⁶⁴ E. S. Uyekki, 'Residential distribution and Stratification 1930-1960', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXIX, No. 5, (March 1964).

⁶⁵ See D. V. Glass, *The Town*, London, 1935.

⁶⁶ The smaller proportion of mothers who were born in eastern Europe as compared with fathers, and a similar difference between respondents and their wives, is probably due to the relatively younger age-groups to which mothers and wives belong and consequently their greater likelihood of being born in England.

⁶⁷ See Glass, ed., op. cit., Chapters V and VI.

⁶⁸ See Sklare, ed., op. cit.

⁶⁹ To define 'preparing' for university or college I accepted the double criterion of children actually working for GCE A level examinations and an assurance from parents that this was with a definite view to taking up university studies.

⁷⁰ See Glass, ed., op. cit., p. 21.

⁷¹ For a definition of 'social class' see, for instance, D. G. MacRae, *Ideology and Society*, London, 1961, pp. 65, 66. For a

discussion of theories of social class see M. M. Gordon, *Social Class in American Sociology*, Durham, N. C., 1950, and L. Reissman, *Class in American Society*, London, 1960.

⁷² H. M. Brotz, 'The Outlines of Jewish Society in London' in Freedman, ed., op. cit., pp. 155, 162.

⁷³ J. B. Montague, *Class and Nationality*, London, 1963, p. 42.

⁷⁴ G. D. H. Cole, *Studies in Class Structure*, London, 1955, p. 3.

⁷⁵ F. M. Martin, 'Some Subjective Aspects of Social Stratification' in Glass, ed., op. cit., pp. 51 ff. This study was about the general population in these areas.

⁷⁶ See Brotz, op. cit.; see also his article, 'The Position of the Jews in English Society', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. I, No. 1, 1959, p. 107.

⁷⁷ It is possible that between 1949-50, when Brotz studied his group, and 1963 when my own survey was carried out, certain developments leading to greater differentiation took place. For one thing, this was a period of continuous in-migration into the North-West area from less affluent districts. It is probable that those longer established in the North-West areas would regard themselves as belonging to the upper strata as compared with the more recent arrivals. This factor might have been less important three or four years after the Second World War than it was in 1963.

⁷⁸ See Martin in Glass, ed., op. cit., p. 55.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 54, Table 3.

⁸⁰ See Martin, op. cit., p. 56.

⁸¹ See Brotz in Freedman, ed., op. cit., pp. 159, 171, 194.

⁸² E. Krausz, *Leeds Jewry: Its History and Social Structure*, Cambridge, 1964, p. 75.

⁸³ During the nineteenth century, and right up to a few decades ago, the number of Jews in the professions was relatively small—see E. Krausz, 'The Economic Life of Jews in Britain' in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, forthcoming.

⁸⁴ See Freedman, ed., op. cit., p. 76 and *Jewish Year Book*, London, 1962, p. 45.

⁸⁵ See Lipman, *Social History of the Jews . . .*, op. cit., and Gartner, op. cit.

AMÉRICA LATINA

The regional social science journal in
Latin America

Some recent articles:

A Sociologia na Argentina – *Gino Germani*

Movimentos Messiânicos no Brasil – *René Ribeiro*

Hacia un Nuevo Esquema de Composición de la Sociedad en el
Perú – *Carlos Delgado*

Modernization and Family Structure in the Region of São Paulo,
Brazil – *Bernard C. Rosen and Manoel T. Berlinck*

Efectos Mútuos del Desarrollo y de la Religión en América Latina
– *Luz Basaure Avila*

Social Science News—Book Reviews—Abstracts

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE LATIN AMERICAN CENTER FOR
RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES UNDER THE AUSPICES
OF UNESCO

Subscription for four numbers: US \$7.00

Back numbers still available at US \$2.00 each

The subscription includes, free of charge, the bimonthly bibliographical bulletin *Bibliografía* on the social sciences in Latin America.

**Caixa Postal, 12 (ZC 02)
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil**

BOOK REVIEWS

JACOB FREID, ed., *Jews and Divorce*, xiii + 208 pp., Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1968, \$5.95.

Recently the Commission on Synagogue Relations of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, by its Committee on Divorce, held a colloquium, representative of widely differing disciplines and interests, on 'Jews and Divorce'. Papers were read and discussions followed and are contained in this little book. Dr. M. M. Brayer, Professor of Biblical Literature and Religious Education and Consultant Psychologist at Yeshiva University, read a paper on Marriage and Divorce in Jewish Law, a devoted exposition or defence from the traditional viewpoint of that unhappy branch of the law, marred by some remarkable statements dictated by enthusiasm—such as that monogamy is 'the only type of marriage sanctioned by Jewish law, as inferred in the very first biblical story of God matching Adam with his one and only mate—mother Eve' (p. 2); or that 'the Jews regarded the Jewish mother as the ruler of the household' (p. 5). On the other hand, Rabbi Julius Kravetz, a Professor of Rabbinics at the Hebrew Union College, Institute of Religion, contributes a brief but careful paper on 'Divorce in the Jewish Tradition', writing from the progressive point of view. There is a paper by Dr. Nathan Ackerman, Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Columbia University, on the problems of 'Divorce and Alienation in Modern Society'. Mr. George Rothman, Executive Director of the Jewish Community Services of Long Island, gives 'A Family Agency View of Divorce', and Rabbi Seymour Siegel, Associate Professor of Theology at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, writes on 'The Jewish Tradition's View of Sex'. A group of workers of the Jewish Family Service Bureau, Cincinnati, contribute a survey of a number of divorces of Jewish and mixed marriages in Hamilton County, and an English solicitor, Mr. Malvyn A. Benjamin, contributes a brief sketch of the 'Incidence of Divorce among the Jews of England'. This includes some surprising statements, made without evidence being produced, and sometimes on the authority of the London Beth Din, such as that 'Perhaps the most startling fact concerning Anglo-Jewish divorce is that 75% of all Jewish divorces involve at least one member of the marriage being under 30 years of age. The figure is probably higher (about 90%) in the community if the non-religious homes are included' (p. 189).

But the more interesting paper is that of Professor Nathan Goldberg, Professor of Sociology at Yeshiva University, which is entitled 'The Jewish Attitude toward Divorce', but it is chiefly a collection of statistics of the frequency of divorce in Jewish and other communities of many lands at various times between 1897 and the present day.

The deficiencies of the evidence are probably well known. The principal sources of information on the frequency of divorce among Jews are two. One

BOOK REVIEWS

is the census of population, if marital status (single, married, separated, divorced or widowed) is given according to religion or ethnic group. Many or most countries, of course, including the United Kingdom and the United States, do not give it. Where it is so given, it is only at the date of enumeration, and persons divorced or widowed who have remarried are given as married. Consequently, the number of persons classified as divorced will vary, *inter alia*, with the rate of remarriage, and this is always unknown.

The second source of information is contained in annual reports of the number of divorces granted, if, again, the religious or ethnic group of the divorced is given. Where it is given, says the author, 'there is practically no way of ascertaining how many of those who had ever married were divorced in the year'.

There is a minor additional source of information in surveys of Jewish communities, but the numbers of these are small, very few were made at the time of a census of population, and they seem at present to be confined to small localities in the United States. The investigators use various standards and classifications and territorial boundaries different from those of the Census Bureau.

Of the two main sources Professor Goldberg uses the first—namely, the census data, and his method, he tells us, is to take as his measure of the prevalence of divorce the number of persons stated as divorced or separated per 1,000 living spouses, excluding in all cases widows and widowers. He calls this rate the 'index of divorcées'. Unfamiliarity with the French language is not uncommon, but here is a difficult obstacle for the reader to overcome. The word 'divorcées' is apparently used to denote all persons, male or female, whose last marriage, at the time of the census, has ended in a divorce or who are separated, so that the learned author can say, for example, that 'there was a larger percentage of divorcées among the women than the men', or that 'the index of divorcées of Jewish males in cities increased'. Sometimes he uses the word 'divorcees' (without the acute accent) but the meaning is apparently the same. There are misprints in various places in the figures—for example, '22 per 1,000' at p. 53 should apparently be '2.2 per 1,000', and the figures 11.3% and 10.1% on p. 68 are stated as 11.9% and 10% on p. 80—but subject to these difficulties there is a considerable amount of interesting statistical information taken from censuses at different dates in Russia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Prussia, Australia, Canada, Egypt, Morocco, and Israel, and from the local American surveys. He does not usually keep apart the figures of divorced and separated persons, though it seems that the available information would enable this to be more often done.

This method of calculation brings into high relief the importance of the unknown rate of remarriage. For example, everywhere and at all dates in Jewish and other communities, but especially the Jewish, the 'index of divorcées' for women is higher than for men—in most Jewish communities about double, and in the large cities of the Russian Pale of Settlement in 1897 and in Morocco in 1951 four times as high. This disproportion calls loudly for the explanation that husbands (especially Jewish husbands) have remarried more readily and easily than the wives, and especially in the larger towns (where, in addition, the 'index of divorcées' of both sexes is

BOOK REVIEWS

higher than elsewhere). These are ugly figures, and especially for a culture where family life has won so much praise.

There are other interesting figures in Professor Goldberg's paper, but the explanations—and this method calls for explanations—are not always convincing and can rarely be quantitatively informative.

A. S. DIAMOND

DAVID MARTIN, *The Religious and the Secular—Studies in Secularization*, xi + 164 pp., Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969, 30s.

We have by now become accustomed to being told—not least by some theologians—that modern man has 'come of age'. The characteristics of this modern man who enjoys this admirable quality are said to be perfectly obvious. He is a being who has learnt to stand on his own two feet, bravely refusing the artificial props of religion. His world, the only one he believes in, is the secular and he eagerly embraces the process known as secularization. He can get along quite nicely, thank you, without God, and if religion is not to go into even further decline it must learn to speak to him in his own language, which is only another way of saying that religion, too, must become secularized.

Dr. Martin, Reader in Sociology at the London School of Economics, is a religious man himself and yet he denies that he is not 'modern'. He is presumably one of those most affected by secularization and yet he cannot recognize that anything of the sort has happened either in his own person or in society. Martin holds that belief in God frees the mind for a healthy scepticism regarding man-made myths. The concept of 'secularization' is such a myth. Basically it is incoherent, attempting to account for diverse, even contradictory, phenomena. The whole concept has been invented, consciously or unconsciously, by those with an axe to grind. God is dead, it is argued, *ergo* secularization must be happening. The evidence is sought for after the theory has been accepted.

All this is argued for with clarity, wit, and force, and the thesis is convincing. Yet one has an uneasy feeling that Martin tends to dismiss all too readily the real intellectual difficulties that sincere religious believers often encounter when trying to understand their faith. He is helpful in reminding us that superstition is not by any means all on one side in the great debate, but the questing religious soul will not use the argument to avoid the grappling with real problems on the intellectual level, convinced that only in this way can faith emerge secure, refined, and triumphant in the kind of world in which we live.

LOUIS JACOBS

BOOK REVIEWS

PERCY S. COHEN, *Modern Social Theory*, xi + 247 pp., Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1968, 35s.

It is a regular cause for complaint among sociologists that so much of what passes for sociological theory amounts merely to a discussion of what form such theory would take if it existed. Such discussion may clarify the nature of society, or it may examine the conceptual bases of social thought, but rarely does it consider, refine, and develop anything similar to the general explanatory propositions of which theories in other branches of science are assumed to consist.

Percy Cohen's achievement is that he has done this rare thing. He considers different theories of integration and change and advances his own statement of theory in this field. Thus he advances five propositions to account for the persistence of societies. He reviews seven theories of social change, rejects the possibility that any one can be the whole truth, but, unlike so many other critics of such theories, goes on to suggest the conditions under which each might hold.

While using jargon with great facility and clearly being convinced of its general usefulness, the author is never prepared to allow it to cloud issues. Quite admirable is the way he takes basic concepts such as cohesion, solidarity, compliance, commitment, conformity, consensus, and integration, and proceeds to show that basic empirical questions such as 'Why do men continue to participate in social systems?' or 'Why do social groups continue to recognize themselves as such?' are at the heart of our concern with such abstract ideas. The prospect of empirical research to test theoretical hypotheses is not as remote as is so often the case in sociological theory. Dr. Cohen does not belong to those who limit sociological theory to the refinement of concepts. This is important because his unit of analysis is normally the most general possible in sociology, that is, any social system of whatever size and complexity. At this level it is notoriously easy to allow argument to degenerate into aprioristic discussions of the nature of any system of interdependent parts, human or otherwise. It is a level at which possibly only Simmel has been completely successful at offering both testable and interesting general propositions.

This is not to imply that Dr. Cohen does not have his meta-theoretical chapters. The first four fall into that category and it is a pity that they tend to be the least satisfactory. Indeed the first chapter is the most disappointing of all and the book improves with every chapter, as if there was a progressive feedback of inspiration as the book developed. What is said about the nature of sociological theory would have been more suitably placed at the end of the book, by which time the author would surely have said something more appropriate to the high level of theorizing he reaches. He might then have avoided defining scientific theory as 'a universal, empirical statement' and then talking about deducing statements from a theory. From a statement nothing can be 'deduced'. He might have avoided giving as the form of a theory asserting a *causal* connexion, 'whenever X occurs, then Y occurs'. Zetterberg, who is not referred to, deals with this subject much more adequately.

The chapter dealing with functionalism is also less than a fair comment on that school of writing. Quite rightly, Dr. Cohen stresses the logical difficulties involved in some of the functionalist formulations, but he almost

BOOK REVIEWS

completely disregards the substantive part of functionalist theory which is represented by attempts to ascertain the functional prerequisites of societies. He briefly mentions Goldschmidt's work and suggests that to argue that socialization is a universal process is no better founded than saying the same thing for the State, or magic, or the family. This seems an altogether too brusque a rejection of a whole class of theories about society. To say that a society's survival is always dependent upon the process of socialization is to make a true and non-trivial statement. To say that it is always dependent upon the family is untrue. Dr. Cohen does not like statements which refer to the survival of societies because he argues they never die in the sense that biological organisms do. But his argument is focused on social systems generally and it is easy to call to mind cases where communities, parties, primary groups, indeed any collectivity at the sub-societal level, have come to an end. In this connexion it is interesting that Aubert (whose book is reviewed below in this journal) offers different kinds of socialization as a basis for classifying social systems.

But these are minor cavils. This book represents the highest level reached in substantive sociological theorizing in British sociology. Perhaps its greatest oddity is its author's disclaimer of originality and his claim that there are too many original treatises already in this field. Surely there are too few. Certainly Cohen's book belongs to that number.

M. C. ALBROW

VILHELM AUBERT, *Elements of Sociology*, viii + 247 pp., Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1968, 30s.

Here is an introductory text on sociology with a difference. It is based on the assumption that the newcomer to the subject requires something more than a rag-bag of data about modern society. The result is a patient and systematic exposition of the basic concepts of sociology, demanding both perseverance and intelligence on the part of the student. In this respect it differs from nearly every modern textbook, though not, it should be noted, from earlier primers such as MacIver and Page, or Ginsberg.

Aubert takes the idea of the social actor as his starting point, and proceeds through the ideas of expectations, norms, and roles to the social system. He gives body to these ideas with numerous examples from everyday life, and the student should be left in no doubt as to the usefulness of the basic concepts. There are further chapters on social stratification and conflict and deviance, and the conclusion is made up of sociological pen portraits of selected social systems.

The first four chapters, up to and including the social system, rely heavily on Parsons. It is interesting to note how the famous defects of the Parsonian model of society are reflected at this more mundane level. 'A role is the sum of the norms which are linked to a certain task or position.' 'The social system . . . is primarily a set of roles between which reciprocally defined relationships obtain.' Corresponding to these definitions is the usual neglect of non-normative behaviour which is significant for the social system. Power

BOOK REVIEWS

is scarcely discussed, although power-holders appear as 'norm-senders'. Authority is not mentioned.

The discussion of social stratification is excellent. It owes much to the work of other Scandinavian authors, like Svalastoga and Carlsson, who seem to absorb both Marxist and scalar approaches to this subject with great skill. A minor cavil here might be directed at the omission of any mention of status groups. Undoubtedly this would complicate Aubert's exposition, but the student is bound to come across this concept at an early point in his study. The chapter on conflict and deviance clearly owes much to the author's interest in law, and correspondingly benefits.

It can only be a compliment to a writer to say that one wishes there was more of what he has to offer. In this kind of text the omission of any discussion of social change or development is unfortunate. Again it may be attributable to the influence of Parsons. It is a pity that Aubert seems so much in awe of him, even to the extent of presenting the pattern variables in the first chapter, since he is obviously able to argue his own way through the fundamentals. Indeed this becomes mystifying when he admits that the pattern variables do not exhaust the possibilities of schematizing behaviour. He must realize that this subverts Parson's claims to exhaustiveness. If Aubert really has new categories at this level of generality why does he not let us into the secret instead of merely hinting?

But none of these defects is such as to impair the value of the book for the novice. This reviewer will certainly make use of it in his own introductory course. His only fear is that he will be unable to find time for answering the extra amount of questioning to which Aubert is bound to stimulate the student.

M. C. ALBROW

HENRY LEVER, *Ethnic Attitudes of Johannesburg Youth*, xv + 192 pp., Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, 1968, R3.20.

In 1949 Professor I. D. MacCrone wrote that the pattern of race relations in South Africa is a direct reflection of the attitudes of the dominating Europeans towards other racial groups. Although the suggestion of a one-way causal link is debatable it is no doubt true that for the student of South African race relations, investigations of attitudes are of great importance. MacCrone himself published in 1937 a thorough and comprehensive book on race attitudes which remains the most extensive study of ethnic attitudes in South Africa, and followed this by many articles tracing at regular intervals the changes found in measured attitudes of students.

Other investigators have examined race attitudes of White South Africans (Herman (1945); Pettigrew (1960); van den Berghe (1962); amongst others) though on a more limited scale than MacCrone, and there have been some fewer studies of the attitudes of non-White South Africans. This recently published book by Dr. Lever is a valuable addition to the literature.

Dr. Lever reports the results of a study undertaken in 1959 into the ethnic attitudes of 2,302 White high school children in Johannesburg. This

BOOK REVIEWS

investigation was part of a larger study of Johannesburg youth undertaken by the Social Research Unit of the Department of Sociology of the University of the Witwatersrand. He used a version of the Bogardus Social Distance Test to gather data with reference to nine ethnic groups, including the three non-White groups of Coloureds, Indians, and Africans. His major variables were language group (English and Afrikaans) and type of school of respondents, sex, religious affiliations and fathers' education, occupation and place of birth.

The results of the study are not unexpected, although the degree of homogeneity of the Afrikaans-speaking sample is perhaps a little surprising. He presents the data on attitudes to each ethnic group in separate chapters, with good summaries of his major findings in each and a useful summary chapter at the end of the book. Generally he found differences in the rankings of ethnic preferences for each language group, and presents some suggestions to account for these differences in terms of the patterns of cultural and historic links between the groups.

One of the difficulties of this sort of attitude measurement which emerges from a reading of Dr. Lever's work is that the data presented can really only be related to other South African studies, and generalizations beyond the particular sample and location cannot readily be drawn. One exception to this lies in attitudes to Jews, since this is an area of research which has relevance to societies other than South Africa. It is perhaps not surprising that the chapter on attitudes to Jews should be the one in which most use is made of general theories of prejudice as a frame on which to present the Johannesburg data, and perhaps because of this wider relevance this chapter is one of the most interesting and comprehensive in the book. To a lesser extent attitudes towards Africans can also be related to other studies and to some explanatory system and this Dr. Lever has done, drawing on the work of MacCrone, in particular, to elaborate his findings. The other data suffer from the absence of a general theory of attitudes or a background description of the context of social interaction against which they can be understood and made meaningful. These sorts of explanation may be unnecessary for the expert in race relations or attitude theory, or even for a reader very familiar with the structure of South African society, but for the general interested reader they would certainly lend greater meaning to the findings. It is not clear, for example, why Indians should consistently be placed at the most distant position on the social distance continuum, further from the respondents than both Africans and Coloureds. It could be that the Indians are not regarded as indigenous to South Africa, and believed to have an alternative home country; it could be that they are as a community more professionally and materially successful than the other non-White groups; or again, since they are a non-White minority, aggression against the Black majority could be with greater safety displaced towards them; but the reader is not really enlightened as to which possible avenue of explanation would be the most profitable to explore.

It is tempting to suggest that race attitudes in South Africa have become institutionalized to a greater extent than in the United States or Britain. Discriminatory behaviour does not arise from an antagonistic attitude in the individual but is part of the legal regulation of social interaction. Explanations

BOOK REVIEWS

of prejudice towards the non-White groups cannot be couched in terms of the personality dynamics of the prejudiced individual, leaning on theories of authoritarianism or the resolution through various defence mechanisms of personal conflicts. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that there is no correlation between prejudice and F-Scale scores for South African subjects (Pettigrew). It is possible, however, that the evidence from the South African studies can lend support to the view that not all prejudice has a single or even common basis, and that rejection of the non-White groups and antagonism towards Jews may well spring from quite distinct sources; the first may arise from behaviour patterns learned and observed, from discrimination itself, the second could well be an expression of personality structure.

Dr. Lever gives some consideration to the question of ethnocentricity, of why some subjects reject ethnic groups and others are prepared to enter into close and intimate contact with them. Taking subjects at the extremes of the ethnocentric continuum, he used data from the Youth Survey to examine whether they could be contrasted in terms of family life, moral values, and outlook on the future. The only variable which discriminated across his total sample was moral values, and he found differences in the results obtained on the English and Afrikaans-speaking groups. This again points to the complexity of the problem of race attitudes and the need for the somewhat over-simplified explanations often offered to be revalued.

Ethnic Attitudes of Johannesburg Youth is an interesting book reporting valuable findings which are of importance in attempting to understand the structure of attitudes and race relations in South Africa. If it does not always offer adequate explanations of the results it contains, it certainly does present data and relationships of interest to the general reader as well as challenging to the theoretician.

BERYL A. GEBER

MARGARET STACEY, *Methods of Social Research*, The Commonwealth and International Library, x + 173 pp., Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1969, hard cover, 30s.; flexi-cover, 20s.

Few textbooks on the methodology of the social sciences have been produced in Britain despite the upsurge of interest and research in these disciplines since the 1950s. Apart from John Madge's comprehensive book *The Tools of Social Science*, which appeared in 1953, we have had only two more specialized volumes: C. A. Moser's *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*, 1958, and A. N. Oppenheim's *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*, 1966. I stress this point for two reasons. First, the lack of interest in methodology is surprising considering that traditionally the social sciences in this country have been steeped in empirical field work. Second, none of the textbooks so far has provided an easy introductory manual, a gap excellently filled now by Margaret Stacey's book reviewed here.

Mrs. Stacey's chapter dealing with the techniques used when examining existing documents about a research topic is most instructive. Frequently researchers are aware neither of the many sources of data readily available,

BOOK REVIEWS

nor how to use them when given the material. Again she gives an admirable account of the different nuances of the observational technique: participant observation in an alien culture; in different circumstances in one's own culture (that is, in a formal organization or in a locality); in a sub-culture of one's own culture; and, finally, non-participant observation. Her chapters on survey techniques do not come up to expectations despite her obvious competence in this field. This is due to the brevity of the whole book. Far too often we are referred to other more comprehensive and specialist texts. Mrs. Stacey does say in her introduction that subjects such as socio-historical research and sociometry are completely ignored. But other subjects included are also sometimes summarily treated. Considering how lucidly she presents difficult areas in research technology she could have put us more in her debt by producing a fuller treatment of the whole field.

To illustrate how brevity can produce possibly misleading statements, I choose her brief mention of the collection and handling of data on attitudes (p. 77). As an example of a *closed* question on attitudes the following much used group of five categories and codes is given without further elaboration: 1. Strongly agree; 2. Agree; 3. Undecided; 4. Disagree; 5. Strongly disagree. But in attitude-scaling these numerals are not simply codes; they are scores, that is, values. Hence if it is decided that a high scale score is to mean a positive attitude then for some questions, where agreement implies such positive attitude, the scores 4 and 5 must be allocated to Agree and Strongly agree; whilst for some other questions, where disagreement implies a positive attitude, the scores must be reversed. Again, to say without further explanation that 'People's beliefs and attitudes . . . are rarely written down, so that they cannot be found in documents' (p. 70) is startling.

Despite the few lapses the book is a must for all intending researchers. For it is not only an easy guide on basic techniques; it also sets the whole tone and approach to research as such in a finely balanced manner. Margaret Stacey accepts that we are unable to achieve complete detachment in the social sciences (I prefer to be more optimistic), and that in common with the natural sciences we are unlikely ever to get a set of final answers. Yet she argues cogently for exploration and hypothesis-testing, for replication and comparability. For, as she says, 'the frontiers can be pushed back, the exercise is worth doing, knowledge can be increased, and sometimes a really exciting breakthrough is made'.

ERNEST KRAUSZ

PETER ATTESLANDER and ROGER GIROD, eds., *Soziologische Arbeiten, Travaux Sociologiques, Sociological Contributions, I*, 349 pp., Verlag Hans Huber, Bern and Stuttgart, 1966, DM28.

This volume was compiled to mark the notable increase in social scientific teaching and research in Switzerland in recent years. 'There is no uniform doctrine holding this book together.' Contributors offer topics as varied as the sociology of traffic and inter-tribal integration in Burundi. There is an essay by René König on the teaching of sociology and one by J. B. Knox on

BOOK REVIEWS

the Swiss-American sociologist Albert Chavannes. The remaining articles are grouped into eight theoretical works and four research reports.

It is somewhat arbitrary to select items for special mention. Maurice Erard applies Gurvitch's method to the problem of constructing a typology of political parties. Michel Bassand and others look at the relations of technical and social systems in the metal industry in Geneva. Franz Hess shows that working-class children in Switzerland as elsewhere are at a disadvantage in school selection procedures. These will possibly be of the widest interest. The volume also contains a bibliography of Swiss sociology since 1945.

One must have some doubts as to the advisability of publishing such volumes. Since they lack a theme, what is contained is not readily identifiable. It is similar to a once and for all issue of a journal but, unlike a journal, the contributions will not be indexed in the standard reference publications. Could there be a better way of consigning work to oblivion?

M. C. ALBROW

CARLE C. ZIMMERMAN, *Sorokin, The World's Greatest Sociologist: His Life and Ideas on Social Time and Change*, xviii + 97 pp., University of Saskatchewan Bookstore, Saskatoon, 1968, \$1.00.

BARRY SUGARMAN, *Sociology*, Concept Books Series No. 6, viii + 98 pp., Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1968, 7s. 6d.

CAROL OWEN, *Social Stratification*, xii + 99 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1968, Cloth Edition 16s., Paperback 8s.

MICHAEL BANTON, *Roles, An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations*, ix + 244 pp., Tavistock Publications, London, 1968, Paperback reprint 15s.

There is something almost seventeenth century about Professor Zimmerman's title for a ninety-seven page memorial pamphlet to his friend Pitirim Sorokin, 1889-1968, with whom he collaborated on one of the first and best sociological 'readers', Sorokin, Zimmerman and Galpin, *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology* (3 Vols., 1932). It is useful, idealistic, ideological and has an excellent bibliography. Sorokin in my judgement was *not* 'the world's greatest sociologist': he was one of the most interesting, learned, ingenious, and variable minds in sociology. I am willing to wager that he will for years be alternately forgotten and rediscovered and that he will be pilfered from without acknowledgement. To a large extent such a posthumous destiny will recapitulate his fate in life. No doubt he and his friends and expositors—with the dignified and lucid exception of F. R. Cowell in England—protested too much and too loudly and attacked others too freely. But a subject is too big a thing for academic decorum to matter very much in the long run, and a man whose career touched the depths and heights of university life in imperial and revolutionary Russia and America should be forgiven much. There is a great deal that I personally value in Sorokin, and the reader will find some indication of nearly all of it here. In particular I value Sorokin's serious concern with culture as a concept of sociological

BOOK REVIEWS

discourse. Here, I believe, is our most important frontier of ignorance in the present state of the discipline. Sorokin, not only in his *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, was one of the first to cross it.

One enters a duller, more sober world when one turns to the pamphlets by Mr. Sugarman and Mrs. Owen. The first of these is an attempt to introduce sociology to sixth-formers. I doubt if it will much excite them. It is clear and orthodox in terms of the late 1960s—and so it should be, of course. And yet, even if excitement about sociology is not the most desirable thing for the young today when sociology is supposed to be a trigger of revolt, one feels that Mr. Sugarman might have breathed a little enthusiasm into his pages. Beginners in every subject should know that it is in part boring, but surely Mr. Sugarman could have unleashed a little more of the energy manifest on his last page. But this is a clear and workmanlike job.

Mrs. Owen, writing for first-year undergraduates on a narrower theme does so well that one wishes her little book were both longer and more up-to-date. It is weak on both the comparative and historical sides. The metrics of mobility and their problems are not dealt with sufficiently. Her data are even older than is necessary—and our data are always about yesterday. But this book does its job, and it is one that needs to be done: strongly recommended for its purposes. One cavil: one should not talk of 'life-chances' when expounding Marx. It is not just an anachronism to do so; it falsifies a non-probabilistic analysis.

Professor Banton's book on rôles, now reprinted, wears its four years lightly. It is comparative and at once both an introduction to some central perspectives of sociology and a work of real sociology in itself. I believe the vision of society as charade a limited one, and I would not try to build a general theory on it—or, like Professor Dahrendorf, place it at the core of a sociological theory of man. Yet, with learning and grace (how pleasant to meet Burnt Njal in a sociology book!), Professor Banton has given us a book that everyone can gain from, beginner and scholar alike. And it was high time the idea of rôle was taken away from the psychologists.

DONALD G. MACRAE

CHRONICLE

The Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies will be held on 3-11 August 1969 at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Working sessions will be held in the following five divisions:

- Division I The Ancient Near East as related to the Bible and the Holy Land.
 The History of Israel—Period of the First and Second Temples.
 The Dead Sea Scrolls.
 Archaeology.
- Division II Jewish History in the Middle Ages and Modern Times.
 The Jewish Labour Movement—its History and Ideology.
 Contemporary Jewish History.
 Jewish Education in the Diaspora.
- Division III Talmud and Rabbinical Studies.
 Jewish Thought and Kabbalah.
 Jewish Law.
 Hebrew Literature.
- Division IV Hebrew Language.
 Jewish Languages and Dialects.
 Jewish Folklore.
 Jewish Art.
 Jewish Music.
- Division V Research Projects:
 Bible Project; Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language;
 Hebrew Paleography; Jewish Law; Hebrew Bibliography;
 History of Zionism; Folklore; Index of Jewish Art; Institute
 of Hebrew Manuscripts; and the Yad Ben-Zvi Research
 Projects.

The following inter-divisional working sessions will also be held:

- Bible and Hebrew Language.
 Talmud and the History of the Jews.
 Jerusalem in the Light of the Recent Archaeological Discoveries.
 The History of the Jews in Modern Times (Sponsored by UNESCO).

Meetings are planned within the framework of Contemporary Jewish History (Division II) on the following subjects:

- (i) Jewish demographic surveys—objectives and results;
- (ii) Jewish communal institutions and organizations in the Diaspora;
- (iii) research on Jewish education in the Diaspora;

CHRONICLE

- (iv) the Holocaust—attitudes of governments and peoples;
- (v) Eretz Israel and Zionism.

*

The Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality published in 1969 its *Statistical Yearbook 1968*. It notes that the population of the city at the end of 1968 was 387,000, compared with 394,000 in 1963. It attributes the decline to the following three factors:

1. A drop in the number of live births; an increase in the number of deaths;
2. Migration to neighbouring towns (such as Holon and Bat Yam);
3. Young couples leaving the city at an increasing rate; in two years 4,000 young persons left the Municipality after marriage.

The authorities are trying to stem the flow by promoting the erection of new flats for young couples 'to be purchased on easy terms'.

There has been a decline not only in the birth rate, but also in infant mortality. In 1962 the infant mortality rate was 27·8 per thousand live births; in 1966 the rate was 23·5; and in 1967 it had dropped to 16·9. This rate is among the lowest in the world.

As for the increase in deaths, the Yearbook notes, 'As the percentage of elderly inhabitants is increasing rapidly, it is natural that the death rate will increase accordingly.'

Other items of interest are:

Housing

In recent years, the trend in housing has been towards more spacious accommodation. In 1960, 32 per cent of the city flats were one-room units; in 1968 these account for only 25 per cent of all flats. On the other hand, the percentage of three-room flats has increased from 21 in 1960 to 28 in 1968; while for four-room flats the rise has been from 5 per cent in 1960 to 7 per cent in 1968.

Consumer goods

The increase in the ownership of durable goods reflects the rise in the standard of living: for instance, whereas 18 per cent of the city's households had vacuum cleaners in 1965, the percentage had risen to 24 two years later (in 1967). As for private cars, 18 per cent of households had a car in 1967 compared with only 10 per cent in 1965.

Citizens Advice Bureaux

There were nine bureaux in the Municipality in 1968; they dealt with 158,000 applicants who were in need of information and guidance or who wanted to lodge complaints against various municipal services.

Religious services

Seven new synagogues were opened in the city in 1968, bringing the total up to 682. The Religious Council of the Municipality employs 135 rabbis; 78 are engaged full-time, and 57 part-time.

Hotels

In 1961 there were 31 hotels recommended for tourists, with a total of 1,408

CHRONICLE

rooms; in 1968 the number of tourist hotels had increased to only 34, but the total number of rooms in these 34 hotels was 2,233.

Education

In 1968, there were 441 educational institutions approved by the Ministry of Education in the city; the number of pupils was 88,300 and of teachers, 5,000. In the academic year 1968-69 there has been a 10 per cent increase in the number of children in kindergartens as compared with the year 1958-59. Over the same period, the increase has been 61 per cent in secondary schools, while there has been a 300 per cent increase in the number of pupils in municipal vocational schools. There has been a steady rise in the numbers of students from the Municipality in institutions of higher learning: 'from 4,500 students in 1965 to 6,200 in 1967-68 . . .'. More than a third of these students (38 per cent) are enrolled in institutions away from home—in Jerusalem and Haifa. On the other hand, only 43 per cent of the students at Tel Aviv University are domiciled in the Municipality.

*

The President of Tel Aviv University is reported to have stated in October 1968 that the University has 9,300 students enrolled for the session 1968-69; about 500 of these are from abroad. More than 2,000 applicants could not be accepted because there were no places available for them. The academic staff numbers 1,500.

In March 1969 it was announced that Tel Aviv University's budget for the academic year 1969-70 has been set at IL50 million. (The 1968-69 budget is IL40 million.) The University intends to establish a school for social work where students will follow a four-year course. The State urgently needs more social workers.

*

It was stated in Sofia last November that a new Ladino dictionary has been compiled by a Bulgarian Jewish scholar, Itzhak Modiano. The dictionary is said to have 16,000 entries.

*

The Director-General of Bar-Ilan University stated in London in May 1969 that the University has 4,200 students and 650 teachers; it has extensions in Ashkelon, Safed, and the Jordan Valley. Twenty-five per cent of the Israeli students are members of the Oriental communities in the country.

*

A centre for Jewish Studies has been established at the University of Chile in Santiago. It offers courses in the Hebrew language, in biblical and Hebrew literature, and in Jewish archaeology and history. The number of non-Jewish students at the Centre exceeds the number of Jewish students.

*

The Marseilles Jewish community now has the second largest Jewish population (after Paris) in France. It has grown from 12,000 in 1955 to over

CHRONICLE

65,000 in 1968. Last December a new centre, the Edmond Fleg Community Centre, was dedicated in Marseilles; one of its amenities is an auditorium named after the late Charles Jordan.

*

An independent association has been established in Israel to plan and develop the services for the aged. It has been pointed out that in the course of the last ten years the percentage of those aged over sixty-five years has risen from 4.5 to 6.5. It is further estimated that by 1980 8 per cent of the population will be over the age of sixty-five.

*

The chairman of the Executive Committee of the World ORT Union announced last February the adoption of a record budget of \$17 million. He stated that in 1968 there were 50,000 persons in 24 countries under training in various ORT institutions.

There are ORT-operated trade schools in 38 cities and towns in Israel.

*

The Cochin Jewish community celebrated last December the four hundredth anniversary of the establishment of their synagogue. The Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, attended the celebration. She also authorized a new postage stamp showing the interior of the synagogue.

*

In December 1968 the Spanish Government formally rescinded the 1492 Edict of Expulsion of the Jews, and acknowledged the legal entity of the Madrid Jewish Community.

On 18 December 1968 the first synagogue to be built in Madrid since the Expulsion was consecrated. The ceremony was attended by representatives of the Jewish communities of many countries, as well as by Spanish Government officials and the Lord Mayor of Madrid. The Haham of the Sephardi community of Great Britain represented British Jewry and the World Sephardi Federation.

A Mezuzah was affixed to the synagogue by the Vice-President of the Jewish Community of Madrid, who is a direct descendant of the Chief Rabbi of Toledo in 1492.

Attached to the new synagogue is a youth club, and a school where children are taught modern Hebrew and religious subjects.

*

The Jewish National Fund announced last December that it had reclaimed 20,000 dunam of land in the Golan Heights for the use of the ten Nahal settlements established there since the Six-Day War. Most of the land is already under cultivation, and some of the vegetables grown have been exported to Europe.

The JNF has built roads to link the settlements to existing main roads.

*

A Jewish Agency spokesman is reported to have stated in London last

CHRONICLE

January that 1,035 British Jews settled in Israel in 1968. This is the largest number of British immigrants for any one year since 1949. The figure does not include volunteers or tourists who took up temporary residence in the State.

Among the immigrants were 300 commercial and secretarial personnel, 57 teachers, 23 engineers, 20 doctors and dentists, 15 lawyers, and 14 computer operators.

Nearly a third of the olim (314) went to Ulpanim.

*

The Minister for Immigrant Absorption of the State of Israel stated that 8,053 persons immigrated to Israel in the first three months of 1969; the figure includes former residents who returned to the country after an absence of five years. The comparable figure for the first three months of 1968 was 6,197.

*

A million dollar 'palace of education' for the Jewish community of Buenos Aires was dedicated last April in the capital of Argentina. The ten-storey building is to house all Jewish educational facilities; a day school will offer a full Spanish and Hebrew curriculum; there will be an institute of Hebrew studies, a teachers' seminary, and a school to train kindergarten teachers. The building also houses a library, a Jewish arts and crafts museum, and an auditorium seating six hundred persons.

*

It is intended to hold a conference at Monash University, Melbourne, on 26 and 27 August 1969 on sociological aspects of Jews in Australia. A number of papers will be presented by Australian social scientists; it is hoped that some overseas scholars will be able to attend in order to make contributions and to participate in the discussions. Central to the proceedings will be a series of reports on the social surveys of the Melbourne Jewish community which were conducted by the Victoria Jewish Social Service Council in 1966-67. This conference will be held immediately after the annual conference of the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand which will take place at Monash University on 23-25 August.

Further particulars may be obtained by writing to the Jewish Social Service Council of Victoria, 466 Punt Road, South Yarra, Victoria 3141, Australia.

*

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Banton, Michael, ed., *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, A.S.A. Monographs 1, xl + 238 pp., Tavistock Publications, London, 1968; paperback reprint, 19s.
- Banton, Michael, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*, A.S.A. Monographs 3, xlii + 176 pp., Tavistock Publications, London, 1968; paperback reprint, 19s.
- Banton, Michael, ed., *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, A.S.A. Monographs 4, xlii + 156 pp., Tavistock Publications, London, 1968; paperback reprint, 19s.
- Bensimon-Donath, Doris, *Évolution du Judaïsme Marocain sous le Protectorat français 1912-1956*, 149 pp., publication of the École pratique des Hautes Études—Sorbonne, Sixième Section, Sciences Économiques et Sociales, Mouton, Paris and The Hague, 1968, 30F.
- Borowitz, Eugene B., *A New Jewish Theology in the Making*, 220 pp., The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968, \$6.50.
- Cohen, Hayyim J., *Twentieth Century Aliya from Asia and Africa* (Hebrew), 46 pp., publication of the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry (Moshe Davis, editor), The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Sprinzak Division, Jerusalem, n.p.
- Davis, Moshe; Esh, Shaul; Gottschalk, Max; and Levinas, Emmanuel, *Le renouveau de la culture juive*, 51 pp., Editions de l'Institut de Sociologie de l'Université libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, 1968, 60 Belgian Francs.
- Deutscher, Isaac, *The Non-Jewish Jew and other essays*, edited, and with an introduction by, Tamara Deutscher, xi + 164 pp., Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1968, 30s.
- Dushkin, Alexander M., *Jewish Education in the Diaspora—The Problems of Teachers and Teaching* (Hebrew), 95 pp., publication of the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry (Moshe Davis, editor), The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Sprinzak Division, Jerusalem, n.p.
- Ettinger, Shmuel, *The Conventional and the New in Modern Antisemitism* (Hebrew), 82 pp., publication of the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry (Moshe Davis, editor), The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Sprinzak Division, Jerusalem, 1968, n.p.
- Goldstein, Sidney, and Goldscheider, Calvin, eds., *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*, xvii + 274 pp., Ethnic Groups in American Life Series, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968, n.p.
- Halevi, H. S. and Cochavy, Z., *Hospitalization of Ophthalmic Patients in Israel, Survey and Analysis of Patients Admitted to the Ophthalmic Departments of General Hospitals, 1965-66* (translated from the Hebrew), 154 pp., Ministry of Health, Unit for Medical Economics and Statistics, Jerusalem, 1968, n.p.
- Halevi, H. S. and Handelsman, M., *The Institutions for Hospitalization and the Movement of Hospitalized Patients in the year 1967* (Hebrew and English), 64 pp., Ministry of Health, Unit for Medical Economics and Statistics, Jerusalem, 1968, n.p.
- Harrison, J. F. C., *Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America, the Quest for the New Moral World*, xii + 392 pp., Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969, 70s.
- Hurwitz, Samuel J. and Rischin, Moses, eds., *A Liberal in Two Worlds, The Essays of Solomon F. Bloom*, 219 pp., Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1968, \$5.00.
- Israel Society of Criminology, *Delinquency and Society* (Hebrew, with English summaries), 52 pp., Israel Institute of Criminology, Jerusalem, 1968, n.p.
- Kehrer, Gunter, *Religionssoziologie*, 158 pp., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1968, DM 3.60.
- Krajzman, Maurice, *La Minorité arabe en Israël, Contribution à une étude socio-démographique*, iv + 95 pp., Centre National des Hautes Etudes Juives, Brussels, 1968, n.p.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Landau, Jacob M., *The Arabs in Israel, A Political Study*, xiii + 301 pp., issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1969, 70s.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, *Revolution and Counterrevolution, Change and Persistence in Social Structures*, xiv + 466 pp., Heinemann, London, 1969, 63s.
- Litvinoff, Barnet, *A Peculiar People, Inside World Jewry Today*, 308 pp., Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1969, 50s.
- Mahler, Raphael, *Jews in Poland between the Two World Wars, A Socio-Economic History on a Statistical Basis* (Hebrew), 195 pp., The Dvir Publishing Co., Tel Aviv, 1968, n.p.
- McKenzie, Robert and Silver, Allan, *Angels in Marble, Working Class Conservatives in Urban England*, xi + 295 pp., Heinemann, London, 1968, 50s.
- Mitscherlich, Alexander, *Society without the Father, A Contribution to Social Psychology*, trans. Eric Mosbacher, xi + 329 pp., Tavistock Publications, London, 1969, 60s.
- Olitzky, Josef, *The Workers in the Six-Day War* (Hebrew), 191 pp., General Federation of Labour in Eretz-Israel, Tel Aviv, 1968, n.p.
- Qualey, Carlton C., ed., *Thorstein Veblen, The Carleton College Veblen Seminar Essays*, xiii + 170 pp., Columbia Univ. Press, New York and London, 1968, 54s.
- Rogers, Rolf E., *Max Weber's Ideal Type Theory*, x + 109 pp., Philosophical Library, New York, 1969, \$4.50.
- Ruppin, Arthur, *My Life and Work, The Autobiography and Diaries of Arthur Ruppin* (in Hebrew, translated from the German), 3 volumes, Am Oved Publishers, Tel Aviv, 1968, n.p.
- Senior, Clarence and Bernard, William S., eds., *Toward Cultural Democracy*, 173 pp., Selected Academic Readings, New York, 1968, \$3.50.
- Stein, Leonard, ed., in collaboration with Yogev, Gedalia, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Series A, Letters, Volume I, xlii + 477 pp., Oxford Univ. Press, London, 63s.
- Steinbach, A. Alan, ed., *Jewish Book Annual, Volume 26, 1968* (English and Hebrew), v + 252 pp., Jewish Book Council of America, New York, 1968, \$4.00
- Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, *Tax-Payment in Advance*, Research and Statistical Department, Special Survey No. 28, xxxvi + 64 pp. (Hebrew and English), August 1968, n.p.
- Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, *Post Primary Education in Tel Aviv-Yafo (1964-1967)*, Research and Statistical Department, Special Survey No. 29, xxiii + 41 pp. (Hebrew and English), October 1968, n.p.
- Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, *Registered Patients in Municipal Clinics (Census 1967)*, Research and Statistical Department, Special Survey No. 30, xxxii + 56 pp. (Hebrew and English), December 1968, n.p.
- Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, *Private Lessons for Secondary School Students*, Research and Statistical Department, Special Survey No. 31, xxxviii + 62 pp. (Hebrew and English), December 1968, n.p.
- Weinberg, Werner, *Die Reste des Jüdischdeutschen*, 116 pp., W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1969, n.p.
- Wyman, David S., *Paper Walls, America and the Refugee Crisis 1938-1941*, xiii + 306 pp., The Univ. of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1968, \$6.00.
- Zweig, Ferdynand, *Israel: the Sword and the Harp*, ix + 326 pp., Heinemann, London, 1969, 50s.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

- COHEN, Erik; Ph.D., Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Chief publications: co-author, 'Collective Settlements in the Negev' in J. Ben-David (ed.), *Agricultural Planning and Village Community in Israel*, UNESCO, 1963; *Bibliography of the Kibbutz*, Givat Haviva, 1966; 'Progress and Communitarity, Value Dilemmas in the Collective Movement', *International Review of Community Development*, 15-16, 1966; 'Social Images in an Israeli Development Town', *Human Relations*, 21, 1968. Currently engaged in a field study of Ayacucho, Peru, financed by a grant from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- COHEN, Hayyim J.; Ph.D., Lecturer, Hebrew University of Jerusalem; formerly in the Research Department of the Foreign Office, Jerusalem. Chief publications: 'Jewish Theosophists in Basra' (in Hebrew), in *Hamizrah Hehadash* (The New East), vol. XV, no. 4, 1965; 'Note on Social Change among Iraqi Jews, 1917-1951' in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. VIII, no. 2, 1966; *Twentieth Century Aliya from Asia and Africa* (in Hebrew), The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1968; *Zionist Activity in Iraq* (in Hebrew), in press. Currently engaged in completing a book entitled *Contemporary History of the Jews in the Middle East*.
- KRAUSZ, Ernest; M.Sc. (Econ.), Ph.D., Lecturer in Sociology, The City University, London. Held Nuffield Foundation Sociological Research Scholarship at the London School of Economics, 1961-1964. Chief publications: *Leeds Jewry: Its History and Social Structure*, 1964; 'Occupation and Social Advancement in Anglo-Jewry', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. IV, no. 1, 1962; contributor to J. Gould and S. Esh (eds.), *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, 1964; 'The Edgware Survey: Demographic Results', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. X, no. 1, 1968. His book, *Sociology in Britain—A Survey of Research*, is to be published in the Foundations of Modern Society series by Batsford in the autumn of 1969.
- LIPPMANN, Walter M.; Chairman, Jewish Social Service Council of Victoria; Executive Vice President, Federation of Australian Jewish Welfare Societies. Chief publications: 'Demography of Australian Jewry', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. VIII, no. 2, 1966; *Melbourne Jewry—Failure of a Generation*, Melbourne, 1968; 'Multiculturalism in Australia', *The Bridge*, Sydney, vol. IV, no. 2, 1969. Currently engaged in a sociological study of the Jewish Community of Melbourne.
- MAGNARELLA, Paul J.; B.S., M.A., Teaching Fellow in the Social Relations Department of Harvard University. Chief publications: 'Regional Voting in Turkey', *Muslim World*, vol. 57, nos. 3-4, 1967; 'The Turkish Bridewealth Practice in Transition', *Muslim World*, scheduled for vol. 59, no. 2, 1969.
- ROSENTHAL, Erich; M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, Queens College of the City University of New York. Formerly Professor of Sociology,

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

University of Iowa, and Research Associate, University of Chicago. Chief publications: 'Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States', *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 64, 1963; 'Acculturation Without Assimilation? The Jewish Community of Chicago, Illinois', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 66, November 1960, reprinted in T. E. Lasswell et al. (eds.), *Life and Society, Introductory Readings in Sociology*, 1965; 'Jewish Fertility in the United States', *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 62, 1961, reprinted in *Eugenics Quarterly*, vol. 8, December 1961, and in Charles B. Nam (ed.), *Population and Society*, 1968; 'Jewish Intermarriage in Indiana', *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 68, 1967, reprinted in *Eugenics Quarterly*, vol. 15, no. 4, December 1968; 'This Was North Lawndale: The Transplantation of a Jewish Community in Chicago, Illinois', *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 22, April 1960, to be reprinted in *Jewish Social Studies Reader*, 1969. Currently engaged in preparing a study of the effect of previous marital status (especially divorce) upon subsequent intermarriage.

SHMUELI, Efraim; Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy and Religion, Cleveland State University, Ohio. Formerly Dean of the Teachers' Training College, Haifa. Chief publications (all in Hebrew): *Tradition and Revolution*, New York, 1942; *History of the Jewish People in Modern Times* (7 vols.), Tel Aviv, 1941-1958; *Men of the Renaissance* (2 vols.), Tel Aviv, 1954; *Faith and Heresy*, Tel Aviv, 1961; *Don Isaac Abravanel and the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain*, Jerusalem, 1963; *The House of Israel and the State of Israel*, Tel Aviv, 1966.