

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME XIII NO. 2

DECEMBER 1971

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Jewish Identification among Students at Oxford | |
| | <i>Bernard Wasserstein</i> 135 |
| The Berkeley Hillel and the Union of Jewish Students: The History of a Conflict | <i>Matthew Maibaum</i> 153 |
| Education and the Under-Privileged in Israel | <i>Tessa Blackstone</i> 173 |
| Register of Social Research on Anglo-Jewry, 1968-71 | <i>Marlena Schmool</i> 189 |
| The New York Kehillah, 1908-22 (Review Article) | <i>Lloyd P. Gartner</i> 197 |
| Student Revolt and Generational Conflict: Phantasy and Reality (Review Article) | <i>Percy S. Cohen</i> 205 |
| Book Reviews | 219 |
| Correspondence | 242 |
| Chronicle | 245 |
| Books Received | 251 |
| Notes on Contributors | 253 |

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY

on behalf of the World Jewish Congress
by William Heinemann Ltd

Annual Subscription £1.40 (U.S. \$4) *post free*
Single Copies 75p (\$2.25)

*Applications for subscription should be addressed to the Managing Editor,
The Jewish Journal of Sociology, 55 New Cavendish Street, London W1M 8BT*

EDITOR Maurice Freedman
MANAGING 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 1971

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> |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|
| Raymond Boudon | <i>The Uses of Structuralism</i> | M. Freedman | 228 |
| Max Brod | <i>Paganism—Christianity—Judaism</i> | L. Jacobs | 223 |
| Alexander M. Dushkin | <i>Comparative Study of the Jewish Teacher Training Schools in the Diaspora</i> | H. Levy | 235 |
| Orlando Fals Borda | <i>Subversion and Social Change in Colombia</i> | S. Andreski | 234 |
| Lewis S. Feuer | <i>The Conflict of Generations</i> | P. Cohen | 205 |
| Eugène Fleischmann | <i>Le Christianisme 'Mis à Nu'</i> | D. Martin | 224 |
| John A. Garrard | <i>The English and Immigration</i> | M. Beloff | 236 |
| Lloyd P. Gartner, ed. | <i>Jewish Education in the United States</i> | H. Levy | 234 |
| John D. Gay | <i>The Geography of Religion in England</i> | B. Wilson | 225 |
| Arthur A. Goren | <i>New York Jews and the Quest for Community</i> | L. Gartner | 197 |
| Jacques Gutwirth | <i>Vie juive traditionnelle</i> | M. Freedman | 237 |
| Jurgen Habermas | <i>Toward a Rational Society</i> | P. Cohen | 205 |
| Simon N. Herman | <i>American Students in Israel</i> | P. Rieff | 238 |
| Israel Katz and Harold Silver, eds. | <i>The University and Social Welfare</i> | P. Cohen | 205 |
| Michael Lanc, ed. | <i>Structuralism, A Reader</i> | M. Freedman | 228 |
| Ezra Mendelsohn | <i>Class Struggle in the Pale</i> | H. Shukman | 229 |
| J. D. Y. Peel | <i>Herbert Spencer, The Evolution of a Sociologist</i> | M. Albrow | 231 |
| Armstead L. Robinson et al, eds. | <i>Black Studies in the University</i> | P. Cohen | 205 |
| Aileen D. Ross | <i>Student Unrest in India</i> | P. Cohen | 205 |
| V. D. Segre | <i>Israel: A Society in Transition</i> | A. Weingrod | 232 |
| Max Vorspan and Lloyd P. Gartner | <i>History of the Jews of Los Angeles</i> | V. Lipman | 219 |
| Meyer W. Weisgal, gen. ed. | <i>The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann</i> | J. Parkes | 239 |
| F. Wilder-Okladek | <i>The Return Movement of Jews to Austria After the Second World War</i> | M. Schmool | 240 |
| Bryan Wilson | <i>Religious Sects, A Sociological Study</i> | B. Scharf | 227 |
| Betty Yorburg | <i>Utopia and Reality</i> | P. Cohen | 205 |

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Papers submitted to *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* should be addressed to the Managing Editor at 55, New Cavendish Street, London, W1M 8BT. 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.

JEWISH IDENTIFICATION AMONG STUDENTS AT OXFORD

Bernard Wasserstein

Really, there is no such thing as 'the Jewish student' in Britain. At rare times, a corporate presence is established. The student campaign for Soviet Jewry may attract to its marches between a thousand and three thousand students; crisis situations for Israel will bring a large number of students into the streets.

But the way to understand our students is to see them as individuals, defined by politics, by the economy, by the pressures of general society far more than by their relationship to the Jewish community.

THIS conclusion¹ by a former chairman of the Universities' Joint Chaplaincy Commission touches one of the most exposed nerves of Anglo-Jewry today. Never before has there been such concern with the problem of Jewish students, and above all with the problem of maintaining their specific Jewishness. At a time when Anglo-Jewry sees itself shrinking in numbers, through the growth of intermarriage, the end of immigration, and the excess of the death over the birth rate,² the religious leadership of the community has become more than ever interested in developing the quality and intensity of Jewish education at all levels, and especially in halting the apparent drift away from Judaism amongst Jewish students at universities. Since his appointment in 1966 Chief Rabbi Jacobovits has paid visits to a large number of university Jewish societies, chaplains have been appointed to a few universities, a new Hillel House has been opened in London, and another is planned for Oxford. It is too early yet to assess the results of these efforts, which are for the most part still small-scale and restricted in scope and budget. But they are all symptoms of Anglo-Jewry's profound malaise about its future, and its fear that the effective withdrawal from the Jewish community of large sections of the best educated of its youth will lead by the avenues of intermarriage and assimilation to the decline if not the extinction of the Jewish community in England.

Parallel with this spiritual-cum-social concern on the part of the religious leadership runs a similar *political*-cum-social concern with the Jewishness of Jewish students on the part of Zionist leadership. Hence the foundation by the Zionist Federation of Jewish day schools in Britain,

the encouragement of Israel Societies (the word 'Zionist' is apparently no longer quite respectable) at several universities, the organization of Hebrew seminars and cheap trips to Israel for Jewish students, all designed, like the activity of the specifically religious organizations, to try to maintain the Jewish national and spiritual awareness of educated Jewish youth on which the survival of the Anglo-Jewish community seems to depend. Zionist activity in the universities has been given a particular impetus both by the after-effects of the Six-Day War, during which thousands of Jewish students volunteered to go to Israel, and by the desire to counteract anti-Israeli propaganda from the extreme left, which has attained considerable proportions and a certain success in British universities as elsewhere.

In all this, as in other spheres of their activity, Anglo-Jewish communal workers have been hampered by ignorance of crucial facts about the objects of their endeavours—in this case, Jewish students: just as the exact size of the Jewish community in Britain was until recently computed on a basis which amounted to little more than optimistic guesswork (a method which recent research has shown to have resulted in a consistent over-estimate of the Anglo-Jewish population by at least 10 per cent)³, so nobody is sure today how many Jewish students there are in Britain. The Inter-Universities Jewish Federation had about 4,000 affiliated members in Jewish societies in British universities in 1970; but, of course, there are very many Jewish students who never join Jewish student societies. Even in particular universities there is frequently no clear idea of how many Jewish students there are. For example, at Oxford (the membership of whose Jewish society fluctuates between 100 and 200) it has been customary for many years to cite the figure of '500 or 600 Jewish students' in the university. In fact the true figure is almost certainly between 300 and 400. Is this frequent Jewish tendency to numerical self-aggrandizement another symptom of minority unease?

If we move from the realm of pure numbers into other regions, we find that even less is known about Jewish students in England, in particular about their religious, social, and political attitudes. A recent study by Mrs Vera West⁴ has, however, shown that there is a strong movement among Jewish students away from Jewish commitment. On the basis of a study of 155 Jewish students (that is, students with at least one Jewish parent) at several universities, Miss West demonstrated that, although a majority of students accepted the standards of their parents in religious matters, the large minority who rebelled against parental standards of Jewishness almost invariably moved in an assimilationist direction. Thus, of 41 whose views on intermarriage differed from those of their parents, 39 were more favourably inclined towards it, and of 50 whose standards of religious practice differed from those of their parents, 46 were less orthodox. It is worth noting that two startling, although tentative, results of Mrs West's survey are largely confirmed by the

OXFORD STUDENTS

present study. First, she discovered that orthodoxy of *belief* is declining even faster than orthodoxy of *practice*; 13 of those who told her that they were observant said that they did not believe in God, including eight who said they were orthodox. Second, she found that the 13 former Jewish secondary school pupils in her group of interviewees were *more* disposed to reject Jewish religion than those from similar backgrounds who did *not* attend Jewish schools!

The present study⁵ attempts to build on the foundations of the little which is at present known about the outlook of Anglo-Jewish students. It is based on a survey carried out in Oxford in June 1970. The main purpose of this survey was to attempt to measure the extent and nature of Jewish identification—religious, social, and political—among Jewish students at Oxford. What is said here about Oxford applies (as usual) in almost equal measure to Cambridge. In spite of certain important differences between the two ancient universities and other British universities, including some of direct relevance to the subject of Jewish students which are noted below, most of the broad conclusions of this survey of Jewish student attitudes at Oxford may be held to be representative of Anglo-Jewish student attitudes in general.

Oxford itself, although the home of a significant Jewish settlement in the medieval period, has today only a negligible Jewish community; almost all Jewish students therefore come from outside the city. Almost all undergraduates live and eat in their colleges for one or two years; in their final year many live outside the college in lodgings; there are next to no Jewish lodgings in Oxford, and there is no residential 'Hillel House' of the kind which exists in some other university towns. Similarly, the majority of postgraduate students live either in college or university hostels, or in rented rooms. Thus all Jewish students at Oxford almost inevitably live for the entire duration of their studies at the university in a predominantly non-Jewish environment. In this Oxford differs greatly from London or Glasgow universities, where a large proportion of Jewish students live in their parental homes, or such universities as Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, and Birmingham, which have large indigenous Jewish populations close by, and as a result Jewish lodgings, Jewish communal institutions and activities, and sometimes residential 'Hillel Houses'.

One consequence is that the number of strictly orthodox Jewish students who apply for Oxford (or Cambridge) is proportionately lower than the number applying for London (or perhaps Manchester),⁶ since by going to university in their home town strictly orthodox students can continue to practise with a minimum of inconvenience and the least distraction such rituals as *kashrut* and Sabbath observance. Orthodox parents, concerned about the 'dangers' (as they see them) of exposing their children to the alien world of the university, but concerned nevertheless that they should enjoy the fullest opportunities for 'getting

on' (generally in the professions), frequently resolve the dilemma by sending the children to their home town universities (that is, in most cases London or Manchester) and insisting on their living at home for the duration of their studies.⁷ Failing this they will generally try to send the children to a university situated in a town with a large Jewish community. Oxford University which (like Cambridge) possesses neither this nor any adequate institutions designed specifically for Jewish students will be viewed by Orthodox parents with a certain suspicion. Hence the lower proportion of Orthodox Jewish students at Oxford than at most of the other British universities which have large student bodies. But, of course, the number of strictly orthodox Jewish families in Britain is very small in relation to the Jewish population as a whole. The mass of Jewish students in all universities in this country comes from homes which are at most only nominally orthodox; and in this Oxford differs little from elsewhere. Oxford does differ from most other universities in the high proportion of students drawn from public schools. As will be seen, a slightly smaller proportion of Jews than of Gentiles at Oxford are drawn from public schools, but it is still true that the number of Jewish public schoolboys is proportionately much higher at Oxford and Cambridge than elsewhere. In general, in spite of the differences noted above, Jewish students at the two ancient universities are probably much the same as their fellows elsewhere in background and outlook. Whether their educational levels and future prospects are also similar, given the continuing academic and social pre-eminence of Oxbridge in English higher education, is more difficult to assess. What is certain is that whatever we can learn about Jewish students at Oxford will yield valuable information about the character and outlook (as well as the prospects for survival as a distinct entity) of the future Anglo-Jewish élite.

This survey was based on an analysis of 133 questionnaires completed by Jewish students at Oxford at the end of the academic year 1969-70. These represent 51 per cent of an original total of 260 questionnaires sent to all known Jewish students in Oxford. An additional 20 of those returned were found to be from non-Jews, persons with a Jewish father and a non-Jewish mother, or were not completed, and these were therefore excluded from the analysis. It is, of course, important to consider to what extent the results of a survey based on such evidence can be regarded as representative. How far did the selection of the original 260 persons who received the questionnaire bias the outcome? And to what extent may the very large minority who did not return the questionnaire be held to differ in their attitudes from those who did? Mr. Emanuel J. de Kadat⁸ has pointed out that there are two related but distinct problems in research of this kind: the first is one of *definition*, the second one of *location*. The problem of 'Who is a Jew?' has taxed the keenest legal and historical minds in the Jewish world;⁹ it is not proposed

here to enter into a talmudical discussion of 'Who is a Jewish student?'. For the purpose of this study two different attitudes were adopted at two stages of the survey. At the initial stage, an *inclusive* attitude was adopted; all those who were identified in any way as Jews were included and were therefore sent copies of the questionnaire. For this purpose the membership lists of the Oxford University Jewish Society, the O.U. Israel Society, and the O.U. Choolant Society (a Jewish dining society which exists 'to savour the delights of choolant') were utilized. But, of course, these yielded the names of only a minority of Jewish students in Oxford, since most Jewish students in Oxford at any one time are not members of any Jewish society. In addition, therefore, all other possible sources were drawn upon. The representatives of the Jewish Society in every individual college supplied lists of all Jewish students, whether or not members of the society; the University Jewish Chaplain supplied a list of all Jewish students known to him, itself based partly on lists supplied by the (non-Jewish) chaplains and deans of the various individual colleges; all Israeli students in Oxford (who have a kind of *Landsmannschaft*) were included, as were students listed in official university publications as having attended Jewish schools such as Carmel College; finally, all students listed in the University Calendar having 'unmistakably' Jewish names such as Cohen or Levy or Bueno de Mesquita were included. The last criterion is, of course, the most questionable and was the one most carefully employed. As cognoscenti of both Association Football and the Anglican Episcopate will confirm, a Jewish name is by no means a sure indicator of Jewish faith. Yet Bishop Montefiore (like Disraeli) calls himself, and is in some sense regarded by his contemporaries (Jewish and non-Jewish), as a Jew. The very retention of a strikingly Jewish name such as Cohen can perhaps be regarded as a form of Jewish identification, just as the anglicization of such names is a sign of assimilation. Clearly (and as the Israeli Government has found to its cost), it is unrealistic to lay down hard-and-fast criteria of 'Jewishness'. The inclusive approach (which is both the most realistic and the most humane) yielded a presumed total of 260 students at Oxford who either identified themselves or were susceptible of identification by others as Jews, and it was to these that the questionnaire was directed. As de Kadt demonstrated, however, the results of a survey based on this kind of sample are liable to be biased; clearly if we are *measuring* Jewish identification we must take account of Jews who do *not* wish to be identified as such. But here we encounter de Kadt's second problem, that of *location*. How is it possible to identify as Jews those who do not subscribe to this identification of themselves? More importantly, in what sociological (as distinct from, say, Hitlerian) sense is it correct to regard such people as Jews? Here again the most realistic and humane approach seems to be to regard the figure of 260 as something approaching a maximum rather than a minimum estimate of the

total number of Jewish students in Oxford. Allowing a possible margin of 15 per cent for defects in data collection, we arrive at a figure of 300 as the Jewish student population of Oxford. It should therefore be borne in mind that the results set out below relate only to students who are in some way identifiable as Jews, and that there is as a result a certain inherent bias in the direction of Jewish commitment, since some 'marginal' Jews who may recognize themselves as such have been excluded. On the other hand, because of the variety of methods of identification employed, the thoroughness with which it was possible to set about this operation on account of the peculiar nature of the collegiate system, and the nature of available published data relating to Oxford students, the margin of error is probably much lower than de Kadt would allow for Jewish university students in Britain in general. It can therefore be assumed that at least 80 per cent of all Jewish students in Oxford were included at the initial stage. At the analysis stage a more *exclusive* criterion of Jewishness was employed, based on the material provided in the answers to the questionnaire itself. This was the Halachic criterion of having a Jewish mother. Unrealistic though it may be, and repugnant to the liberal mind though it certainly is, this criterion was adopted in order to ensure that the final group of 'respondents' included *only* those who by *any* standards can be termed Jewish. Several 'half-Jewish' respondents with Jewish fathers were therefore excluded at this stage (about half of the twenty excluded from analysis out of 153 questionnaires returned). This is probably a further small element of bias in the direction of Jewish commitment. Finally, and most importantly, we have to consider whether the very action of returning such a questionnaire (albeit anonymously) does not constitute a kind of act involving a certain measure of Jewish identification. Does this produce a further element of bias? We are here dealing with a total imponderable since we have no evidence of the attitudes of the 107 persons who did not respond. But it seems reasonable to assume that the silent minority is less Jewishly committed or identified than the vocal majority, although, of course, it is impossible to quantify this. Given all these elements of bias, what value can be attached to the results? Probably a greater value than might at first be assumed. For one thing, all the elements of bias tend in the same direction, that is towards over-emphasizing the degree of Jewish identification among Jewish students at Oxford. Secondly, as will be seen, the broad general conclusion which we may draw from the results as they stand is in the opposite direction: that is, Jewish identification for the majority of the 133 respondents is in most ways minimal and apparently declining. If this can be shown to be true of this self-selecting group of identifiable Jews, how much more so must it be true of other Jewish students. We cannot, of course, know *how* much; but as a weathercock showing clearly the way the wind is blowing the following results, and the conclusions drawn from them, merit the

OXFORD STUDENTS

attention of those concerned with the outlook and attitudes of Jewish students.

The 133 respondents were distributed as follows: 109 (82 per cent) were male and 24 (18 per cent) female; 106 (79 per cent) were undergraduates and 27 (21 per cent) post-graduates; 98 (74 per cent) were reading for degrees in arts or social science subjects and 35 (26 per cent) in other (mainly science) subjects; 112 (84 per cent) were British citizens and 21 (16 per cent) foreign nationals. In all these categories there was little significant variation from the proportions in Oxford University in general.¹⁰ Sixty-eight (50 per cent) of the respondents said that their parental home was in London, 43 (33 per cent) that it was in the provinces, and 22 (17 per cent) abroad.

Most of the questions were of the multiple-choice or yes/no type; a very few contained room for further amplification, or were 'open-ended'. The questions fell broadly into three groups designed to elicit information regarding the religious, social, and political identifications of the respondents. (The actual order of questions was of course different; more intrusive questions were placed towards the end of the series.) The results and further conclusions are here presented in these three categories.

Religious attitudes were found to be the least important factor in Jewish identification. Apart from the statistics which follow, the same conclusion was reached from a reading of the open-ended comments which the respondents were invited to make at the end of the questionnaire; of the large number who availed themselves of this opportunity to explain in their own way what they regarded as the constituent elements of their personal Jewish identity, religious factors were frequently not mentioned at all, or if mentioned they were consigned to a subordinate position compared with historical, social, or national factors. That this was not merely a matter of exposition is apparent from the following figures. Only a minority, 37 (28 per cent),¹¹ stated that they believed in the existence of God; 55 (41 per cent) said they did not; and 41 (31 per cent) expressed uncertainty. Asked for their religious affiliation, one replied 'Anglican', 111 (83 per cent) said that their religious affiliation was Jewish; and the remaining 21 (16 per cent) replied 'none'. (All 133 had mothers brought up in the Jewish faith.) That religious 'affiliation' was regarded purely as a matter of form is clear from the fact that in answer to the question 'Do you consider yourself a practising Jew?' 41 (32 per cent) said 'yes' and 87 (68 per cent) said 'no'. Questioned about the regularity of their synagogue attendance 9 (7 per cent) said they attended at least once a week (which explains the not infrequent lack of a *minyan* in Oxford Synagogue); 11 (8 per cent) attend at least once a month; 78 (59 per cent) attend 'at least once or twice a year'; and 34 (26 per cent) never go to a synagogue at all. To the question 'Do you attend synagogue more regularly when you are at home during

the vacation than you do while you are in Oxford?' 65 (54 per cent) replied 'yes'. The 109 males were asked whether they had performed the *barmitzvah* ceremony: 99 (91 per cent) said 'yes'; only 10 (9 per cent) said 'no'. As for *kashrut*, seven (5 per cent) said that they made a point of eating kasher food at all times; 15 (12 per cent) said that they did so 'generally'; 36 (28 per cent) did so in their parents' home but not elsewhere; 72 (55 per cent) did not observe *kashrut* at all. In the light of these figures it is not surprising that the university kasher meals service staggers from one financial crisis to another. The replies to further questions about their parents' religious outlook strengthen the impression already given that, notwithstanding strong parental pressure towards certain forms of religious behaviour (evident in the replies to the last three questions above), orthodox belief and practice are both declining sharply among Oxford Jewish students; parental influence probably accounts for the rather slower decline of practice than of belief.

Information about the social background and outlook of the respondents showed very similar patterns. The great majority of those questioned belong to the second generation of Jews born in Britain, and are mainly the grandchildren of refugees from eastern Europe who arrived in England before 1914. A smaller number belong to the first generation of British-born Jews, and these are largely the children of post-1933 refugees from central Europe. Although it is in general true that second-generation Jews in Britain (and the U.S.A.) display a greater tendency to 'acculturation' and loss of various aspects of Jewish identity, this is to some extent counter-balanced by the fact that a high proportion of the immigrants from central Europe during the thirties and forties had already 'escaped from the ghetto' before arriving in Britain. Their children, therefore, although displaying a higher degree of sensitivity to such subjects as coloured immigration to Britain than the grandchildren of the pre-1914 eastern European wave of immigrants, are not necessarily more sympathetic to other forms of social or (in particular) religious Jewish identification than those whose parents grew up in the strictly orthodox, Yiddish-speaking Jewish quarters of East London, Leeds, or Glasgow.

The parental origins of the respondents were as follows. 83 (62 per cent) had fathers who were born in Britain, and 50 (38 per cent) fathers born abroad. Of grandfathers (paternal), 22 (17 per cent) were born in Britain, and 107 (83 per cent) abroad (the great majority within the borders of the Russian Empire). Of 266 parents 23 (9 per cent) were stated to be Sephardi, and 215 (81 per cent) Ashkenazi. Fourteen of the respondents (10 per cent) were unable to answer the question; several of these indicated that they did not know what it meant. One hundred and seventeen (88 per cent) of the respondents said that their parents were members of a synagogue, and 16 (12 per cent) said that they were

not. Synagogue *membership* in Britain is not, of course, any guide to the religious attitudes of Jews, particularly in the case of the largest group of synagogues, the United Synagogue, which has in its relationship to Anglo-Jewry something of the 'established' and 'umbrella' characteristics of the Anglican Church. It is interesting, however, that 22 per cent of those parents who are synagogue members belong to Reform or Liberal congregations. This figure (which is higher than the national average) confirms to some extent the impression that the Reform and Liberal movements appeal in particular to the more affluent and better-educated sections of the community (from which the parents of university students in Britain tend to be drawn). In 89 (67 per cent) of the parental homes candles are lit on Friday night. This is a low figure for what is generally regarded as a basic form of Jewish religious observance, and tends to support the view that Jewish religious observance in Britain is declining rapidly. In Edgware in 1962-3, 85.6 per cent of those questioned said that they had Sabbath candles lit in their homes.¹²

One hundred (75 per cent) of the parents of Oxford Jewish students contribute generally to Zionist fund-raising campaigns. The students themselves, as will be seen, are in the majority favourably disposed to Israel; in this sphere there seems to be strikingly little 'conflict of generations'. The contrary seems to be the case, however, when it comes to certain social attitudes closely connected with Jewish identification. Prominent among these are discrepancies between the generations of fathers and sons (and even more so between mothers and daughters) in attitudes to intermarriage. Sixty-seven (58 per cent) of the respondents considered that their parents would probably 'strongly disapprove' if they decided to marry a non-Jew; 25 (21 per cent) said that their parents would probably 'mildly disapprove'; and 24 (21 per cent) believed that their parents would have 'no objection at all' in such an eventuality. A milder (but still majority) parental disapproval was registered of children 'dating' non-Jewish partners. Questioned about their own attitudes to intermarriage, 24 (18 per cent) of the respondents thought intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles 'desirable'; 34 (26 per cent) thought it 'undesirable'; and 69 (52 per cent) said that they had 'no strong opinion either way' on the subject; six (4 per cent) did not reply to this question. Those respondents with a high level of Jewish education displayed only a very slightly greater resistance to intermarriage than those with a more sparse Jewish education or indeed than those with no Jewish education. This tends to make nonsense of the idea that 'survival-oriented' Jewish education can halt social assimilation.

On no point of social attitudes were respondents with a good Jewish education found to differ more than slightly from those who had had a weak Jewish education or none at all. This should not, of course, be construed in any sense as affording ammunition for those who oppose present efforts to expand Jewish education in Britain. Quite apart from

'survival-orientation', Jewish education may perhaps be held to have a certain intrinsic value?¹³ It is noteworthy that this group of respondents appear to have enjoyed a significantly higher level of Jewish education than is the case among Jewish children in Britain in general. It seems that Jewish parents who value their children's secular education to the extent of encouraging them to apply for Oxbridge, also value their children's religious education more highly than do other parents. Fifteen (13 per cent) of the respondents had attended a Jewish day or boarding school (eight at primary level, and seven at secondary level); three (2 per cent) had attended a yeshiva; 37 (33 per cent) said they had attended Jewish classes more than twice a week, and 58 (51 per cent) had done so at least once a week. Twenty of the respondents (15 per cent of the total) did not record any Jewish education at all.

Certain facts should be borne in mind. Because of the general disproportion of sexes among Oxford students, a very large majority of the respondents were, as noted above, males. In Britain boys generally receive a more intensive Jewish education than girls, particularly before their *barmitzva*. Amongst the 24 female respondents in this survey, four (16 per cent) had received no Jewish education at all. Of the 20 who had received some form of Jewish instruction, one had attended a Jewish primary school, none of course had been to a yeshiva, four (20 per cent) had attended Jewish classes more than twice a week (the corresponding figure for males was 33 per cent), and the remaining 15 girls (75 per cent) had attended Jewish classes only once a week. (46 per cent of male respondents fell into this last category.) These results provide no indication of the length of time most of the students underwent a Jewish education, but given the figures for frequency, we may safely assume that for the very great majority Jewish education ceased at or shortly after the age of 13. Questioned about their knowledge of Hebrew, 15 (11 per cent) claimed that they knew Hebrew 'very well' (but most of these were Israelis); 36 (28 per cent) claimed a 'fair' knowledge of the language; 65 (49 per cent) said that their knowledge was 'minimal'; and 17 (12 per cent) said that it was 'non-existent'.

Figures for the general education of Jewish students follow but do not exactly parallel the pattern for Oxford students in general: 46 (35 per cent) had attended a public school (c. 36 per cent of all entrants to Oxford in 1969 were drawn from public schools)¹⁴; 30 (23 per cent) had been to a 'maintained' grammar school (c. 35 per cent of all Oxford entrants); 33 (25 per cent) to a 'direct grant' grammar school (c. 14 per cent of all Oxford entrants); and 24 (17 per cent) had attended other kinds of school, including comprehensive schools, private Jewish schools, and schools overseas (c. 15 per cent of all Oxford entrants).

Answers to questions relating to the social class background of the respondents are not reproduced in full because they contain few surprises, and because of the ambiguity or lack of definition which still

OXFORD STUDENTS

inevitably attaches to many of the categories involved. However, broadly speaking, the group revealed itself (as was to be expected) as drawn overwhelmingly from the urban professional and business upper middle class; this in self-estimation, in terms of parental occupation, and (even more overwhelmingly) in terms of expressed career aspirations. As for the latter, there was a distinct tendency (which has been noted in other surveys of British and American Jews) for offspring of successful middle-class business men to opt for professional rather than commercial careers. Other answers further accentuated the gradual withering-away of certain forms of Jewish social identification. Ten respondents (8 per cent) said that they generally read the *Jewish Chronicle* every week; 55 (41 per cent) said that they did so only in their parents' home; 28 (20 per cent) said that they read it very occasionally; and 40 (31 per cent) never read it at all. The extent of knowledge of, or interest in, Anglo-Jewish affairs among Oxford Jewish students may be gauged from the fact that when asked about their own attitudes towards the so-called 'Jacobs Affair' of 1964, 86 (64 per cent) either said that they were indifferent or did not answer the question. A very large number said that they had never heard of the affair. (Of those who did reply 83 per cent were generally in support of Dr. Jacobs's position, and only 17 per cent opposed to it.)

Seventy-four (56 per cent) said that they had at some time belonged to a Jewish or Zionist youth movement. But there was no difference whatsoever as regards attitudes either to Israel or to such matters as intermarriage between those who had been members of youth movements and those who had not. Given the overt ideological objects of many of these movements, this fact is instructive. Sixty-four (48 per cent) of those questioned were members of the Jewish Society in Oxford; in spite of the strong sympathy for Israel revealed by other answers (see below) only 39 (29 per cent) were members of the Israel Society. This surprisingly low figure may, however, be partially explained by the tendency in recent years of the Oxford Israel Society to offer rather uninspiring programmes consisting of lectures by public relations spokesmen from the Zionist Organization or the Israel Embassy. It is noticeable that when distinguished speakers without any axe to grind are invited to speak to the Society attendances soar. (For example, large crowds turn out to hear such speakers as Sir Isaiah Berlin or the Israeli poet Amos Oz, who spent an academic year in Oxford.) Failure to *join* the Israel Society may also be attributed to impatience with 'established' Zionist institutions, or indeed to an impatience (which has been noted in other contexts) of large numbers of students with all forms of organization for political or semi-political ends.

Political attitudes as a form of Jewish identification are perhaps in Britain sometimes underestimated (perhaps because of the contrast with the overtly ethnic politics of the U.S.A.). Jewish students at Oxford

appear to veer more definitely to the left than Oxford students in general. 65 (49 per cent) supported the Labour party, 26 (20 per cent) the Conservatives, 19 (14 per cent) the Liberals, and the remaining 23 (17 per cent) a variety of other causes, mostly of a left-socialist nature. It will be remembered that this survey was conducted during the 1970 general election campaign. Polls taken of Oxford students in general at that time are suspect, but none of them shows such a great discrepancy between Labour and Conservative support. This strongly leftist tendency is perhaps the more remarkable among Jewish students when we consider that a much greater proportion of them come from upper-middle-class backgrounds than is the case with students in general even at Oxford. It is almost certainly a reflection of their parents' political attitudes, these being (it is generally accepted) much more strongly left-wing than those of Gentiles in comparable social categories. It is interesting that this specifically Jewish characteristic should survive into the second and third generations after immigration. Answers to general political questions revealed a consistently leftist inclination among Jewish students in Oxford. This was particularly pronounced in questions involving race. On immigration to Great Britain one (1 per cent) concurred that 'all further coloured immigration to this country should stop and coloured immigrants already here should be encouraged to return to their countries of origin'; seven (5 per cent) assented to the proposition that 'all further coloured immigrants should be stopped for the time being'; 60 (47 per cent) believed that 'present restrictions on coloured immigration should continue for the time being'; 37 (29 per cent) agreed that 'present restrictions on coloured immigration should be relaxed to permit a greater number of immigrants to enter the country'; and 23 (18 per cent) subscribed to the view that 'coloured immigration into this country should be completely unrestricted'.

Although there are no adequate comparable figures showing the opinions on this question of Oxford students in general, the fact that only six per cent of Jewish students favoured further restrictions on immigration, while 47 per cent favoured liberalization of the controls is suggestive, and Jewish opinion is almost certainly more strongly anti-restrictionist than is general opinion in the University (let alone, of course, in the country at large). We must remember that the great majority of Jewish students are themselves the children or grandchildren of immigrants to Britain. Not surprisingly, students who were either born overseas themselves, or who had at least one parent born abroad, were significantly more liberal in their attitude towards this question than others (59 per cent of the immigrant or first-generation British-born group favoured relaxation of controls compared with only 36 per cent of the rest). Similar attitudes evidently governed the responses to a question on apartheid, which produced an even more overwhelmingly anti-racialist response: only two respondents expressed

a measure of approval of apartheid; 100 (79 per cent) supported the view that 'Apartheid is an evil and oppressive system and should be overthrown by whatever means necessary.'

This very heavily anti-apartheid result is particularly striking when considered in relation to the results deriving from a question about the Middle East conflict. It will be borne in mind that great efforts have been expended on the part of what are known (although mainly by their opponents) as 'New Left' groups on campuses in Britain and elsewhere to seek to integrate the Middle East conflict ideologically into what is seen as the general struggle of the 'Third World' against imperialism and neo-colonialism. In this scenario the Israelis are portrayed as colonialist aggressors and the 'objective allies' of imperialism, while their Arab opponents are likened to the Vietnamese peasants, and the Palestinian commando organizations to the Algerian or Vietnamese National Liberation Fronts. During 1969 and 1970 such views gained considerable currency among large sections of the 'Oxford Left' (although they are by no means confined to that group), a development aided, *inter alia*, by meetings addressed by members of the Israeli 'Matzpen' group. Notwithstanding the strongly left-inclined sympathies of Jewish students at Oxford, and their views on other political questions mentioned above, it appears that Jewish students take up a position in relation to the Middle East conflict primarily *qua* Jews, and that their attitude towards Israel forms a key element in their self-identification as Jews. This was true even of some supporters of extreme left-wing views on political matters in general. None of the respondents associated himself with the position that 'The Arabs are entirely in the right and have your full support'; three (2 per cent) agreed that 'The Arabs make mistakes but in general they have your sympathy'; 21 (16 per cent) believed that 'there are rights and wrongs on both sides' and supported neither Israel nor the Arab states; 99 (75 per cent) believed that 'Israel makes mistakes but in general has your sympathy'; and nine (7 per cent) assented to the proposition that 'Israel is entirely in the right and has your full support'. From this and other evidence we can conclude that there is a vast well of sympathy and support for Israel among Oxford Jewish students, a support which has become far keener since the 1967 crisis. Support for Israel bears no relation to strength of religious feeling, to degree of Jewish education, or to membership or otherwise of Jewish youth movements. Nor is it a response to antisemitism in Britain. Respondents were asked whether they had personally experienced any manifestation of antisemitism in this country; if the answer was affirmative they were asked to give brief details. Sixty-one (48 per cent) said 'yes'; almost all of these, however, specified minor instances such as name-calling in school. Those who said they had experienced some form of antisemitism were not any more Zionistically inclined than the others.

A number of further conclusions about the nature and level of Jewish identification among Anglo-Jewish students in general and within Anglo-Jewry as a whole emerge from this study.

There is no doubt at all that Jewish religious practice, and even more so, Jewish religious belief, among Anglo-Jewish students and the community as a whole are decreasing both absolutely and as a significant factor in Jewish identification.¹⁵ This study is not concerned with the 'hard core' of the very strictly orthodox. It is possible that this minuscule and increasingly self-isolating minority has in recent years succeeded in maintaining itself numerically. (One means towards this end is the shielding of their children from the 'disintegrating' influences of the university.) But as far as the broad mass of Jewish students in Britain is concerned, Judaism as a creed or code of conduct no longer seems to represent the primary form of Jewish identification. (Moderate) expenditure by the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation, serious efforts by Chief Rabbi Jakobovits, the appointment of Jewish chaplains, evangelizing forays by the Lubavitch Hassidim—all these seem (until now) to have made little difference. Neither Jewish education nor Jewish youth movements seem to have much effect either. Already only a minority of Jewish students believe in the existence of God, consider themselves 'practising Jews', attend synagogue more than once or twice a year, or practise *kashrut*; of those who practise *kashrut* the great majority do so only in their parents' homes. *Mutatis mutandis*, the case is the same with synagogue attendance. It is occasionally argued that what we are witnessing here is merely a temporary phase of 'youthful revolt', and that the majority of Jewish students will 'return to the fold' later in their lives. There is little evidence to support this view, and, as will be seen later, there are certain factors which would inhibit any such trend were it to take place. The implications are clear: if the Jewish *religion* were the sole operative factor in Jewish identification, Anglo-Jewry's obsessive fear for its survival as a distinct entity would be justified indeed.

However, sociology and Zionism have both demonstrated in recent years that there are other influences at work in the maintenance of Jewish identity. The recent study of Jews in Edgware found that 'identification with the Jewish minority persists despite the decline in religious traditions'.¹⁶ This identity subsists chiefly in common patterns of social behaviour and outlook. But the evidence of the present survey (as well as other recent studies) suggests that here too (although more gradually than in the religious sphere) a dissolving process is at work. Eighty-three per cent of the parents of those questioned mix socially mostly with Jews. In the case of Oxford Jewish students the question had to be altered to take account of the fact that, unlike their parents, they live willy-nilly in the predominantly non-Jewish environment of the college. Asked: 'Of your three best friends of your own sex, how

OXFORD STUDENTS

many are Jewish?', 25 per cent said 'none', 75 per cent replied that at least one was Jewish, 42 per cent said 'two', and 16 per cent 'three'. Here again it can be argued that this form of social assimilation is a temporary phenomenon which can be attributed to the unusually liberal and tolerant atmosphere of the university, insulated from the 'harsh realities' of society in general as regards Jews, and that when the Jewish student emerges from the university and confronts these realities, he will gradually move back within certain Jewish social patterns (for example, live in a Jewish neighbourhood, mix mainly with other Jews, etc.).

There is, however, little real evidence of the 'harshness' of the 'realities' which confront British Jews in their relationship with general society. Although of the 48 per cent of respondents who said that they had experienced some manifestation of antisemitism *not one*, when specifying its nature, mentioned anything which had occurred in the university environment, it is equally the case that *not one* expressed any form of apprehension regarding possible future antisemitism. Moreover, the argument that the process which has been described is a temporary phenomenon ignores a crucial point: the majority of Jewish students will marry within ten years of leaving university. Lack of resistance to the abstract concept of intermarriage has already been noted. All available evidence suggests that such resistance is being further eroded in Anglo-Jewry both in the abstract and in actual marriage patterns.¹⁷ Intermarriage may indeed be reaching what one might call a demographic 'take-off' point, leading to an actual population decline. The religious sanction against intermarriage is undoubtedly of decreasing importance among Jewish students; so probably are the social sanctions which continue to exist. Evidence from the United States¹⁸ suggests that the tendency to intermarry increases among Jews in proportion to the level of secular education they receive. College students are more likely to intermarry than high-school graduates who did not go to college, and so on. There is no reason to suppose that a similar tendency does not exist in Britain. With the great expansion that has taken place in British higher education in the past decade, and with the exceptionally high representation of Jews in the universities, we may therefore expect an intensification of the trend towards intermarriage. However, whereas the pluralistic and self-confident American Jewish community is equipping itself socially and ideologically to take account of this social change (largely by means of change within the Reform movement),¹⁹ Anglo-Jewry, predominantly Orthodox in complexion, and overwhelmingly so in its leadership, will not accommodate itself to the prospect of gaining (at the price of Halachic principle) rather than losing adherents through intermarriage. Thus we are confronted with the double paradox that (assuming the respondents translate their lack of resistance to intermarriage into the act itself) a majority of Jewish students will

intermarry with non-Jewish spouses *and yet* (as 75 per cent of all the respondents asserted) 'intend to bring up their children as Jews'. In the case of children with non-Jewish mothers they will, however, encounter institutional and ideological barriers which will prevent their carrying out this intention either in the generally accepted religious, or in many social, senses. Thus those Jewish students who may *wish* to 'move back' into a closer relationship with the Jewish community at a later stage may well find barriers in their path difficult if not impossible to clear. This robs the 'temporary phenomenon' argument as applied to the increasing social assimilation of Jewish students of very much of its force.

It is in their political outlook and behaviour, most notably in relation to Israel, that Jewish students in England display their Jewish identification most strongly. This in spite of the fact that there are no 'Jewish issues' nor any 'Jewish constituencies' in British politics. The crisis of 1967 seems to have had something of a catalytic effect in respect of Jewish identification in Britain (as elsewhere). The very fact that the crisis was *not* an issue in British politics certainly emphasized for British Jews that their pro-Israeli reflex actions were symptoms of specifically Jewish identification. Support of Israel is the *one* form of Jewish identification in which Anglo-Jewish students appear to equal if not exceed the intensity of their parents' Jewishness. The majority of the several thousands of Jews who volunteered to go to Israel during the 1967 crisis were students. Sixty-two per cent of all the students questioned in the Oxford survey had visited Israel, most of them since the Six-Day War. Since 1967 emigration figures from Britain to Israel have quadrupled (in 1970) to about 2,000 per annum, the majority of these young and highly-educated. Forty-eight per cent of Anglo-Jewish parents now apparently would like their children to live in Israel.²⁰ It is striking that 92 per cent of Oxford Jewish students could name the Prime, Foreign, and Defence Ministers of Israel. Only 60 per cent knew the name of the Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, and only 50 per cent could name the Oxford Jewish Chaplain. In short, the conclusion of this study is that there is nothing which unites, which concerns, and, we may say, which *identifies* Jewish students in England today as a group more than their relationship with the State of Israel. As current events in other parts of the Jewish world are demonstrating in a heightened form, this is no isolated phenomenon. It may not be a temporary one either.

NOTES

¹ Rabbi Dr. A. H. Friedlander, 'On the Brink of Revolt', *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 January 1971, p. 17.

² See S. J. Prais and Marlana Schmool, 'Statistics of Milah and the Jewish Birth-

Rate in Britain', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. XII, no. 2, December 1970.

³ See S. J. Prais and Marlana Schmool, 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population, 1960-65', *The Jewish*

OXFORD STUDENTS

Journal of Sociology, vol. X, no. 1, June 1968.

⁴ Vera West, 'The Influence of Parental Background on Jewish University Students', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. X, no. 2, December 1968.

⁵ I wish to thank the following for their help at various stages of the preparation and analysis of this survey: Rabbi S. B. Leperer, the Universities Department of the Office of the Chief Rabbi, the officers and representatives of Oxford University Jewish Society, the O.U. Israel Society, the O.U. Choolant Society, Mr. David Wasserstein, and Count P. Jankowski. I have also profited greatly from comments made by Mr. I. M. Crewe of Nuffield College, Oxford, Professor A. Wasserstein of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Rabbi D. Greenberg of Scarsdale, N.Y. The author alone is responsible for the opinions expressed in this article.

⁶ Vera West (op. cit.) shows that this is true of Cambridge.

⁷ I know personally of a striking case of this kind, where strictly Orthodox Jewish parents in London refused to allow their son to proceed to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem because of what they considered the 'irreligious atmosphere' there. The son went instead to London University.

⁸ Emanuel J. de Kadt, 'Locating Minority Group Members: Two British Surveys of Jewish University Students', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, no. 1, July 1964.

⁹ For the latest state of play in this legal-political-theological tournament see Amnon Rubinstein, 'Who's a Jew, and Other Woes', *Encounter*, vol. XXXVI, no. 3, March 1971.

¹⁰ I am grateful to the Oxford University Chief Statistical Officer for supplying me with figures about Oxford University students in general.

¹¹ Except where otherwise stated, all the percentages cited in this article relate only to the total number of respondents to each question; a few questions did not receive replies in a few questionnaires.

¹² Ernest Krausz, 'The Edgware Survey: Factors in Jewish Identification', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. XI, no. 2, December 1969.

¹³ Surprisingly this view lacks favour in some Orthodox Jewish circles. One Orthodox Jewish educator complained to me recently that Jewish Studies programmes at most American Universities were 'at best objective'.

¹⁴ For figures about the school backgrounds of Oxford University entrants I am grateful to the Oxford Colleges Admissions Office Secretary.

¹⁵ See in particular the results of a National Opinion Poll survey of the religious outlook and behaviour of British Jews in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 29 January 1971, which showed heavy declines in, for example, Sabbath observance and *kashrut*.

¹⁶ Krausz, op. cit., p. 153.

¹⁷ Forty-nine per cent of the British Jews questioned in the National Opinion Poll survey considered intermarriage acceptable. See also S. J. Prais and Marlana Schmool, 'Synagogue Marriages in Great Britain, 1966-8', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. XII, no. 1, June 1970.

¹⁸ See Israel Ellman, 'Jewish Intermarriage in the United States of America', *Dispersion and Unity*, no. 9, Jerusalem, 1969.

¹⁹ See Marshall Sklare, 'Intermarriage and Jewish Survival', *Commentary*, vol. 49, no. 3, March 1970.

²⁰ According to the N.O.P. survey cited above.

A new quarterly for all who are working in, or concerned with, the field of race and community relations in Britain

NEW COMMUNITY

Edited by Sheila Patterson
for the Community Relations Commission

This is a new journal which will cover applied and theoretical approaches to the associated fields of community relations, ethnic and race relations and migration. It will publish articles by field-workers and researchers in the social and psychological sciences, anthropology, education, political science, history and related disciplines.

Reports of relevant legislation, anti-discrimination procedures, programmes concerned with education, housing and local community relations, and situations in particular localities and within immigrant communities will also be included, as will reports of work in progress and book reviews.

The first issue is mainly concerned with the theme **BRITAIN, EUROPE AND MIGRATION** and includes the following articles: 'Britain, the E.E.C. and Labour Migration' by W. R. Bohning; 'Minority Groups in France' by Anne de la Presle; 'Immigration and Social Policy in the Netherlands' by Christopher Bagley; 'Europe, the Unions and Social Policy' by Colin Beever; 'The Future Protection of Migrant Workers' by Bob Hepple; 'The Commonwealth and the E.E.C.' by Arnold Smith; 'New Zealand and the European Adventure' by Richard Thompson; 'Tribute to Learie Constantine' by Sam Morris; and 'Race, Heredity and I.Q.' by Alan Marsh.

Future issues will, in addition to regular specialist reports, focus on such general themes as community relations and integration, education, and industrial relations in Britain.

Annual subscription £2.00, individual copies 50p, post free. Inspection copies and other information available from:

**The Secretary, NEW COMMUNITY
Community Relations Commission
Russell Square House
Russell Square
London WC1B 5EH**

THE BERKELEY HILLEL AND THE UNION OF JEWISH STUDENTS: THE HISTORY OF A CONFLICT

Matthew Maibaum

THIS paper is a study of the relationships within and between two student organizations: the Hillel Foundation of Berkeley and the Berkeley Union of Jewish Students. It deals with their internal goals, their policy-making processes, their accommodation of internal differences and conflicts, their reactions to events external to each and to both of them, and their patterns of coping with their social environment. The study covers the history of the two groups from October 1967 to the end of May 1969.¹

I. The Community

There are approximately 4,500 Jewish students enrolled at Berkeley.² Most of them come either from Southern California (Los Angeles and its environs particularly), or from New York and its contiguous areas in the East.

The Hillel Foundation is a national organization for Jewish college students; it supplies cultural, social, and religious services on the campus. In Berkeley, it plays (at least theoretically) a significant role in that it is the only official, Jewish community-sponsored, campus-recognized, Jewish student organization. It is led by a rabbi.

Berkeley is the one major American university with a significantly large Jewish student body that is not located in or near a city with a large well-organized Jewish community. Thus the situation of the Jewish student at Berkeley is quite different from that of his colleagues at the City College of the City University of New York (CCNY), or at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), where Hillel Houses are backed culturally by a plethora of adult and youth organizations in the Jewish community at large.³ It is often said that the students attracted to Berkeley differ in kind from those who are drawn to UCLA, CCNY, or Brooklyn College; and that, moreover, the Jewish students at Berkeley differ from Jewish students at these other universities: they are not as prominent at Berkeley in social and cultural activities.

Hillel

The Hillel Foundation is a nation-wide organization intended to provide 'social, cultural and religious services' to college students across the country.⁴ It sponsors cultural programmes, holds religious services, and puts libraries at the disposal of its members. In 1924, the Foundation established a chapter at Berkeley. Hillel has been in its present building since 1952; it is a large three-storey auditorium-like structure with a separate library, office and study rooms, and a kitchen. In 1968 and 1969 there were approximately 850 Hillel members. In 1969 about 24 people formed the 'core group' of leadership, including officers, the heads of committees and of auxiliary function programmes (such as the United Jewish Appeal fund-raising effort), and assistants to the committee heads.

The Hillel Foundation does not own its building, which was put at its disposal by a patron. The annual maintenance of the building costs about \$40,000; there are additional salary costs of about \$7,000 per annum for the Administrative Assistant to the Rabbi (Secretary), and an unspecified salary for the Rabbi himself.⁵ This annual expenditure is met mainly by the Jewish Federation Council of the East Bay and by donations from the Jewish residents of the Oakland, Richmond, and Berkeley areas. Student subscriptions cover only the cost of postage to members and some of the dances and parties organized during the year.

In 1967 and 1968, Hillel House held services on Friday evenings, High Holyday Services on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, and two Seder dinner services for Passover. On the High Holydays the more traditional students organized an Orthodox service upstairs in the Library, to which about thirty students came each year, while the usual attenders at the Reform services led by the rabbi downstairs in the general-purpose auditorium numbered on each occasion about 2,000 persons (students, their family members, and teachers). On two nights a week, Hillel House served a kosher dinner for which students paid; but the meal was subsidized by Hillel and organized by about a dozen Orthodox students.

The Rabbi observed the activities of the Student Council and made programme suggestions. He also gave individual and confidential help and advice to students who had marital, vocational, academic, or other personal problems. Periodically, and usually in the face of an issue which directly affected Berkeley students, the Council members met and passed resolutions 'in the name of the Hillel Student Council of Berkeley'. In 1968-69, three such issues were the firing of Eldridge Cleaver in the autumn, the Third World Liberation Front student strike effort for a Third World Studies College in Berkeley in the winter, and the People's Park demonstrations and arrests in the spring of 1969.

BERKELEY STUDENTS

On all these issues, the Hillel Student Council took a majority stand and communicated their resolution to the members and to the Berkeley student paper. It also took a stand on what it felt the United States' role in the Near East vis-à-vis Israel should be, and another against the San Francisco B'nai B'rith's election of San Francisco State College President S. Y. Hayakawa for its Man of the Year Award for 1968-69.

The government of Hillel at Berkeley, by the rules of B'nai B'rith and according to its own Hillel Constitution, is vested in representatives of the 'student body' of Hillel, Committee Chairmen, and the President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Vice-President.⁶ The Rabbi and Administrative Assistant vote in the event of a tie on issues that arise in the Council. The Committees are student service and activity committees; the following ones existed in 1967, 1968, and 1969: Religious, Programme, Social Action, United Jewish Appeal (or 'UJA'), Membership, Cultural, Zionist Activities (new in 1969), Drama, and Music. Each was headed by a chairman. The President, Treasurer, Vice-President, and Secretary were the formal 'top elective officers' with whom the committee chairmen functioned at fortnightly Council meetings, as a kind of advisory and planning cabinet. Each committee usually consisted of four persons; but the Religious Committee was larger while the UJA Committee was usually the smallest. Each member of the Student Council had one vote but could abstain from voting on any issue if he wished to do so. In 1968, in view of the political agitation on the campus about Vietnam (and fears of police investigations which might jeopardize the students' future), the Hillel Constitution was amended at the request of the Rabbi: records would not be kept of the way individual students voted. Formal Hillel Foundation laws, binding upon the respective chapters nation-wide, allow a Hillel Student Council, as a body 'representing' the total Hillel membership, to make resolutions on social and political issues of the day, and on the internal administration of their own chapter; but political endorsement of candidates or parties is discouraged. Furthermore, Hillel constitutions, including that of the Berkeley chapter, expressly forbid the hiring of building or other Hillel facilities by any organization that is Communist-sponsored, Communist-affiliated, or which expresses explicit Communist leanings, or any which is explicitly anti-Jewish or antisemitic in its leanings, programmes, content of presentation, or past record of activities.⁷

The Union of Jewish Students

The Union of Jewish Students is an independent organization set up by Berkeley students. It was formed in October 1967 by a group of Jewish students, most of them from the East, who had formerly been active in other organizations (such as the Student Zionist Organization); the Berkeley SZO had ceased to function a year earlier. The leaders of

the Union, about half a dozen students, looked upon their group as a local chapter of the World Union of Jewish Students. They said that they had constituted themselves into a separate group in order to provide an alternative to what they felt to be the administrative rigidity and inertia of Hillel, its lack of political action-oriented and social-oriented activities, and the lack of inspiration of its religious services. A substantial number of students who became members of the UJS had frequented Hillel in the past; the 'leadership group' of about half a dozen, however, seems to have had no affiliation with Hillel for at least the previous year. Some of them attended the Orthodox synagogue rather than Hillel services, and went to Hillel only for kosher meals. By June 1968, there were approximately 110 students on the mailing list of the UJS, but in effect it seemed that their 'working membership' was of the order of 15 to 25 people for each meeting.⁸

General comparisons

The leaders of the UJS differed from the leaders of Hillel in several ways. Most of the active Hillel students were either Conservative or Reform Jews, the Conservatives being the more numerous and accounting for about two-thirds of the leadership. In the UJS, about half (or probably more than half) of the members were of Orthodox background, the others being Conservative or Reform. The only Reconstructionist students, two girls, were in the UJS group. Those UJS members who attended synagogue regularly went to the Orthodox synagogue; none went regularly to Hillel for services. On the other hand, two or three Hillel members went to both the Orthodox synagogue and to Hillel services. No information was available about the level of wealth of the members of the two groups. A substantial number of student leaders in both Hillel and the UJS worked part-time in order to pay for their tuition or maintenance, in addition to taking full study loads. In terms of academic characteristics, it appears that a substantial minority of students in both groups majored in the liberal arts, especially the girls,⁹ but that in the 'core groups' of both, a majority of students were studying in 'practical' or 'applied' fields such as law, medicine, engineering, teaching, consulting psychology, applied mathematics, and government service. Almost all the students of both core groups were honours students, with B averages or better, and several of them graduated each year Phi Beta Kappa or with high distinction. In Hillel, it was unusual to find someone who obviously or avowedly was a 'poor student', or who was 'having problems' with some kind of academic record below the minimum for graduate study.

Politically, a wide range of views were generally voiced in Hillel: from the Far Left position by a few students, admittedly on only a handful of issues, across to what one might call a 'Conservative Democrat' or 'Liberal Republican' stance, with the bulk of the students

BERKELEY STUDENTS

apparently being 'Liberal Democratic' in orientation. Of the 24 core group members, possibly three or four seriously preferred Eugene McCarthy or the allegedly 'New Left' Senator George McGovern for Presidential candidate in 1968; the rest tended to conform to general traditional two-party preference patterns, and in the main seemed to support Humphrey. Left 'Radical' candidates and standpoints were discussed at Council meetings or informally, but were viewed critically and with suspicion, and to my knowledge no members of the Hillel core group participated in any 'Left' rally or demonstration, even of the less eventful sort. Any type of political or administrative 'extreme' or 'radical' actions taken by the government, or the university administration, or by Jewish or non-Jewish students, was viewed askance, although no stance of 'moderation' was ever formally advised by the Hillel Council or stated explicitly in its constitution. It is possible that the demanding nature of the courses, the need for some to work for money, and the organization of religious and cultural activities, made difficult (or unwise or unpopular) any active participation in the time-consuming radical activities on the campus. Very often one would hear, particularly within the four weeks preceding the final tests in November, February, and May of each year, that a student had 'too much to do already' to participate in another activity, to investigate this or that political or college event in depth, or to discuss political or university issues informally within or outside Hillel.

In the UJS group, the political and administrative picture was quite different. The Union assumed a 'radical' stance and self-image by October or November 1967, rejecting philosophically and ideologically a relationship with the established Jewish Federation Council, the Hillel Foundation, or the other elements of the Jewish 'regular' private-government bodies, and also rejecting the more traditional American forms of political affiliation. The members identified themselves instead with radical-left causes and with radical-left political candidates for college or public office.

It has been said by some critics of the 'Third World Radicals', and of various radical-left movements, that these groups—such as the Third World Liberation Front, various Black militant movements, and Chicano (Mexican American) student movements—are essentially conservative in their orientation to their own in-group problems but adopt a jargon and a political revolutionary orientation borrowed from the 'Old' Far Left political movements. The Union of Jewish Students was peculiar among 'radical' movements, however, in the fact that, unlike other radical groups, it expressed little or no overt hate for 'the System' as it existed, and no note of 'militancy' or 'violence'. When its members criticized the policies of the government, of the university, or of Jewish organizations, they did so almost entirely in mixed ethical and practical terms. They accused the Jewish Federation Council and

the B'nai B'rith, for example, of being unwise, too conservative politically, uncommitted on topical issues of importance (such as racism, political repression, and administrative intransigence). They were not especially interested in working or fighting for 'Jewish-related' needs and causes in the United States and abroad; but they gave open support to most Leftist, general (non-Jewish) movements and action groups on and off the campus. As one girl said early in 1968 on the question of working for specifically Jewish causes and on Jewish problems in the United States and elsewhere, 'What is there to fight for? What kinds of problems do the Jews have anyway? What are we supposed to do, for instance, and just what should we go and protest for?' A graduate student affiliate of Hillel and former Youth Habonim member from San Francisco commented, 'Here is an example of a Jewish organization, made up of Jewish students that call themselves "radicals", but that does non-Jewish things.'

The Union of Jewish Students received support from outside organizations (as does Hillel) for about a year; the World Zionist Youth Foundation provided a proportion of their annual budget. They had no building and no formalized structure; they met informally and sporadically at different members' houses, and at places on the campus such as the Student Union's premises. For a brief period of about two months in the spring of 1968, they met on Sundays at a local café in Berkeley serving kasher-style food, but ceased to do so after some students complained that the food was not kasher and that the meeting-place was somewhat inappropriate. Out of the approximately 110 members on the mailing-list, and out of the eight to 15 core members, there were perhaps two 'main voices' or, more properly, main 'discussion leaders', who informally organized the rest of the UJS core group into action and who led people in discussion on current issues. Meetings were informal 'face-to-face' group debates for much of the time. Large meetings on campus in halls or classrooms, with onlookers, were rare. 'Core group' members of Hillel and of the UJS avoided each other's meetings or any kind of dialogue or discussion about each other's groups, although individual discussions occurred on the Sproul Plaza between 'table sitters' of one group and interested individuals belonging to the other. About two or three 'formal' group meetings can be said to have occurred in 1968 and 1969, where core members from each group met at Hillel and talked about policies, but that was within the framework of Jewish student activism on international issues (such as Soviet Jewry rallies, or protests about Polish purges of Jewish officials and other citizens in 1968), and within the framework of larger community-wide efforts organized initially by the Jewish Federation Council or by a 'third group' in the Jewish community. In these meetings the two groups came together merely as collections of individuals from differing backgrounds.

II. The Conflict

It is quite evident that the UJS was founded in the autumn of 1967 explicitly and specifically out of great dissatisfaction with Hillel itself, and as a counterweight and 'viable alternative' to it. Members of the UJS who were interviewed informally and individually stated that their Union was designed to function as an alternative to Hillel from the start. The UJS may have been in some way a successor of the Student Zionist Organization, which had ceased to function effectively in the autumn of 1966, but only in the sense that it now became 'the other Jewish organization' (that is, other than Hillel). The assistant president of the UJS said to me late in 1967, 'You want to join SZO? We're starting another chapter here, a group that'll be SZO or something like it, and we'll tell you when the first meeting is.'

Only about ten students attended the first meeting of the UJS. Most of them wanted an organization in which they might express Jewish values on issues arising on the campus or in the wider community; their union was to provide an alternative to Hillel, which they almost unanimously felt to be staid, boring, cold, and most distasteful of all, uninvolved in social issues. They also thought that Hillel's Rabbi was aloof. In all fairness, it must be said that many Hillel members (active and passive) themselves complained that Hillel was uninspiring, short of funds, and lacked the ability to mobilize opinion on campus issues and on problems of interest in the community. Many of these sentiments were echoed, too, by Hillel's President several times in 1968-69, by the United Jewish Appeal Chairman, and by two or three members of the Hillel core group as well. However, it should be kept in mind that Hillel's constitution prevented it from engaging in outright 'political' activities in any issues involving action by the national or the local government. Hillel did organize, as it does now, several unobtrusive but significant and continuing social service programmes in the local Oakland Jewish Home for the Aged, fund-raising for Israel and for Jewish charities in the United States and abroad, a segment of the Berkeley San Quentin prisoners' rehabilitation project, and tutoring of Black students in Oakland and Richmond; and it raised money for such causes as the Biafran refugees. This record¹⁰ is probably a good deal more extensive than that which the UJS could boast of over the same period of time.

At the first UJS meeting, which was held in the Student Union building, the students said that they wanted to have an organization on campus to represent those Jews who felt a 'commitment' to political movements and ideals, and who were unable to function within the framework of established Jewish groups, like Hillel, where partisan political activities were not allowed. It was decided at the meeting that since most of the members present were 'progressive leftists', dissatisfied

with contemporary political means of handling problems in the university and in the country, the group from the outset would represent and espouse radical principles, as well as basic Jewish social ideals. There was much discussion of the concept of Jewish law and history; of human rights; and of the need to end racism, oppression, and war, and to become committed.

It was decided to hold meetings each Thursday afternoon, or whenever the three or so 'discussion leaders' summoned members. Group members would be guided by their own radical and secular traditions as well as by their understanding and interpretation of Jewish ethical ideals. No mention was made at this meeting (or subsequently at other meetings that year) of an orientation towards specifically Jewish problems and specifically Jewish crises.

Hillel, meanwhile, began the academic year 1967-68 with services for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. As we said earlier, the Rabbi officiated at the main service, Reform and mostly in English, while about 30 students conducted an Orthodox service upstairs on each occasion. Shortly after these services, the first Student Council meetings were held, and the officers elected the previous May now being in office, new Committee heads were chosen or volunteered for the year. Committees were set up for drama, music, culture, religion, social action, and the United Jewish Appeal.¹¹ All these committees functioned throughout the year; each one had members who were not on the Student Council. In each committee the members worked on their own to look into ideas for Hillel programmes, and they presented their plans at fortnightly Council meetings.

Among the programmes were visits to the Jewish Home for the Aged in Oakland; weekly lectures by some distinguished Berkeley teachers on a variety of topics; and folk-dancing on Wednesday and Saturday nights that drew crowds of 200 to 300 people at a time. There was high praise for the intellectual merit of the lectures; and the discussions in the Graduate Study Group on current and past books of Jewish interest (such as *Babi Yar*, Singer's *Short Friday*, and Avrom Yehoshua Heschel's works) were considered stimulating. Throughout the year, on the other hand, political stands were not taken on most 'general social' or national issues. In October 1967 the Student Council voted in the majority to 'express concern' about and 'criticism' of the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War, and expressed the wish that the conflict be ended as soon as possible.

By April 1968, the UJS had organized and built up a membership of about 110. Its members had set up a table in the Sproul Plaza near the other groups' tables, giving out information about its purpose and function, about Israel, about the problems of Blacks, Mexican Americans, farm workers, and American Indians, and about other causes of 'radical' interest.

BERKELEY STUDENTS

In March 1968, Arab students set up a table on the Plaza for fundraising for El Fatah terrorists, with the slogan 'Support the Palestine Revolution' as their banner, dispensing material about Palestinian Arab terrorists, alleged Israel atrocities, and the nature of socialism and the 'Arab revolution' (designed evidently to appeal to the radical sentiments of the leftists in the Berkeley student body). This was a new challenge for Hillel. Up to now, it had put out each day from noon to 3 p.m. on its table on Sproul Plaza free information about opportunities in Israel for work, study, and tourism for American students. And now, this being the season of the United Jewish Appeal drive, other information about the needs of Jews abroad (including Israel), and the needs of domestic and local Jews, was distributed by Hillel students at the table. Upon request (by the Hillel President, the UJA Chairman, and the Social Action Chairman), the Jewish Federation Council now sent Hillel literature about Arab terrorists, Israeli domestic and foreign policy, Israeli history, and problems of minorities in Israel. This material was put on the Hillel table and was distributed to passing students. But the emergence in strength of the El Fatah 'table' as a separate Arab group, as well as the extent of its following among many Berkeley students, mostly of the radical left, although it worried and shocked the Hillel Student Council, did not provoke any concerted counter-action on their part. At Student Council meetings, the sentiment that 'We'll have to be out there more often, and argue back with the Arabs and the radicals more strongly' was expressed, but no special effort seems to have been made to acquire new anti-terrorist literature or factual books useful for refuting Arab and radical arguments, and no special programmes of campus lectures or speakers were organized.

The Union of Jewish Students had meanwhile taken a stand on the Middle East conflict; it had asserted Israel's right to exist, but also that the Palestinian Arab refugees had a right to 'self-determination', that they had a right to establish a Palestinian 'socialist republic' in Palestine, and that Israel should withdraw from territories occupied during the Six-Day War, unconditionally and for 'moral reasons'. In its platform, however, the issues of the security of Israel and of the security of Jews in Arab lands were not mentioned. On the Plaza, nevertheless, the Arabs were as vehemently argumentative with UJS members and their table-sitters as with Hillel members, and the discussions on the Middle East were as intense and heated between UJS members and Arab students as between the latter and Hillel students.

In April 1968, shortly before Israel Independence Day, the UJS staged an 'Anti-Israel Day' rally in Sproul Plaza, in which two speakers, one of them the acting head of the UJS, spoke at noon against Israel as 'an aggressor and imperialist' in the Middle East, and called for Israel's withdrawal from occupied Arab territories. This event, when heard about in advance at Hillel, infuriated some Student Council members.

The rally lasted about thirty minutes. It appears to have been the turning point in the relations between the two groups: Hillel now viewed the UJS with open suspicion and growing hostility, rather than with curiosity.

For Passover, Hillel sponsored a traditional Seder dinner for the first and second nights; the Rabbi officiated in the auditorium, and about one hundred students and teachers came each night from the Berkeley community. With no facilities of its own, the UJS offered no regular Seder like that of Hillel, but it advertised and sponsored a 'Hip-Hasidic' Seder, off-campus in Berkeley, where all interested students were welcome and which was to combine a 'hip' modern flavour with the traditional rituals and food of the Hasidic Jews. It was a new idea, and the Seder was well-attended by a number of Berkeley students, from the religious at the one extreme to some 'hippie' types of little formal traditional religion at the other. It was advertised by word of mouth in Hillel, and a few Hillel members and other Jewish students joined it after attending the Hillel or their family Seder.

Meanwhile, the United Jewish Appeal student drive had been in progress since April, and Hillel had by June raised about \$850 from its members and from other students generally.¹² No members of the UJS co-operated in this function with Hillel, but some members of the UJS sent individual donations to Hillel's drive for Israeli and other Jewish needs, in the United States and abroad. The UJS itself as a body did not participate in fund-raising for the United Jewish Appeal or any other charity body, and did not offer, nor was it asked, to raise funds on the campus at its table or through the post; but Hillel received many individual contributions from students who were affiliated to the UJS.

With summer came a break-up of the Berkeley student community for three months, and most of the Hillel and UJS students returned home. Hillel remained open two nights a week for folk-dances and for some general activities such as the library and religious services. On 11 July, Hillel's Administrative Assistant decided on her own initiative to allow several radical campus groups to stage a rally against the Vietnam War in the large Hillel auditorium. A coalition of Vietnam Day Committee activists, Maoists, and other leftist and radical-leftist student protest groups marched into the Hillel building and staged a day-long rally and demonstration. Television crews appeared on the premises and a film was broadcast in the East Bay and San Francisco areas.

This event, not sponsored by Hillel, embarrassed the Rabbi, who was on holiday at the time, and many Jewish residents of the Bay Area. Many telephoned Hillel to complain angrily about the use of Hillel by the 'radicals'. Upon their return in the autumn of 1968 even before the first Student Council meetings and programmes got under way, the

Student Council members deplored the 11 July event. They were now openly critical of the methods employed by radical campus groups. The UJS was a radical group, and as such, it became suspect.

III. The Confrontation

In October 1968, when the Hillel Student Council convened for the first time that year, the leadership had changed as a result of the previous spring's elections. The former chairman of the Social Action Committee was now President, and several new students (freshmen) headed some of the other committees. The positions of Treasurer and Vice-President and that of the Programme Committee chairman were now in the hands of experienced seniors. Socially, the leadership situation was different from that of the previous year; the President was in closer personal contact with Committee heads and with officers; and he maintained this collaboration throughout the year. The United Jewish Appeal Chairman functioned for most of the year in close association with him, as a friend and as a kind of 'special adviser' on Hillel problems. Several members who had held no office, and who had thought 'about what we can make of this place, what we can do to fix it up more', and about ways of making Hillel generally more attractive re-appeared as committee members or even as volunteer heads of committees. Among these were a girl from the Campus Conservation Committee, who worked on the Religious Committee, and a local rabbi's son who worked in the areas of music and Zionism. On the whole, the Hillel leadership that emerged by October 1968 appeared to be more goal-oriented, more determined, and especially closer-knit.

About the time that Hillel placed its small annual announcement concerning High Holyday services in the *Daily Californian* University paper, the Union of Jewish Students advertised in the same paper¹³ that it was offering its own 'New Year's Jewish service', which would differ from Hillel's. The advertisement said that if one was 'tired of the usual boring services you find at Hillel', one should go to the UJS service. It was conceived and designed as a kind of 'radical Jewish service', in which a new 'list of sins committed during this previous year' replaced the traditional one recited by the Jew; it would make no use of Torah readings, and would invite non-Jewish speakers such as Bobby Seale of the Oakland Black Panther Party and some other radical leaders and activists. It was conceived not as a religious service in the traditional sense, but rather as one which all conscientious students of any faith or persuasion could attend and which was to demonstrate the solidarity of Jewish radicals with 'progressive' forces in the community generally. It would dispel the image of 'the Jew as conventional, inconsiderate, unconcerned, White middle class like everyone else' in the eyes of the 'Third World' and radical students. Inasmuch as it was classified as a

'convocation of conscience' rather than a 'particularist' service of a religious faith, it was held in the auditorium of Wheeler Hall, the Berkeley English Building, on the second night of Rosh Hashanah, and it began later than the usual Conservative and Reform services in the local community synagogues, so that students who wished to do so might attend both ceremonies. It attracted, all told, over two hundred students of many political persuasions and faiths, Blacks and Mexican Americans (Chicanos) as well as whites. It stood out as an interesting, challenging, and significant 'experience in a new direction' on the part of the Jewish students concerned, as a development of new expressions of religious ethics in terms of current social problems, as a departure from established patterns of religious and religious-oriented behaviour, and as a 'radical' event.

The Hillel Student Council members, when they saw the UJS advertisement, found it insulting; they were unhappy about the statement that their services were 'boring'. Moreover, some thought that the UJS service was childish and silly and probably served no real purpose other than to express 'radical' deviance for its own sake. It was further suggested by two students that the UJS advertisement would make Hillel unpopular in the eyes of incoming Jewish freshmen.

One of the first issues brought up in Student Council discussions was that the UJS was 'competing with Hillel for funds from the Jewish organizations'. Hillel members asserted that the UJS was 'competing unjustly and unfairly' as a 'parallel organization of Jews on campus' for funds which Hillel rightly deserved; and that the UJS did not represent the best aspirations and ideals of Jews in the campus community. Hillel Council members were much concerned about this issue for three or four weeks. Members of the UJS denied that they were getting funds from the Oakland Jewish Federation Council or any other Jewish 'regular organization' in the community to the detriment of Hillel. During this period, the UJS had apparently acquired some modest financial assistance from the World Zionist Youth Foundation, a nation-wide organization based in New York City.¹⁴ But it does not appear that they received any substantial amount from the Federation Council of the East Bay or from other sources of funds for Hillel.

Late in October 1968, leaders of the two groups met at Hillel; they decided to hold a formal meeting in the course of which representatives from each side would explain their aims and air their grievances before a B'nai B'rith gathering drawn from the local Jewish residents. This meeting was held on an evening in the middle of November before an audience of about twenty members of the Diablo Valley Hadassah and their husbands, in a house in Lafayette, a small community to the east of Berkeley. The participants in this 'Lafayette Meeting', as it subsequently was called, were a girl from the UJS (a rabbi's daughter from Los Angeles); the Hillel President; the Hillel Programme Committee

BERKELEY STUDENTS

chairman; and the United Jewish Appeal Chairman of Hillel, who as a past member of each group was there to give a comparative impression of 'both groups from within'. The debate aroused much interest from the audience, who listened avidly to all four students. After the speeches by the students (in which each set out in his own way the problems, aims, and functions of his own group), there was a question-and-answer session. Only one man vehemently questioned the UJS girl, saying, 'Who are you? Who supports you? Who are your backers? What kind of radical causes do you sympathize with? Are you a Communist?' and the like. The girl replied with some difficulty; she said that her group sought to better social conditions by 'some radical means if necessary'; she denied that the UJS had any extremist political ties with Communists or any other group that was anti-American or anti-Jewish. The meeting was followed by a general informal session in which the residents mingled with the students. Earlier, the United Jewish Appeal chairman had told the audience: 'Many of you should come over to Berkeley and see what we're like.'

One of the results of that meeting was that the Diablo Valley Hadassah decided to bear most of the expenses of Hillel for the duration of the year. Another result was that relations between the two groups were essentially quiet for the rest of the year. But they still functioned separately, neither used the other's facilities, and inter-group membership or participation was almost nil throughout the year.

In November 1968, members of both groups attended a rally in the Stern Grove park in San Francisco to protest against the treatment of Soviet Jewry. Each group went separately. Shortly after this, the head of the UJS spoke on the Sproul Steps at Berkeley at noon one day, for half an hour, about the plight of Soviet Jews. By now it was becoming apparent that Hillel and the UJS had similar interests and concerns in several fields: the problem of Jews in Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia; the Russian invasion of that last country; poor Jews abroad; and 'social action' concerns in Oakland and elsewhere in the United States. Hillel Social Action members worked in tutorial projects and in other social aid projects in Oakland to the north; and so did some UJS students. During the year, both groups organized rallies at noon on the plight of Soviet Jewry. Although it exhibited a 'socialist' bent and a radical jargon, the UJS was quick to criticize, as were most radical groups, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, the UJS core group members were wary of what some might call 'too much support' for Israel, lest it be interpreted as encouragement for what they considered to be Israel's intransigent and aggressive stance vis-à-vis the Arabs. Further, when there were discussions about poor Jews in the United States, some UJS adherents commented: 'Jews here aren't poor, there's so much money around to help them you wouldn't believe it', or 'The JFC [Jewish Federation Council] is

oriented in the wrong directions, and there's racism and real problems to fight among the Blacks and Chicanos'.

Meanwhile, Hillel did not engage in public political protests, or in political activity of any partisan type. Admittedly, Hillel Council expressed concern (in letters posted to their members) about the removal of Eldridge Cleaver from his visiting lectureship in Berkeley in November 1968, about the San Francisco B'nai B'rith's Man of the Year Award for 1968 to San Francisco State College president S. Y. Hayakawa, and about the police and University handling of the Third World Liberation Front student strikes in January, February, and March 1969. Earlier, in the autumn of 1968, Hillel had sent 55 letters to Army and Air Force officials, and to selected officials of the United States Government, in which they urged that the United States government give military and economic aid to Israel in view of Russia's help to Egypt. On the other hand, Hillel did not support 'radical' issues (such as the Third World Liberation Movement), or officially participate in any demonstration in favour of strikes current then, such as the Standard Oil strike or the Farm Workers' strike. This fact seems to have reinforced the old, and rooted, impression held by the UJS that Hillel was basically a 'non-active, useless, morally stagnant' student group that did 'nothing', at least in terms of the UJS definition of 'activity'.

In the spring of 1969 (in particular during April), the Arab Students' Association again seems to have made an especial propaganda effort. But it was at least two weeks after this Association was out on the Sproul Plaza with extensive information and propaganda to dispense that Hillel Council members became organized enough to collect information and set up the Hillel table with pro-Israel material and general literature about Israel; moreover, the data were not particularly 'anti-Arab' or written in such a way as to discredit or refute Arab propaganda. The United Jewish Appeal Chairman and a Hillel graduate student complained continually that the material was poor and was no effective answer to the claims of Arab students and their radical allies; they insisted that other and better information would have to be provided and that an effective anti-Arab-propaganda effort must be organized. Over the next month Hillel members laboriously collected material and facts about Israel and the Middle East conflict from the Jewish Federation Council in Oakland, from the Israel Consulate in San Francisco, from the San Francisco Jewish Community Relations Council, and even from the Jewish Federation Council Building in Los Angeles, 400 miles away. They distributed the literature to university students from the Hillel table on the Plaza. The UJS also had a table at that time, but it was not engaged in vehement argument by the Arab students as in the previous year. Hillel seemed to be making almost a lone stand 'against the Arabs and anti-Israel radicals. During this period (at the end of April 1969), and overlapping with the annual United Jewish

Appeal drive, the UJS staged a new Warsaw Ghetto Revolt Memorial Rally at Berkeley, followed later by a rally for Soviet Jewry. Many Hillel students were in the audience. By now, the UJS-Hillel conflict seemed dormant. Hillel Council members spoke at UJS activities, and UJS members noted the presence of Hillel members at UJS rallies; a few UJS members sat periodically at the Hillel table on the Plaza, and more Hillel members sat at the UJS table. There seemed to be a definite policy on the part of each group to avoid conflict.

IV. The twilight of the conflict: People's Park and after

In the late spring of 1969, the Arab-Hillel battle in Sproul Plaza, the campus rallies on the Middle East situation, and the residual traces of the open conflict between Hillel and the UJS were drowned by the 'People's Park' affair. In May 1969, when university officials put the small park four blocks south of the campus out of bounds to students and to townspeople generally and declared that they were going to turn it into another sports field, 'street people', hippies, and students who had occupied the garbage-strewn piece of land for the previous month or so (and had planted bushes, dug a pool, built a stage, and generally rehabilitated the area) were angered. After the Governor had called in a large force of National Guard and County Sheriffs and police to occupy the park area and drive the people out, a series of demonstrations took place in the course of which one student was shot dead and another blinded. For the ensuing two weeks, the four blocks south of the university and parts of the campus were alive with protesters and demonstrators, and filled with National Guard, while the police sprayed the area liberally with tear-gas and arrested all told some 450 people in a way later stated to have been quite indiscriminate. The 'People's Park Affair' paralysed regular university events for two or three weeks, while normal town life was disrupted by curfews and street arrests. The Arab-Israel issue became dormant. During this period, a Hillel Council member sat at a lone Hillel table on the Plaza for a week and gave out information about Hillel programmes, travel to or study in Israel, and the United Jewish Appeal drive of that year, raised money for the UJA from passers-by, and discussed the issues and problems involved in the People's Park issue, while helicopters circled overhead. The Hillel Social Action Committee and Student Council also organized a large Biafra Victims Benefit Dance in the off-campus International Students' House; the dance drew some 200 people in the middle of the Park conflict and raised about \$450 for Biafran refugees. Ten days before the dance, in the midst of patrolling troops, Hillel Council members had gone about Berkeley putting up posters and flyers on posts and shop fronts announcing it. This event was considered to have had a meaning above and beyond its fund-raising significance, in that

it was an example of defiant resourcefulness. In the campus community (and indeed in the town itself) there was then an atmosphere of intimidation and hostility.

During that period, members of the UJS met regularly and took strong informal group stands against the Governor's actions, the Guard occupation, and the 'stealing' of the Park. The UJS, like other radical groups, demanded that the Park be returned to the 'people of the community' for general community use.

By this time, the academic year was drawing to an end, and United Jewish Appeal donations were being collected. By the beginning of the summer, Hillel UJA had raised approximately \$850 (about the same amount as had been raised in the previous year), although its fund-raising efforts had been restricted; moreover, contributions from passers-by on the Plaza and from students were still forthcoming.

It is interesting to note the responses of the two groups, as groups, to the People's Park events. Hillel in a sense cut around the issue and continued as best it could with its own planned events and programmes, without becoming paralysed by or involved in it. The UJS had no ongoing programmes at the time, and it reacted strongly to the Park issue as a unitary group, voicing strong criticism of the Governor, the National Guard, and Sheriffs, as did some other radical organizations on the campus.

In the days that followed, Hillel had its last Council meetings; it assessed its programme successes over the year, collected its last charity donations, and made awards to its leading students for their services during the year. Several of its officers and committee chairmen graduated, and some past freshman students were now elected to succeed them. The UJS activities came to an end with informal meetings and discussions about the People's Park affair, 'radical' successes on the campus during the year in general, Israel and the Arabs, and local social issues. There were also discussions concerning proposed future protests. Shortly afterwards, the *de facto* president and leader of the UJS who had spoken at rallies about Soviet Jewry, who had been one of the organizers of the 'Anti-Israel Day' of 1968, and who had been the most active (though unofficial) leader of the group during the previous two years, emigrated to Israel with his wife and children. The year that had begun with something of an open and very lively conflict between the two groups drew to a quiet close.

V. Conclusions

We have examined the activities of two organizations which went their separate, and yet somewhat parallel, ways. They stayed separate and apart from each other as groups co-sponsoring, on paper, only a handful of rallies or events. Their respective core members, and

BERKELEY STUDENTS

probably their affiliated members as well, rarely intermingled. For two years, each group held dear different issues and goals, and worked for these while almost consistently ignoring what the other group was doing. When communication did take place, it occurred almost entirely in an atmosphere of hostility and of conflict.

One is tempted to ask why the two groups could not co-operate. The answer is that the members of one group were fundamentally different from the members of the other. Hillel attracted to its core leadership the Jewish student who was more pragmatic, not particularly religious traditionally, who was interested in social service, who liked regular meetings, and wished to belong to a 'recognized' organization, but who did not care to put political, pressure-group, and 'radical' social action ahead of other things of Jewish importance while he was in college. The Union of Jewish Students, on the other hand, appealed to the student who preferred spontaneous responses to issues as they arose, who valued 'radical' social action and discussion above almost all else, and who put 'political' activities ahead of other things of Jewish importance, although he often tended to be a more observant Jew.

In these circumstances, it is clear that the two groups could not usefully 'join hands'. Indeed, one can go even further and state that they thrived on their hostility to each other. The existence of Hillel, and the image of Hillel held by some students, provided the very uniting factor, the very inspiration, for the genesis of the UJS; that movement wished to remain perpetually 'the other group', the defiant 'alternative' to Hillel. As for Hillel, its core members saw the UJS, especially by the autumn of 1968, as an actively hostile group which was competing unfairly for funds; and they commented that there was 'something ominous here that we have to deal with'. This challenge made them aware of the need to unite in the face of the enemy.

On the other hand, viewed in retrospect, the challenge does not seem to have noticeably affected Hillel's policies or activities. There is no evidence that its programmes or special projects increased in number, or that they were carried out more effectively than in previous years. Again, there is no evidence that when internal conflicts arose, they were resolved (or channelled) more briskly than in the past. Over a period of two years, the main (perhaps the only) practical effect of the clash between the UJS and Hillel seems to have been a strengthening of in-group identification within each of the two organizations. Neither group appealed to the Jewish community on the campus, or to the established Jewish community agencies, for popular or administrative support for its own programmes and needs, in the face of the challenge posed by the other group. Neither group seems to have explored the ideological underpinnings of the other, or to have reviewed its own position and that of the opposing group vis-à-vis the whole society, Jewish society, or the student community of which each was a part.

And, perhaps most significantly of all, neither group worked with the other on any joint projects in the areas of social service, Jewish community service, community welfare, campus and student problems, or the like.

The outside observer may well see in this conflict a tragic waste of talent, a situation in which suspicion and acrimony engendered needless conflict, and prevented a friendly co-operation which would have been fruitful. But such a judgment ignores the fact that for most Berkeley students, intergroup hostility and conflict, and even hate, was a way of life. Moreover, Hillel and the Union of Jewish Students did not need to underline their differences; it was perfectly evident that they had fundamentally divergent ideologies. The UJS was a passionately militant radical group, while the core members of Hillel were wary of political action and of innovation. In these circumstances, the two groups could work together in unity and friendship only if one or both changed their beliefs and policies. Such a demand would have been not only impractical, it would have been unfair.

NOTES

¹ I was a member of the Hillel Foundation at Berkeley from September 1967 to June 1969, and a member and affiliate of the Union of Jewish Students from October 1967 to November 1969. Thus I was in the fortunate position of being able to observe both groups from within, and in the case of the Hillel group, from a position within the leadership core as a member of the Student Council for two years. Members of both organizations discussed their problems and aspirations with me; their comments were invaluable.

² This figure is based on estimates by the Berkeley Hillel Foundation in 1968 and 1969.

³ In Los Angeles, at UCLA for example, one finds in the Westwood-Beverly Hills-West Los Angeles area surrounding the campus, two large ATID chapters (one of which is the largest ATID chapter in the country, with 200 members), Yavneh, Young Israel, various Reform student groups, the whole range of Zionist student and youth groups, and youth groups at virtually all synagogues in the area. (ATID is an international American-based youth group affiliated with Conservative synagogues.) Many members of UCLA Hillel are active in one or several of these other organizations as well.

⁴ Cf. the Constitution of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation of Berkeley in March 1969.

⁵ Cf. the files of the Office of the Administrative Assistant of Berkeley Hillel for October 1968.

⁶ Cf. the Constitution of the Hillel Foundation of Berkeley, March 1969.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ I base this statement on my own observations; I attended several of their meetings over the two academic years.

⁹ Over the two-year period, there were between 4 and 8 girls among the 24 Hillel Council members; the Hillel Treasurer and the Head of the Religious Committee were girls. The President and Vice-President were males. In the UJS during the same period there were three or four girls among the 6 to 15 active core members.

¹⁰ A list and summary of Hillel's programmes can be found in the Hillel 'Invitation to Membership' leaflets for 1967 and 1968.

¹¹ The Drama Committee was 'to write Jewish plays or readings for oral presentation at Hillel, to the public, or to other audiences'. The Musical Committee was 'to provide a musical complement to the regular Hillel services with possible special performances to Hillel and the public'. The Cultural

BERKELEY STUDENTS

Committee was 'responsible for many of Hillel's speakers and for a Hillel Discussion Group'. The Religious Committee was 'primarily concerned with Sabbath Services, and co-ordinating its activities with the Drama and Music Committees'.

The Social Action Committee presented 'an interesting challenge to the person motivated by a desire to help others, a key concept of Jewish belief of achieving a world of Justice. . . . Last year's activities (1966-67) included aid to Vietnamese war-injured children, protest against the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union, assistance to the Berkeley Emergency Service Center of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and distribution of material from the world Jewish community to Hillel members at Berkeley. The Committee may cover as much ground as the people comprising it wish to.'

The United Jewish Appeal; 'the annual programme here being a very important activity of Hillel, with funds raised by UJA helping our people throughout the world at all levels of need'. See 'A Brief Resumé of the Hillel Committees' made available to the membership in November 1968, in the Berkeley Hillel Foundation Administrative Assistant's files.

¹² Cf. the files on the Student United Jewish Appeal (UJA) Drive, the Office of the Administrative Assistant, Berkeley Hillel, June 1968.

¹³ UJS advertisement in the University of California Berkeley *Daily Californian* student newspaper, 30 September 1968, page 4.

¹⁴ One UJS member told me that the amount was \$200 for the academic year 1967-68.

RACE

A Journal of Race and Group Relations

The Institute of Race Relations, 36 Jermyn Street,
London, SW1Y 6DU

The journal provides contributions to the study of race relations from a wide range of academic and applied disciplines. Some emphasis is placed on articles contributing to the debate on policy and structural change. As well as articles, most numbers include 'Quarterly Forum'—which carries discussion on methods, and reports on organizations, conferences, and programmes—Correspondence, Book Reviews, and Books Received. One number in each volume will be devoted to a special issue: the April 1972 number will be on 'Race and Social Stratification'.

VOLUME XIII

JULY 1971

NUMBER 1

Han Suyin · *Race Relations and the Third World*

R. K. Wilkinson with S. Gulliver · *The Impact of Non-Whites on House Prices*

Michael D. Biddiss · *The Universal Races Congress of 1911*

Jenny Laishley · *Skin Colour Awareness and Preference in London Nursery-School Children*

Phyllis Lewsen · *The Cape Liberal Tradition—Myth or Reality?*

Quarterly Forum · Reviews

Quarterly £3.50 or \$9.50 a year

£1.00 or \$3 single copies

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

EDUCATION AND THE UNDER-PRIVILEGED IN ISRAEL

Tessa Blackstone

ISRAEL is foremost among a small group of countries which have tried to develop special measures to improve the educational opportunities of children from poor homes. It is an educational and sociological commonplace that children from certain kinds of under-privileged families are unsuccessful at school. It is also widely accepted that this failure is in large part due to certain disadvantages associated with the socio-economic background of the children concerned and to the failure of the educational system to take these into account. It is not accepted by many that it is due to innate lack of ability. This paper¹ aims to describe the policies that have been developed in Israel to improve the educational attainment of under-privileged children, and to speculate a little about their likely effectiveness. Although the paper is sometimes critical of these policies and of the wider educational system in Israel, it is necessary at the start to point out that Israel has made a more concerted effort to try to deal with this problem than any other country. Israel's educational system is not being compared with that of other countries; what is being judged is the effectiveness of a system which has made equality of opportunity a central value.

It is particularly useful to examine these policies at the present time, since in Britain there is increasing concern about the ways in which educational resources can be channelled towards those children who have benefited least from them in the past. This concern is reflected in the Educational Priority Areas policy, the priority in the school building programme given to the replacement of nineteenth-century primary schools, mostly in inner city areas, the change to a non-selective secondary school system, and the raising of the school leaving age. It is in addition reflected in certain pressures for changes in policy: the demand for pre-school education, the advocacy of a more relevant curriculum for lower working class children, and the concern about the lack of educational and training facilities for many fifteen-year-old school leavers. In the United States the Poverty programme has given rise to similar action with the implementation of schemes ranging from

Headstart to Mobilization for Youth. But both the British and American attempts at intervention programmes in education are a good deal more recent than many of the Israeli experiments. It seemed pertinent to ask the question, what if anything can we learn from the Israeli experience in this field?

In Israel, the under-privileged are for the most part people of Oriental status, that is of Afro-Asian origin, or of what is sometimes described as Sephardi origin (incorrectly, since only some Afro-Asian Jews are Sephardim). The connexion between ethnic identity and low socio-economic class and even poverty and deprivation is dangerous, as we know from the United States, in that it is likely to encourage racial prejudice and social divisiveness. The recognition of this fact, and the special situation of Israel with respect to the political commitment to encourage Jewish immigration from other countries and to accept all those who wish to come, are important factors behind the decision to develop special measures. Most of the children concerned are not immigrants themselves, but the children of immigrants who arrived in large numbers in the late forties and early fifties. In 1967-68 the population aged 14-17 of Oriental parentage accounted for 53 per cent of the total Jewish population in that age group. The following figures indicate the extent of their educational failure: only 37 per cent of the secondary school population were from Oriental backgrounds, and the proportion dropped considerably in academic secondary schools to 27 per cent. Early leaving from secondary education was also much higher among this group so that the proportions fell to 22 per cent for all secondary schools, and to 19 per cent for academic secondary schools in the final school year. The proportion of students from Oriental backgrounds in higher education is lower still. In 1966-67, when they constituted 51 per cent of the population aged 18-29, only 13 per cent of Israeli undergraduates and 9 per cent of graduate students were Orientals.² The overall figures mask large differences between faculties; for example, these students were less severely under-represented in agriculture than in some of the more selective faculties. These are the dimensions of the problem. The question is, by what means can a higher proportion of children from Oriental homes be helped to transcend the disadvantages of poverty, poor housing, large families, and parental ignorance about education and/or lack of interest in it, so that they stay on at school and achieve greater academic success?

This paper makes three basic assumptions. The first is obvious: that some of the policies which have been implemented are more likely to be effective than others. This assumption will be discussed in terms of sociological knowledge about the educational attainment of different cultural groups, and the sources of educational failure among them. It cannot alas be discussed in terms of any systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of the various policies, because this has not yet been under-

EDUCATION IN ISRAEL

taken. A project of this kind is necessary to test scientifically a number of specific hypotheses about the relative success of the various policies, and the validity of the theories that underlie them. (One is to be started in the near future at the University of Tel Aviv.) The second assumption is that none of the policies can be more than piecemeal attempts at limited improvement as long as the élitist nature of Israeli secondary education continues. The third assumption is based on knowledge about the relative failure of education as a social service to redistribute either income or opportunity. It is unlikely that any amount of tinkering with the educational system can wipe out the differences between privileged children of European and American origin and under-privileged children of Asian and African origin even in two or three generations. The problem must be attacked simultaneously on a number of other fronts.

The following section describes the educational policies that have been implemented to deal with the problem, starting at the pre-school stage and working through to higher education. In order to understand the educational context in which these policies exist, the structure of the system will also be discussed briefly at each stage.

There is a long tradition of early childhood education in Israel, and it is the only country in the world to have made one year of pre-school education compulsory. This takes place from five to six years of age, in state kindergartens.³ A large number of children aged three and four also attend private fee-paying kindergartens or those run by voluntary organizations (where fees are charged according to means). Approximately 50 per cent of all three- and four-year-olds are at kindergarten, but nearly three-quarters of them do not attend the voluntary or private schools: they are in state kindergartens run especially for children from poor homes or development areas. This is the first of the policies we are considering.

In 1969-70, places were provided for 38,000 children under this scheme; but it is recognized by all those concerned that still more must be provided if all those children defined as needing them are to be accommodated. The present programme aims to increase places at the rate of 5,000 per annum until there will be kindergartens for up to 60 per cent of the child population aged three and four years. This means providing approximately 20,000 more places. Most of those would go to three-year-olds, since the present policy is generally to take in four-year-olds first, and then three-year-olds when vacancies are available. The shortage is most acute in the slum areas of the major cities, where three-year-olds can rarely be admitted. In the new development towns and the rural development areas a substantial proportion of three-year-olds are already attending.

The government has decided not only to make extra provision available to enable under-privileged children to start school early, but also

to provide special educational programmes to help them start elementary schooling on the same footing as middle-class children of Western origins. The highly informal, unstructured nature of kindergarten teaching with its heavy emphasis on play is being adapted by adding an 'intensive work' programme. This aims to develop concept formation, perceptiveness, and powers of memory, and to prepare the child for learning to read and work with numbers. Many kindergartens in poor areas have introduced these programmes, with the aim of providing enrichment for children whose homes give them little opportunity to acquire the basic tools necessary for progress in the elementary schools. The age of transfer to these schools is six, and there are few links between them and the pre-school system.

Until 1970, education in Israel was compulsory up to the age of fourteen. The school leaving age is to be gradually raised to sixteen. Elementary schooling is still of a traditional type. The curriculum is structured in a formal way, the method of teaching is traditional: the teacher standing at the blackboard in front of the children lecturing to them as a class. There is relatively little group or individual work. This major change in approach from that of the kindergarten makes for unnecessary difficulty for the child in the transition to primary school. (This formality will be referred to again later when the second assumption in this paper is discussed in more detail.) There are, however, a number of policies operating at this stage of education which are designed to help Oriental children. The first of these is what is known as the long school day. The hours of schooling are short in Israel: from 8 a.m. to 12 p.m. (or 1 p.m. for older children), although attendance is for six days per week; in certain schools the day has been extended by one or two hours. There are four criteria for determining which schools fall into this category. They are the proportion of children passing the examination for entrance to academic secondary schools; the socio-economic characteristics of the community; the extent of the teachers' experience; and recommendations made by the inspectorate. In this way a school rather than a child is defined as in need of special help and no individual need feel stigmatized. The number of schools falling into this category has been limited to one third of the total number of schools. This means that the programme is available for about half the child population of Oriental origin and an unknown number of other children who attend the schools described above. The teachers are free to use the extra time as they wish, as long as it is not purely an extension of the frontal teaching used in the rest of the day. Some teachers have chosen to concentrate on social activities and others on more academic pursuits.

Not only can these children have a longer school day—they may also have a longer school year: special programmes are run during August, so that the long summer holiday is cut by half. In 1969 nearly 20,000

pupils in 750 classes received an additional month's tuition. For children in the top classes of the primary schools an innovation known as 'horizon-widening' has also been introduced. This consists of arranging activities in the cultural sphere such as music, drama, and art. Enrichment centres constitute another similar programme. In this case the children visit a special centre, which services a number of schools, twice a week for two or three hours. The aim is to prepare children for secondary education by getting them to work independently on a variety of activities.

A quite different kind of policy is setting by ability.⁴ Although it is different in approach, its aims are similar to those policies described so far: to improve the achievement of the less able children in the older age groups in the elementary schools. In the past, streaming and setting were not accepted, since teachers normally concurred with the prevalent social philosophy of egalitarianism. Some people began to see such heterogeneity in the classroom as an obstacle to progress, and as a result a system of setting in Hebrew, arithmetic, and the first foreign language has been introduced. Apparently the main aim has been to help the less able. How far this has in fact been achieved as a result of setting is debatable, and will be discussed later in the paper. Parallel to setting there has been an extension of remedial teaching for younger children and special intensive instruction has been introduced in the normal class or given to groups of children outside the normal class programme.

Lastly, at the elementary stage teachers in schools needing special treatment are given extra guidance on how to help their pupils. Experienced teachers are trained to undertake this work, and mainly supervise teachers responsible for the first four years of primary schooling. They advise on such subjects as educational aids, the assessment of pupils, and group and individual instruction.

At the secondary stage there are fewer policies of this kind. One concerns the transfer from the primary schools. A system known as 'the two norms scheme' operates in the examination for entrance to the academic secondary school: children of Oriental origin are not expected to achieve such high marks to pass as other children; in other words, there are two quite distinct pass marks. Success in the examination leads to the award of a means-tested grant (secondary education is not free) and a place in a selective school. Failure means that a child from a poor home has no alternative to private secondary schools or to vocational education, for which his parents must also pay. The existence of two norms means that more Oriental children will obtain secondary education or at least start it, even if they fail to finish it.

One way in which the problem of early leaving has been tackled is to set up boarding establishments in the hope that they can provide an environment more conducive to study than home, through for example

supervised preparation of homework and various organized activities in the evening. By 1966-67 there were ten of these schools accommodating more than 1,000 *gifted* children from poor homes in development towns and areas, where the existing secondary education is frequently inadequate. The children attend the ordinary selective day school and live in special boarding houses.

Even when children from these backgrounds manage to stay at school and pass the school leaving examination, they often do not succeed in obtaining a place in an institution of higher education. For this reason the army and the universities have collaborated to set up a programme for a small number of soldiers in their last year of army service to prepare them for university entrance. Those who gain a place in this programme are relieved of other duties and undertake full-time studies for eight months; the aim is to increase the pass rate in the competitive examinations for a university place and to reduce the drop-out after embarking on a course.

This completes the description of the main policies. The following section covers research undertaken or being undertaken, which either directly evaluates these policies or has some bearing upon them. Where no research findings are available, the policies are discussed in the light of the assumptions made earlier in the paper.

Several relevant studies are under way on pre-school education. Mention should also be made of a study concerning mothers and their children some time before the pre-school stage. The study⁹ is attempting to discover how far improving mothers' speech will aid the language development of their infants. The assumption is that by the time the child is three and can go to kindergarten he may already have fallen behind in linguistic ability, which is a central part of intellectual development at this stage. Therefore it is necessary to try to prevent this occurring by teaching mothers the importance of talking to their children from a very early age. A sample of Oriental mothers of different educational levels was selected, but difficulties were experienced in getting them to co-operate by coming to lectures; the researchers are therefore not optimistic about their results. The results of the second part of the project, which sent secondary school girls to talk to and play with one-year-old children for two hours a week, were disappointing: there was no difference between the children who had had this help and those who had not. But the mothers' attitudes had changed, and the girls learnt the importance of this activity, so there may be some more favourable long-term effects. The use of adolescent girls, and for that matter boys, in projects of this kind could well be extended to become a regular part of their education. There is mounting evidence about the importance of the earliest years, and if potential parents can learn this at an early stage, much will have been gained.

This paper considers pre-school education at some length because, of

EDUCATION IN ISRAEL

the various compensatory measures Israel has adopted, it is probably the most likely to succeed, for the following reasons. It attempts to deal with the problem before it becomes a problem; it tries to change the conditions which gave rise to it, and thus attacks its causes rather than dealing with its symptoms; it provides a unique opportunity for contact with parents, since at this age a child must be taken to and from school; successful parental education may in turn affect attitudes towards the rearing of younger children still at home. Yet it would be naive to expect the provision of nursery education to achieve miracles, and completely to wipe out the educational differences between Oriental and other children. But for the reasons given above, it ought to be the lynch pin in any plan which attempts this. There are still many unresolved questions about what kind of pre-school education would be most effective, and some educationists are studying this issue. For example, Dr. Sarah Smilansky has carried out several pieces of research.⁶ She has had some success in teaching children to read before they start elementary school, and is now investigating whether the gains children make are maintained; she has been working with parents of the kindergarten children and found that about a third co-operated very well, a quarter did not co-operate well, while the rest co-operated adequately. Less recently she evaluated both play⁷ and a scheme of 'directive teaching' in which children were taught in a more structured way in kindergartens. There were gains in I.Q. scores initially, although these were not maintained after two years. The intensive teaching mentioned earlier, which is a less structured version of the same approach, has now been widely adopted. But the evidence from this study indicates that if long-term gains are to be achieved, more drastic measures involving programmes designed to alter the child's cognitive structure may be necessary.

A Centre for Research in Education of the Disadvantaged now exists, and one of the projects⁸ under its auspices is studying the feasibility of training mothers of three- and four-year-old children to teach their own children at home. Materials have been developed which are used by the mother with the guidance of aides, and for the purpose of comparison the same materials are being used by teachers in the kindergartens; there is also a control group which does not receive the instruction at all. The assumption is that most mothers want to do the best for their children, especially at this age, but that many of them do not know how to go about it. Instead of using research workers, aides living in the local community are trained to instruct the mothers in the use of materials, as this is in the interest of better communication. Many of the mothers do not read Hebrew, and some are illiterate, so in these cases the material must be presented pictorially. The mothers work through the programme with their children for twenty minutes a day, five days a week. So far, after one year only two families out of 48 have

discontinued. Results with respect to gains made by the children are not yet available. The disadvantage of this kind of intervention is that it will be expensive and difficult to organize on a large scale. But earlier research has indicated the central importance of parental attitudes in educational attainment, and a project which goes into homes and works with mothers has obvious merits.

One of the most important controversies in educational policy surrounds the question of whether children of different ability should be taught together or not. In Israel a piece of research is now under way on homogeneous and heterogeneous ability groupings at the pre-school stage.⁹ Its main aim is to discover whether disadvantaged children do better in a mixed ability or class group or whether they progress faster when they are placed in a separate group. Some interesting findings have emerged: after two years of pre-school education all the children had gained in I.Q. scores, but the middle class children in the sample had gained much more in spite of special individual tutorial instruction given to the children from poor homes only. From this latter group those in classes of mixed ability achieved higher I.Q. scores than those in homogeneous classes, but they seem to have gained less in terms of social maturity measured by leadership roles, self-confidence, and initiative, and less also in terms of creativity. The most startling finding was that even among those young children there was little mixing in school between the upper middle class and lower working class children in the heterogeneous groups. In spite of the fact that teachers felt they were integrating well, the social interaction study revealed otherwise, but an intermediate group of lower middle and upper working class children established relationships with both the other groups, which may have given the teachers the false impression that complete mixing was taking place.

These findings fail to give clear-cut guidance to policy makers on the issue of ability grouping. But the results with respect to social maturity and mixing must weaken the conviction of those who argue that re-zoning and re-definition of catchment areas is essential, so that one-class schools may be eliminated. In Israel much more far-reaching policies with respect to the development towns and areas would be necessary to achieve this anyway.

Two important pieces of research have been undertaken¹⁰ in order to evaluate the primary school policies described earlier. The first of these concerns the long school day. Space does not permit going into details about how this research was carried out, but its findings so far are optimistic. Children undergoing the experiment did considerably better in various tests than the control group, although the novelty effect of a programme of this kind must not be discounted. The children following a programme consisting largely of social activities gained more than those following academic programmes, possibly because the

EDUCATION IN ISRAEL

latter group were less highly motivated. Since attendance for a long day is based on the characteristics of schools—all pupils in that school attending—there is little or no stigma for the individual pupil. But when such schools are situated in large cities rather than development areas, and choice is available to parents, the school itself may become stigmatized and shunned by the more affluent or better informed parent. This may be an unavoidable consequence of such selective policies, but policy makers should be aware of such a situation arising.

The second piece of research is on homogeneous groupings. The findings provide little support for those who wish to extend this policy. There were no significant differences in the achievement of those in groups of similar ability and those in groups of mixed ability, whether the measure used was teachers' assessment, intelligence, or school performance. Therefore the main aim of the policy to give more help to the less able children was not achieved. In fact, B level children appeared to suffer a little from the lack of stimulation of A level children, although it made no difference to C level children. The number of children who moved between levels was small (4 per cent). The type of grouping made little difference to the self-images of the children: A stream children had a more favourable self-image whether in mixed or high-ability groups. Motivation was also unaffected. These inconclusive findings mirror those of many similar research projects carried out in Europe and the United States.¹¹ They do not provide a strong case for introducing streaming in Israel, or abolishing it elsewhere.

They certainly do not support the case for the introduction of setting. This policy has been criticized in Israel on the grounds that it has been introduced before adequate materials have been developed for the less able children, and before teachers have been properly prepared to operate it. A more cogent criticism is that it has been introduced in spite of little evidence from other countries that it is likely to succeed. Indeed, it is more likely to encourage a further polarization between children of Oriental and Western origins by separating them for the key subjects of the curriculum in those schools where they are studying together.

A follow-up of children benefiting from the relaxation of standards in the transfer to academic secondary education suggests that this policy has failed.¹² Of those who achieved the lower norm only just over a third entered academic secondary education. The proportion of those reaching this standard who gained school-leaving certificates was only 8 per cent, or 21 per cent of those who had started academic secondary education. The problem of policies of this kind is that they treat the symptoms rather than attack the causes of the problem, a fact which few have failed to recognize since the implementation of the two norm system. This is not true of the remaining policies at the primary level:

intensive programmes and guidance to teachers. There is evidence to suggest that the quality of teachers is one of the few inputs into the school system which is a significant predictor of pupils' attainment.¹³ Thus, although this policy has not been evaluated, existing knowledge suggests that it is worth pursuing. Again, the intensive programmes have not been evaluated but this approach also seems worth pursuing. In the United States the long-term results of attempts to compensate disadvantaged children at the pre-school stage have not been successful unless accompanied by a continuation of special programmes at the elementary school stage. It may also be necessary to continue these in the secondary schools.

There is a suspicion that the unspoken rationale behind setting is to help the able children from Afro-Asian backgrounds to escape from being dragged down by their less able contemporaries. This is certainly one of the major reasons for the establishment of boarding schools for such children. To avoid inadequate secondary education in development areas they are accommodated in 'boarding schools for the gifted' in the town, 'where they rub shoulders with the "normal" Western middle-class populations of such institutions'.¹⁴ To date there has been no published work based on a scientific evaluation of this scheme. But the programme for men in the army, which like the boarding schools is designed specifically for a hand-picked group of gifted young people, is being evaluated.¹⁵ Little research is necessary to demonstrate that the programme has been an outstanding success in terms of achieving its goal of reducing drop-out among Oriental students: failure to complete their course has been less frequent among those students who received the programme's special instruction than for *all* students at the university. The aim of the research is to examine the content of the programme and to make recommendations about ways of improving it; and to identify the factors affecting success or failure. For this purpose, a sample of Oriental students who have not taken the course has been selected as a control group. Learning problems, aspirations and expectations, motivation and self-image are being studied, and should provide interesting evidence on the nature of educational failure in higher education. It is noteworthy that in Britain and in the United States the educational performance of working-class students ceases to compare badly with that of middle-class students, once the university stage has been reached.¹⁶

What such research does not aim to do, and therefore cannot do, is to challenge the basic philosophy behind this programme and the boarding school scheme: that 'the problem of the Orientals' should be tackled by increasing their numbers in the élite social positions of the society. There is no evidence that a small-scale diversification of the élite can achieve much. The hope that the Oriental recruits to positions of status and power will provide models of upward mobility with which

EDUCATION IN ISRAEL

other members of the community will be able to identify, and later emulate, seems far-fetched. Nor are many of them likely to return to the development towns or areas to become the leaders of their community of origin. Those who have ambitions for a political career may be more likely to go back to their home towns, as for complex reasons there are political advantages in doing so. There are too many more attractive opportunities in the big cities, and to ask the newly-mobile to reject these is to expect idealism and self-sacrifice in measures that few possess. More important, is the selection of a small group of clever children, on whom special care and extra resources will be lavished, consistent with equality and social justice? Are not the less fortunate average and below average children equally deserving, if not more deserving, of extra help?

This leads to the concluding paragraphs of this paper. The overall effect of all the policies described so far is limited by the fact that there are a number of central flaws in the Israeli educational system.¹⁷

The formal structure of primary education reduces the likelihood that the child with special educational problems will be able to receive the kind of individual help it needs to progress more satisfactorily. The shortness of the school day means that an undue emphasis must be placed on homework, which penalizes the child whose home is not conducive to getting this done. Linked with this, the failure to treat extra-curricular activities as an integral part of the educational system means that less affluent children have few opportunities to pursue them and leads to the need for special programmes of such activities. The training of teachers is inadequate from the point of view of length and content, and young teachers emerge from their colleges with too little theoretical and practical knowledge of the special difficulties of children of Oriental origins. The allocation of educational resources favours the children from middle class Western homes: for example, the least experienced and least well qualified teachers are found in the vocational schools and the development areas.¹⁸

The development of a more extensive system of educational planning is necessary, if such resources are to be more efficiently and equitably allocated than at present. For example, it may be necessary to establish a quota system for the deployment of qualified teachers, while they are in short supply, to ensure that less prestigious schools and areas get a higher proportion of qualified staff than others.

The Israeli system of secondary education has frequently been described as a bottleneck which prevents the successful flow of children from elementary to further education. Until the long awaited reform of secondary education is complete, it would not be an overstatement to say that much of the effort that has been put into the policies discussed here will be wasted. The system at present is neither free nor compulsory, and although over 85 per cent of children stay on at school, many do

not complete the course. It is also highly selective, and as such socially divisive. The arguments for abolishing selection in secondary education are well known, and have been accepted by most commentators in Israel. They range from the failure to avoid serious mistakes in selection, and the difficulty of transfer where such mistakes have been made, to the lack of prestige and resources of the non-selective schools, which therefore provide limited opportunities for their pupils. So long as most Oriental children are educated in separate and often inferior schools, much of the 'horizon-widening' taking place in the elementary schools will be dissipated.

It is planned to establish compulsory non-selective schools for children from thirteen to fifteen years of age throughout the country, and some areas are already experimenting with this system. How far this reform will succeed depends on what happens at the next stage. If the old system of separating out the élite is to continue at the 15 to 18 stage, little more than a postponement of selection from 13+ to 15+ will have taken place. The proportion of children staying on at school after the age of 15 might even decline, in that pupils who fail to qualify for academic education might feel more deterred by the prospect of embarking on some other school course at this age than at 13+.

To sum up: much of the point of the egalitarian reforms, many of which are well conceived, is lost if they are forced to operate in a wider framework which is élitist, and as such detrimental to the chances of the less able and the less fortunate. Another way of putting this is to say that certain changes in the universally provided system of education are necessary before selective policies can work. When the basic structure is reformed, positive discrimination in favour of the Oriental can be applied. But even when such educational reforms are complete the gap between Oriental and Western Jew will remain, less wide perhaps but still present. Educational failure is not just a function of a school system which fails to provide the right context in which children other than those of the educated middle class can learn. It is also a function of families too large to provide the individual contact with parents which children need to develop intellectually. There is plenty of evidence to show that family size is an important variable affecting educational attainment irrespective of class.¹⁹ Oriental families in Israel have on average several children more than the average family of Western origin.²⁰ In spite of the political difficulties created by the wartime situation and the presence of religious parties which would oppose such a measure, free advice on family planning and free distribution of contraceptives should be available to these families. If the aim to narrow the educational and economic gap between the two types of Israeli has the high priority politicians claim it has, then the taboos on a national drive to encourage family planning must be broken.

Secondly, educational failure is often a function of inadequate hous-

ing; there is abundant evidence to show that both overcrowding measured by the number of persons per room and inadequate amenities, such as lack of a bathroom, retard attainment at school.²¹ Again, this is irrespective of social class. A good deal of effort is being put into improving the standard of housing in Israel, but further resources should be devoted to this, especially directed towards Oriental families with children of school age. Improved income maintenance is also necessary if more Oriental pupils are to stay on to the end of secondary education, since many Oriental families cannot afford to forgo their children's earnings. Increased family allowances or maintenance grants for those who stay on at school after the school leaving age are two possible ways of achieving this.

These are just a few of the policies which need to go hand in hand with educational reform, if some of the disappointments the Americans have met in attempting to compensate children from poor backgrounds are to be avoided. Israel's unique contribution to the development of special educational policies designed to help the disadvantaged child could well be threatened, were they to fail through being too narrowly confined to one social service—namely education. There are conservative groups, including some middle class parents, who will be quick to seize on the failure of such policies and to suggest they should be abandoned rather than strengthened. As it is, Israeli policy totters on the brink that divides élitism and egalitarianism. At one time the philosophy of egalitarianism was fiercely held *and* practised. Some commentators have suggested that it was pursued with too much vigour, at the expense of Oriental children.²² This is a valid criticism, but it would be a pity were it turned on its head to admit differentiation whose main aim was too favour only the most able Oriental children. We have seen that there are many practices of an élitist kind operating today; the failure of some of the more egalitarian policies to improve educational performance could lead to further swings towards élitism.

No mention has been made of the education of Arab children in this paper. But it ends with the sad note that the reason for this is that the programmes described here have not been developed for Arab children. Arabs constitute about 13 per cent of the Israeli population, and are even more in need of special help than the Jews of Oriental origin. The charge that they are treated as second-class citizens may not be justified, but it will be harder to refute as long as educational policies designed to help the under-privileged exclude the Arab minority, for whom this label is at least as appropriate as for the Afro-Asian Jew.

NOTES

¹ I should like to thank the following people for the help, information, and advice given to me during my stay in Israel during the summer of 1970: at the Centre for Research in Education of the Disadvantaged, and the Department of Education in the Hebrew University Dr. Gina Ortar, Dr. Mordechai Nissan, Mrs. Jane Cohen and Mrs. Judy Kugelmass, Mrs. Sylvia Krown, Dr. Avima Lombard and especially Dr. Chaim Adler; at the Ministry of Education Mr. Shmuel Bendor, Mr. Dan Ronen, Mr. Rokach and the Deputy Minister of Education Mr. Aharon Yadlin; Mrs. Niza Naphtali, Chief-Superintendent of Kindergartens; Mr. Arye Simon, director of the Youth Village of Benshemen; Dr. Hannah Gelber, Mrs. Judith Schectermann and Mrs. Rifka Naharias of the Women's International Zionist Organisation; at the University of Tel Aviv, Dr. Rina Shapira (Department of Sociology), Dr. S. Abu-Ghosh (Department of Political Science); at the Technion, Haifa, Mr. Joseph Ami, Mr. David Kohn and Mrs. Yoelle Rom; Dr. Moshe Rinot of University College, Haifa; Dr. Moshe Sicron and Mr. Uri Avner of the Central Bureau of Statistics; at the Szold Institute of Educational Research, Mr. Dan Well and Mrs. Leah Naphtali; Mr. Aranne, for many years Minister of Education, alas now dead; at the National Insurance Institute, Mr. Elhanan Gaffny, Mrs. Nira Shamai and Mr. Raphael Rotter; and finally I am especially indebted for the kindness and help of Dr. Israel Katz, the Director General of that Institute. Without the help of these people this paper could not have been written. I should also like to thank the Anglo-Israel Association for the award of a Wyndham Deedes Travel Scholarship, which made the whole trip possible. Its Director, Mr. Kenneth Lindsay, took a great deal of trouble in providing me with advice and I am most grateful to him. I am also grateful to Professor Richard Titmuss, Professor Percy Cohen, and Mr. Avishai Ehrlich for comments on the paper.

² See Aharon F. Kleinberger, *Society, Schools and Progress in Israel*, London, 1969, pp. 291-2.

³ Education from the age of five years is also compulsory in Britain and three or four other countries, but it is part of

the elementary system, not of pre-school education.

⁴ Setting involves grouping children according to ability for certain subjects, normally key areas in the curriculum such as mathematics or the first foreign language. Other subjects are taught to heterogeneous ability groups.

⁵ Under the direction of Dr. Gina Ortar of the Education Department, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

⁶ Carried out at the Szold Institute for Educational Research, Jerusalem.

⁷ See Sarah Smilansky, *The Effects of Social Dramatic Play on Disadvantaged Pre-School Children*, New York, 1968.

⁸ Directed by Professor A. Tannenbaum and Dr. Avima Lombard.

⁹ Directed by Dr. Dina Feitelson of the Department of Education, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

¹⁰ At the Szold Institute for Educational Research under the direction of Mr. Dan Well.

¹¹ For example, Joan C. Barker Lunn, *Streaming in the Primary School*, National Foundation for Educational Research, Slough, England, 1970; Central Advisory Council for Education, *Children and Their Primary Schools*, vol. I, ch. 20, pt. III; vol. II, Appendix 11, H.M.S.O., London, 1964. T. Husen, *International Study of Achievement in Mathematics*, Stockholm, 1967; J. S. Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunities*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, 1966.

¹² See Leah Or, *Follow-up Study of the Further Education of Seker Examinees in 1957*, Szold Foundation, Jerusalem, 1964 (in Hebrew).

¹³ Coleman, op. cit.; Central Advisory Council for Education, 1964, op. cit.

¹⁴ Kleinberger, op. cit., p. 303.

¹⁵ Under Dr. Mordechai Nissan at the Centre for Research in the Education of the Disadvantaged, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

¹⁶ See Robbins Report, *Higher Education*, Appendix I, Command 2154, H.M.S.O., London, 1963.

¹⁷ Kleinberger, op. cit., ch. 7.

¹⁸ See Central Bureau of Statistics figures which show that in 1969-70, 10 per cent of primary school teachers in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv were not qualified compared with 25 per cent in both the Northern and Southern regions.

EDUCATION IN ISRAEL

Similar discrepancies occur at the secondary stage.

¹⁹ For example, J. W. B. Douglas, *The Home and the School*, London, 1964; Central Advisory Council for Education, *15 to 18* (The Crowther Report), H.M.S.O., London, 1960.

²⁰ See J. Matras, *Social Change in Israel*, Chicago, 1965, ch. 5.

²¹ See J. W. B. Douglas, *op. cit.*; and Peter Wedge and Jane Petzing, 'Housing Conditions and their Relationship to Educational Performance and Social Adjustment in Seven-Year-Old Children', Paper delivered at the 1970 Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

²² 'In the first decade of independence (1948-57), the dominant egalitarian ideology prevented the acknowledgement

of the existence of a special problem that called for special measures. The principle of equality was taken to imply that no distinctions were to be made, and that all children, irrespective of their socio-cultural backgrounds and individual attributes, were to be subjected to an identical treatment in a uniform kindergarten and elementary school. It was naively assumed that by exposing the children of Oriental immigrants to the same curricula, text-books, and methods of instruction that had been successful with children of veteran residents and immigrants from Europe, they would soon be assimilated to the normative culture of the Yishuv which was predominantly European in origin and orientation.' Kleinberger, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

Additional works not cited in the Notes

Chaim Adler, 'The Israeli School as a Selective Institution' in Andreas M. Kazamias and Erwin H. Epstein, eds., *Schools in Transition*, Boston, 1968.

Chaim Adler, 'Education and the Integration of Immigrants in Israel', *International Migration Review*, vol. III, no. 3, Summer 1969.

Joseph Bentwich, *Education in Israel*, London, 1965.

B. Bettelheim, *Children of the Dream*, London, 1969.

Central Bureau of Statistics, *Bulletin of Educational Statistics*, Jerusalem, 1970.

S. N. Eisenstadt, *The Absorption of Immigrants*, Glencoe, Ill., 1955.

S. N. Eisenstadt, *Israeli Society*, London, 1967.

Dina Feitelson, 'Training Teachers for Conditions of Cultural Diversity', Paper delivered to the Second International Congress on Reading, Copenhagen, 1968.

Miriam Glikson, 'Some Aspects of Non-conventional Methods of Education in Israel', The Henrietta Szold Institute Report No. 137, Publication No. 484, Jerusalem, April 1969.

Ministry of Education and Culture, *Educational Developments 1969-70*, Jerusalem, 1970.

Ministry of Education and Culture, *Schools and Kindergartens 1967-68*, Central Bureau of Statistics, Jerusalem, 1970, Special Series No. 303.

Gina Ortar, 'Educational Achievements of Primary School Graduates in Israel as Related to their Socio-Cultural Background', *Comparative Education*, vol. 4, no. 1, November 1967.

Arye Perlberg and Yael Rom, 'A Compensatory Program on the Higher Education Level—An Israeli Case Study', *The Educational Forum*, March 1969.

Moshe Smilansky, ed., *Child and Youth Welfare in Israel*, The Henrietta Szold Institute, Jerusalem, 1960.

Moshe and Sarah Smilansky, 'Intellectual Advancement of Culturally Disadvantaged Children: An Israeli Approach for Research and Action', *International Review of Education*, vol. 13, no. 4, 1967.

Differentiation and Cooperation in an Israeli Veteran Moshav

E BALDWIN The moshav movement was concerned with setting up cooperative agricultural communities based upon the ideologies of socialism. This study of one of the oldest moshavim in Israel shows how political, economic and social factors have necessitated the reinterpretation of moshav law and principles of organisation. *£3.60 net*

Arab Border-Villages in Israel

A COHEN 'The high quality of the field research is matched by the skilful analysis . . . makes a substantial contribution to our understanding of one segment of Israeli society, to the general question of the social organisation of Arab villages and to the still more general problem of the ways in which minority groups function in stress situations.'—*Race* *£1.80 net*

Immigrant Voters in Israel

S DESHEN The presence of immigrants in great numbers is a permeating feature of Israeli society. By investigating specific aspects of one election campaign in a small town, focusing mainly on themes of religion and ethnicity, the author shows how various beliefs operate in the realities of politics in an immigrant locality. *£3.00 net*

Bedouin of the Negev

E MARX The life of the Bedouin is shaped by a complex environment, increasing governmental influence and the impact of an expanding Israeli society. This study of contemporary Bedouin society describes these factors and analyses the organisation of one tribe. 'An outstanding contribution to social anthropology.'—*Jewish Chronicle* *£2.10 net*

The Dual Heritage

M SHOKEID Tells the story of the migration of a whole community from the Atlas Mountains in Morocco to one of the new rural villages in Israel, situated in the Negev region. Much of it is dedicated to an analysis of social change—it deals with the patterns, processes and problems of adjustment and change, particularly in the spheres of politics and family relationships. *£3.00 net*

Immigration and Social Change

D WEINTRAUB In the first few years of its existence, the State of Israel embarked upon a unique experiment—the establishment of hundreds of new agricultural villages in which were settled people from diverse backgrounds. This book looks at the nature of the undertaking, examines the social problems and difficulties which accompanied it, and traces its successes and setbacks. *£3.00 net*

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH ON ANGLO-JEWRY 1968-71*

Marlena Schmool

Introduction

SINCE the publication in December 1968 of the first 'Register of Social Research on the Anglo-Jewish Community'¹ there has been a steady increase of research in the area covered there. From the interest shown in this field it has become clear that an up-to-date version of the Register would be helpful both to those engaged on research work and to others. The Research Unit has therefore revised the original Register in the light of information available in January 1971;² projects noted in the original Register and still in progress are also included.

The layout of the present edition follows that of the original, which was modelled on the *Register of Research in the Human Sciences* compiled by the Ministry of Technology, London. For each project the following information is given, in so far as it is relevant and available:

- (a) title of the project;
- (b) short description;
- (c) the name of the person or committee responsible for the research;
- (d) the name(s) of the principal research worker(s);
- (e) the actual or proposed starting date;
- (f) the actual or proposed completion date;
- (g) date and details of publication of interim results;
- (h) the actual or probable date and place of publication of final results.

The Register is divided into two parts: Part A includes research undertaken or sponsored by Jewish communal organizations; Part B covers research undertaken under university auspices (as a research thesis or otherwise). Within each part the entries have been listed in alphabetical order of the names of the institutions sponsoring the research (where appropriate, the words 'University of' are omitted). Research projects have been numbered serially throughout the Register

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

for subsequent convenience of reference. In Part A are included research projects undertaken by provincial communities where such projects cover more than the routine collection of communal statistics. An innovation in the present edition is the inclusion of an index of authors and research workers; the reference number in the index refers to the serial number of the project as given in the Register.

Inquiries regarding a particular entry should be addressed to the person or organization undertaking the research. It would be appreciated if information on further projects would be sent to the Research Officer at the Board of Deputies, London, so that the Register may be kept up-to-date.

Part A. Research undertaken by Jewish Communal Organizations

BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS
Statistical and Demographic Research Unit,
Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place,
London, WC1H 0EP

Established 1965. Compiles statistical data on various aspects of the community and prepares interpretative studies of trends, etc. c. Functions under a Special Committee which is a sub-committee of the Board's Executive Committee (Chairman of Special Committee: Mr. Harry Landy); d. Honorary Research Adviser: Professor S. J. Prais; Research Officer: Mrs. Marlena Schmoool.

1. a. Trends in synagogue marriages in Great Britain.
- c.d. As above.
- e. January 1966.
- g. Reports on 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969 available in mimeograph.
- h. 'Statistics of Jewish Marriages in Great Britain, 1901-65', *JJS*, Vol. IX, No. 2, December 1967.
- 'Synagogue Marriages in Great Britain: 1966-68', *JJS*, Vol. XII, No. 1, June 1970.
2. a. Demographic trends in Anglo-Jewry.
- b. Analyses of the Anglo-Jewish population based on fertility, mortality, and marriage statistics.
- c.d. As above.
- e. January 1966 (marriage).
- April 1966 (mortality).
- May 1968 (fertility).
- g. Report on births, marriages, and deaths, 1969, available in mimeograph.
- h. 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population, 1960-65', *JJS*, Vol. X, No. 1, June 1968.

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH

- 'Statistics of Milah and the Jewish Birth-Rate in Britain',
JJS, Vol. XII, No. 2, December 1970.
3. a. The socio-economic structure of Jews in England and Wales.
b. Analysis of a sample of Jewish deaths (carried out with the help of the Registrar General).
c.d. As above.
e. January 1968.
 4. a. Causes of death among Jews in England and Wales.
b.c.d. As entry No. 3.
e. January 1968.
 5. a. Trends in synagogue membership.
b. Study of the size and development of the different synagogal groups and of the geographical distribution of the Jewish population of Greater London.
c.d. As above.
e. June 1969.
f. December 1971.
 6. a. Statistics of Jewish education.
b. The extent of Jewish education received by school-age children in Great Britain.
c.d. As above.
e. December 1969.

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH AFFAIRS
13-16 Jacob's Well Mews,
George Street, London, W1H 5PD.

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

7. a. Aspects of Jewish identity.
b. A sample study of the Jewish population of Greater London investigating their nature, forms, and degree of identification with Jewry.
c. Professor S. J. Gould with Research Board.
d. Miss R. Seal.
e. June 1968.
f. 1971-72.
8. a. Young Jews and the New Left.
b. The personal circumstances and motivations prompting young Jews to join the New Left; how this affects or is affected by their attitude to Jewish issues, especially to Israel and the Arab-Israel conflict.
c. Professor P. S. Cohen.
d. Miss S. Bornstein.

MARLENA SCHMOOL

- e. September 1970.
- f. Spring 1972.

JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

74a Charlotte Street, London, W1P 2AH.

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

- 9. a. Allowance survey.
- b. A study to assess the role of weekly allowances, monetary and non-monetary help, in the families receiving weekly allowances and in a control group selected by a random method from all the other cases in the department.
- d. Mrs. R. Beenstock.
- e. March 1968.
- f. December 1968.

MERSEYSIDE JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL,
Demographic and Sociological Unit,
5 Oxford Street, Liverpool 7.

Study of patterns and trends in the Jewish population of Merseyside.

- 10. a. Demographic studies of the Liverpool Jewish community.
- c. Dr. M. Goodman.
- e. 1965, continuing.
- g. Demographic data is available for 1965-70.
- h. 'A Research Note on Jewish Education on Merseyside, 1962', *JJS*, Vol. VII, No. 1, June, 1965.
'Liverpool Jewry', *In the Dispersion*, Vol. 5-6, World Zionist Organization, Spring 1966.

Part B. Research undertaken under university auspices

BRISTOL, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
Bristol, 2.

- 11. a. The identity of some Bristol Jews.
- b. A study of 55 Orthodox and Liberal Jews in the Bristol area.
- c. S. Harris (for M.Sc.; supervisor: Dr. T. G. I. Hamnett).
- e. September 1967.
- f. June 1970.
- g. Thesis available at the University library.

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH

BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Kingston Lane, Uxbridge, Middlesex.

12. a. A study of Jewish families in London.
- b. A depth study of middle- and working-class families covering power patterns within the Jewish family, inter-personal family relationships, individuals' self-images, and the presence of any eastern European emotional heritage.
- c. Mrs. M. Fachler (for M.A.; supervisor: Professor D. Miller).
- c. September 1970.
- f. October 1971.

THE CITY UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES
St. John Street, London, E.C. 1

One of the areas of research encouraged is race and minority studies.

13. a. A comparative study of minorities in Britain.
- b. Analysis of material relating to Jews and other minorities, both white and coloured, in order to clarify theories concerning the adjustment of minority groups to British society.
- c. Dr. E. Krausz.
- e. April 1969.
- f. April 1971.
- h. *Ethnic Minorities in Britain*, McGibbon and Kee, London, September 1971.

LIVERPOOL, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
Bedford Street, Liverpool 7.

14. a. Jewish ideology and Jewish community.
- b. Interrelation between Jewish cultural and religious elements, showing their impact on the Jewish community in Liverpool and its social structure.
- c. Dr. N. Kokosalakis.
- d. Mr. G. Littlejohn.
- c. 1970.
- f. End of 1972.

LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE.

15. a. Role and structure of the Anglo-Jewish Rabbinate.
- b. The social background, training, and role of ministers serving congregations in England. Based on a questionnaire survey and depth interviews.

MARLENA SCHMOOL

- c. Mrs. M. Schmool (for M.Phil.; supervisors: Professors M. Freedman and P. S. Cohen).
- e. September 1968.
- f. 1972.

NOTTINGHAM, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD.

- 16. a. A comparison of inter-generational relations in the Jewish and non-Jewish family.
- b. An analysis of four types of conflict based on interviews with a sample of Jewish youths and their parents.
- c. G. Cromer (for M.A.; supervisor: Professor S. J. Gould).
- e. October 1967.
- f. October 1971.
- 17. a. Social Mobility of the Jewish Immigrant.
- b. An empirical study of social mobility based on a survey of Baghdadi Jews, from India and the Far East, now living in London.
- c. P. Gottlieb (for M.Phil.; supervisor: Professor S. J. Gould).
- e. October 1967.
- f. October 1969.
- g. Articles in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* describing the contemporary situation under the following headings:
(i) India, (ii) Bombay, (iii) Cochin, (iv) Pakistan.

THE OPEN UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
Walton Hall, Walton, Nr. Bletchley, Bucks.

- 18. a. The financing systems of minority groups.
- b. Minority groups provide religious, cultural, and educational facilities for their members. This research investigates how these activities are financed; whether the system of finance can act as a measure of group identity; and applies general economic principles concerning taxation and subsidies to minority group taxation. The minority groups studied are the Jewish, Polish, and Cypriot communities in the U.K.
- c. L. Wagner.
- e. June 1970.
- f. April 1971.
- h. End of 1971.

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH

OXFORD, ORIEL COLLEGE

19. a. Social Determinants in the Religious Practices and Organization of the Jews in England, with special reference to the United Synagogue.
- b. The influence on religious practices and organization of the changing economic, cultural, and social circumstances of Jews in English society. Detailed attention is given to the organizational structure of the United Synagogue; the emergence and legitimation of new patterns of authority; the division of functions between lay and ecclesiastical bodies and their relationship; and the importance and effects of bureaucracy.
- d. S. Sharot (for Ph.D.; supervisor: Dr. B. R. Wilson).
- e. October 1965.
- f. October 1968.
- h. 'Secularization, Judaism and Anglo-Jewry', in M. Hill ed., *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 4, SCM Press, London 1971.

QUEEN MARY COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
Mile End Road, London, E1 4NS.

20. a. Leisure-time activities of Jewish youth.
- b. Sample-survey of Jewish youth in London, the results to be compared with those of an earlier study in 1964 ('Leisure Activities of Jewish Teenagers in London', *JJS*, Vol. VIII, No. 2, December 1966).
- c. A. Ziderman.
- e. Autumn 1970.
- f. Summer 1971.

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC HISTORY
Western Bank, Sheffield 10.

21. a. Anglo-Jewish response to immigration and racial tension, 1950-70.
- b. A short history of Jewish and coloured immigration to Britain, examining the Jewish response to coloured immigration as expressed in newspaper reports and through the work of both Jewish communal institutions and individual Jews.
- c. Miss M. Waldenberg (for M.A.; supervisor: Mr. C. Holmes).
- e. October 1969.
- f. January 1971.

MARLENA SCHMOOL

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

- 22. a. Evolution of Jewish education in England with special reference to Liverpool, 1840-1957.
- b. A study of education in Jewish voluntary schools, against the background of national education and the sociology and demography of Anglo-Jewry. Hebrew teaching in board and voluntary schools is contrasted with traditional methods.
- c. C. P. Hershon (for Ph.D.; supervisor: Mr. G. R. Batho).
- e. October 1968.
- f. June 1972.

NOTES

¹ Schmool, M., *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. X, No. 2, December 1968.

² My thanks go to Professor S. J. Prais and to Mrs. M. Hyman for their assistance in compiling this Register.

Index of authors and research workers

| | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------------|----------------------|
| Beenstock, R. | 9 | Kokosalakis, N. | 14 |
| Bornstein, S. | 8 | Krausz, E. | 13 |
| Cohen, P. S. | 8 | Littlejohn, G. | 14 |
| Cromer, G. | 16 | Prais, S. J. | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| Fachler, M. | 12 | Schmool, M. | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15 |
| Goodman, M. | 10 | Seal, R. | 7 |
| Gottlieb, P. | 17 | Sharot, S. | 19 |
| Gould, S. J. | 7 | Wagner, L. | 18 |
| Harris, S. | 11 | Waldenberg, M. | 21 |
| Hershon, C. P. | 22 | Ziderman, A. | 20 |

THE NEW YORK KEHILLAH, 1908-22

Lloyd P. Gartner

(Review Article)

A standardized historical portrait of the eastern European immigrant in America between the 1880s and the 1920s has been naturalized in American historiography. It depicts masses of oppressed and impoverished Jews from Russia, Poland, and Rumania coming to the United States during an era of prodigious urban growth and industrial development, and settling on the Lower East Side of New York and similar working class neighbourhoods in every large city. These immigrant hives, the portrait implies, were a necessary 'portal to America' (lately a modish title) for insecure and unadjusted aliens making their way in a strange country. In those days the Jews were sometimes pedlars and small shopkeepers, but the more interesting segment was the sweatshop tailors. For it was among them that socialists and Yiddish writers and journalists, encouraged by upper-class urban reformers, established a trade union movement which abandoned revolutionary aspirations and became instead a model of trade union skill and innovation, and a torchbearer of urban reform. The immigrant Jewish masses, we are to understand, adjusted to their new society by quickly discarding their religious traditions, except for a pathetic rear-guard. Educators, trade union leaders, Gentile reformers, and social workers all stirred political interest among the immigrants and their children, who finally found their political home in the New Deal of the 1930s. They rapidly entered the middle classes while retaining their liberal politics, supposedly owing to Biblical moral imperatives and the communal traditions which they inherited.

This portrait does somewhat explain conspicuous phenomena of the last thirty to forty years: the swift economic rise of American Jewry, its predominantly liberal politics, and the eminent role of Jews in cultural life. The most noteworthy exposition from this viewpoint is Moses Rischin, *The Promised City: New York's Jews, 1870-1914*.¹ Allon Schoener's collection of photographs and newspaper articles is called *Portal to America: The Lower East Side 1870-1925*,² which implies its orientation, while Ronald Sanders's skilful popular book *The Downtown Jews*³ presents the immigrants in essentially the same focus. There are also other works.

There is too much that this by now conventional wisdom of the historians does not account for. It hardly examines the intricate change of immigrant Jewish religion—small 'o' orthodoxy—to Judaism, American style. Perhaps this omission is because American historians and sociologists in general are liberal, secular men, and when they must analyse religious history are most comfortable when locating and handling movements towards secularization and accommodation with contemporary culture. Few seem temperamentally and educationally equipped to come to grips with sacred texts and ecclesiastical politics as they are indeed in the case of social ideologies or governmental politics. (A superlative exception was Perry Miller, while Charles S. Liebman has been writing effectively on American Judaism mainly in recent *American Jewish Year Books*. One recalls here Morton G. White's insistence that historians who write about philosophers must learn some philosophy.⁴) Religion, always central in American Jewish history, has been treated mostly in facile terms of modernization and acculturation. No less a cliché has been the conception of immigrant voters as radicals or as simple souls controlled by political bosses, slowly finding their way into left-of-centre New Dealism. That Jews were New Deal stalwarts is unquestioned, but the explanation of the fact has been simplistic and inadequate. Thus, if the claim is correct that their deprivations as immigrants turned the Jews permanently to liberalism what shall be said of the Italians? Their immigration was contemporary with the Jews' and they were probably more deprived, yet they remained a generally conservative group. Some rather blurry explanations of Jewish liberalism invoke Biblical calls to justice and prophetic righteousness. But rural and small-town Protestants have known their Law and Prophets probably better than any element of the American population, and they have been arch-conservative. (One also refrains from commenting on the self-serving implications of identifying Biblical religion with a particular political outlook.) As to Jewish continuity itself, except as a liberal political and intellectual force, that has been regarded sometimes regretfully as a product of antisemitism and of solidarity with persecuted Jews elsewhere.

Among the many blank spaces in the standardized portrait is any serious reckoning with the immigrant and other Jews who purposefully sought to reinterpret Jewish ethnic life in conscious awareness of American life and conditions. During the immigrant era there were actually significant movements towards reorganizing the Jewish group and redirecting its activities. Eastern European Jews, rich in communal experience, did not attempt to transfer their old oligarchic *kehillah* ('community'; the cognate *kahal* is usually its executive body); nor did they take to the existing arrangement of local synagogues and charitable societies, but in stumbling fashion sought new structures. Leading historians, when they noticed communal movements among the

immigrants, dealt with them summarily. To Oscar Handlin they were imitative reactions to the 'narrow nationalism' among the nativists,⁵ while John Higham, the historian of nativism, follows Eric F. Goldman and writes of the forced, condescending Americanization which 'hurled large blocs of immigrants into compensatory chauvinisms of their own', among which this thoughtful historian includes Zionism.⁶ When historians of this calibre quite casually classify ethnic expression merely as reflexes of external intolerance, then it is really necessary to examine how immigrant Jews (and not only they) refounded themselves as a voluntary American ethno-religious body. This restructuring of organized Jewish life and its continued vigour, the adaptation of inherited Judaism into an American religion, and the continuation of group solidarity well beyond the immigrant age, are all to be accounted for. Such an account is the implicit purpose, as it is the end result, of Goren's book.*

Around 1880 the communal life of the 250,000 to 280,000 American Jews consisted of a few hundred congregations loosely federated in the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, B'nai B'rith and some other fraternal orders, and a great many local charitable societies. By the mid-1920s there were over four million Jews and dozens of functioning national organizations. The scale and conception of Jewish life had changed. Early in the twentieth century manifold interests and activities arose—cultural, philanthropic, recreational, overseas—which far transcended what might be expected of a group identifying itself above all as an American religious denomination. Many other activities such as trade unionism, political groups, and left-wing causes were not Jewish only in a formal sense. The woes of poor Jews which had been unobtrusively assuaged by little charities in 1880 became massive and public. New York City, the boom city of the Western world, became the greatest urban centre of Jews in history, the overwhelming majority of them poor immigrants. The implications of emancipation and American life as the uptown native Jews understood them, however, virtually prohibited a comprehensive organized Jewish community. They openly feared the idea of a state within the state at a time when the East Side looked like one. Besides, if a community were governed by numbers they would be overwhelmed by the immigrants. There was no denying the need, however, to organize the immigrants in league with the natives somehow to grapple with formidable problems of health, education, labour, and crime, and to defend the East Side's good name upon which the uptowners' own reputation indirectly depended. It was clear that the immigrants could not organize themselves.

* ARTHUR A. GOREN, *New York Jews and the Quest for Community, The Kehillah Experiment, 1908-1922*, xii + 361 pp., Columbia University Press, New York and London, 1970, £4.50 or \$10.00.

Their traditional lay and rabbinic communal leadership mostly did not come to America, and those who came proved impotent; Jewish trade unionists and socialist journalists were indifferent or hostile to Jewish communal organization; the orthodox were having little success in acclimatizing themselves to American life. Most simply, the vast majority of immigrants worked too long and hard to concern themselves with remote, abstract problems, and those of their sons who might be rising lawyers or business men could not yet provide leadership. While the uptowners opposed an organized Jewish community for the city, on the East Side it was felt that such a community had to be established by those who were fully American in culture, wealth, and connexions: in other words by those who symbolized what the immigrants hoped to make of themselves in America. In the contemporary context, this meant that the initiative had to come from the masterful omnipresent Jacob H. Schiff and Louis Marshall.

Schiff, Marshall, and those close to them were persuaded only by a sense of danger that words said and charges made against the East Side and its immigrants would undermine their own high status, and that only the Jews acting collectively could cure or improve the social ills of the Lower East Side. The Kehillah of New York City was founded upon this paradox of distrust of an organized community and practical need for its services. It was to concern itself with internal problems only, while the uptowners' recently founded American Jewish Committee was recognized as the exclusive representative for external matters. In return for the Committee's recognition of the Kehillah as representing immigrant Jewry and the indispensable financial support from Committee notables, the Kehillah innocuously styled itself 'the constituent of the American Jewish Committee in its twelfth district'. The functioning head of the Kehillah was Rabbi Judah L. Magnes of Temple Emanu-El, the foremost Reform congregation, one of the most attractive persons in early twentieth century American Jewry. His uptown connexions combined with personal magnetism, Zionist beliefs, and increasing attachment to traditional Judaism, made him the ideal person to bridge the uptown-downtown chasm. The immigrants' dependence upon, and admiration for, the natives is clearly seen from their delegates' election of the uptown leaders to dominant places on the Kehillah's board. On the other hand, nothing better illustrates the education of uptown by downtown than the generous treatment of the newly established Bureau of Jewish Education directed by the dynamic and original, but financially improvident, Samson Benderly. The philanthropists swallowed sufficient of their misgivings about intensive Hebrew education in a Zionist spirit to support this most expensive of Kehillah's projects, out of a typically conservative anxiety that East Side young were recklessly abandoning the faith of their fathers for political or cultural radicalism, or for hedonism and crimin-

ality. They had re-established the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1902 for similar reasons. The bright young men recruited by Benderly for his Bureau staff were mostly college students or recent graduates, who sought to educate their contemporaries in a fusion of modern Hebraism and religious tradition. The staff and its wider intellectual circle were strongly influenced by the challenging new ideas of the cultural nationalists Ahad Ha'am (Asher Ginzberg) and Simon Dubnov. In fact, it is not far-fetched to suggest that the doctrines of these two, in the matrix of the acculturating Lower East Side, gave birth to the theory of cultural pluralism. Its early exponents came from this circle—Magnes, Israel Friedlander, Isaac B. Berkson, Mordecai M. Kaplan, and at some remove Horace M. Kallen and Ludwig Lewisohn; and Brandeis himself when he embraced Zionism. Randolph Bourne seems to have been the only non-Jewish cultural pluralist before 1920.

Other activities of the Kehillah broadly illustrate the attempt to find the proper scope for voluntary Jewish communal life under conditions of emancipation. Thus, the supervision of a kasher meat supply had been a communal function for generations, deriving its justification from common religious values. The Kehillah of New York City entered the field for a quite different reason, because the kasher meat industry was defrauding the religious consumer and causing public scandal. Had the industry been operating properly the Kehillah would not have entered, for it was neutral to kashrut as a religious value. The immigrant Orthodox rabbis, who lost their authority and most of their prestige in the passage from eastern European to American Jewish life, expected the Kehillah's plan to place its kashrut programme under their supervision to restore much of their status. But the replacement of small-town slaughterer-butchers in the old country by untrammelled aggressive meat-packers with their hired religious functionaries lending religious legitimation, proved too much for the Kehillah. It gave up, and thus gained the enmity of the immigrant rabbis. Charity, another venerable communal function, was the principal Jewish activity of the uptowners, and as such was let alone by the Kehillah downtowners who supplied almost all the beneficiaries. The Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies (later the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies) of New York City, which was constituted in 1917, originated from the Kehillah's Bureau of Philanthropic Research.

The Kehillah attempted to establish relations with a powerful new moral and social force, the Jewish labour movement. The Jewish unions frequently resorted to Schiff, Marshall, and Magnes to reason with employers and settle strikes because of the great influence and authority of these men as Jews—certainly there were non-Jewish financiers, lawyers, and clergymen available, had they been wanted. The Kehillah also established a Bureau of Industry in which Paul Abelson and other able mediators solved serious labour issues in the fur,

millinery, and lesser industries. In the minds of labour leaders, however, their Jewishness and that of their members and employers, like the Yiddish widely employed in the unions, were accidental and transitory. The unions and their allied fraternal order *Arbeiter Ring*, declined to be associated with the organized Jewish community. Class consciousness outweighed ethnic solidarity; but could a deeper reason have been sour memories of disdain for the working man on the part of *kahal* oligarchs in the old country?

Goren's chapters on 'Crime in the Jewish Quarter' and 'Crime Fighting by the Kehillah' which integrate New York City politics, personal motives, reform movements to expose crime and its Tammany Hall links, and the Kehillah's anti-crime efforts on the Lower East Side, rank among the most fascinating and revealing discussions yet written on Jewish communal and social problems. The immigrant quarter, extremely touchy about its public reputation, for years denied or glossed over criminal activities—mainly commercial crime—in its midst. The uptown natives, for their part, realized that not only was crime on the Lower East Side a moral peril but it was affecting their good name. So the Kehillah undertook a project so far as I know without precedent or successor in the annals of Diaspora Jewry. At the risk of labelling crime 'Jewish' it maintained a detective bureau with Mayor Gaynor's full co-operation. In close liaison with the police, this Bureau of Social Morals performed salutary service for several years in ridding the Jewish quarter of vicious conditions.

It is evident that the only tie between the old community and the new, besides the word 'Kehillah' itself, was the ancient Jewish group solidarity feeling of corporate responsibility. Otherwise the contrast is sharp between the legal unity under oligarchic domination in eastern Europe, and the approach to American popular democracy under the benevolent Jewish patriciate. The Kehillah of New York City assumed new roles for a Jewish community while abandoning many of the historic ones. As a polity it also differed radically from its European forebear. Besides exercising its moral power it functioned as an unofficial political force in the city's life thanks to its numbers and communal leaders. The Kehillah was thus a means by which immigrants as well as natives took the steps to become a voluntary American ethno-religious body.

The decline of the Kehillah from 1917 seems less explicable than its rise. Certainly the shift of interest to overseas affairs, including Palestine, after 1914 and the flow of money outwards sapped energies devoted to the Kehillah. The indispensable Magnes's outspoken pacifism in 1917-18 made untenable his position as a Jewish leader. But perhaps there were subtler reasons. Was the number of Jews so vast and their acculturation to New York so rapid that their sense of minority and strangeness was diluted to the point where a distinct polity was no

NEW YORK KEHILLAH

longer wanted? At any rate, the Kehillah was extinct by 1922. In contrast to developments in other American cities, New York Jewry never again organized itself centrally.

The reader will be inclined to compare Goren's work with Rischin's mentioned above. Rischin, however, regarded the immigrant Jews' group life as of slight significance and hardly paid it any attention. His meticulously researched book conceives of them moving into the mainstream of urban Progressivism, led by Abe Cahan and his *Forward* and by Jewish and Christian civic reformers, with the climax reached in the victorious strikes of 1909-16. The immigrants' Judaism appears to Rischin a vanishing, irrecoverable quantity, and he is fascinated by their speedy absorption of, and contributions to, contemporary cultural modernism in Yiddish as well as English garb. Goren, who hardly deals with the social and economic life of New York Jews as does Rischin, is far more sensitive to the nuances of their Judaism. Both books are indispensable and complement each other, but I think Goren knows his people better.

The entire Kehillah story with its ramifications is told masterfully. Goren has combed the general, Anglo-Jewish, and especially the Yiddish press. Besides using the papers of Schiff, Marshall, Warburg, Abelson, and others, he has worked through the abundant documents of the Kehillah itself which are among the Judah L. Magnes archives in Jerusalem. Here and there it would have helped to draw evidence from other contemporary eastern European immigrant communities west of the Elbe and the Hudson, and to devote more attention to similar phenomena among other immigrant groups in the American metropolis. But as it stands, *New York Jews and the Quest for Community* is the suggestive, mature, fully realized work of an American Israeli, with its American and Jewish dimensions fully integrated.

NOTES

¹ Published in 1962. I have discussed it in this *Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 1, July 1964, pp. 141-45.

² Published in New York, 1967.

³ Published in New York, 1969.

⁴ Morton G. White, 'The Lives of Philosophers', *Perspectives in American History*, Vol. III, Cambridge, Mass., 1969, pp. 494-95.

⁵ Oscar Handlin, 'Immigration in American Life: A Reappraisal', in H. S. Commager, ed., *Immigration and American History: Essays in Honor of Theodore C. Blegen*, Minneapolis, 1961, p. 14.

⁶ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1925*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1954; 1963 edn., p. 254.

AMÉRICA LATINA

The regional social science journal in
Latin America

Some recent articles:

- 1—*AZEVEDO, Thales*—As regras do namôro no Brasil: um padrão tradicional.
- 2—*GRACIARENA, Jorge*—Notas para una discusión sobre la sociologia de los intelectuales en América Latina.
- 3—*McCOY, Terry L.*—La reforma agrária chilena: una análisis político del cambio estrutural.
- 4—*MOREIRA, Adriano*—Pluralismo religioso e cultural.
- 5—*PIQUET, Rosélia Périssé*—A teoria do comércio internacional em face ao subdesenvolvimento econômico.
- 6—*SALCEDO-BASTARDO, J. L.*—Los estratos sociales en la Venezuela Colonial.
- 7—*THEBAUD, Annie*—Aspirations des étudiants de psychologie.
- 8—*WALKER, Neuma Aguiar*—O modelo de mudança usado pelas teorias de mobilização e de anomia.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE LATIN AMERICAN CENTER FOR
RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Subscription for four numbers: US\$7.00

Back numbers still available: US\$2.00 each

The subscription includes, free of charge, the bi-monthly bibliographical bulletin—*Bibliografia* on the social sciences in Latin America

Caixa Postal, 12 (ZC-02)
Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

STUDENT REVOLT AND GENERATIONAL CONFLICT: PHANTASY AND REALITY*

Percy S. Cohen

(Review Article)

IN a recent inaugural lecture, a distinguished British sociologist put the view that the events which preoccupied the members of a number of universities in the last decade or so might have received an undeserving amount of attention or, at least, the wrong kind of attention.¹ This is a view deserving of attention, but whether it is accepted or not is very much a matter of taste and of opinion: for in the medium-long run, in which some of us are not dead, but sufficiently alive to remember the events of the 1960s known as the students' revolt (and, who knows, perhaps of the 70s and 80s too), it may be that they will be considered as trivial as the advent of the New Look in 1947, or as important as the expressions of Black anger which also occurred in the 1960s.

It is far better to stick to the easier sociological task of asking the following questions.

What are the characteristics of these events or types of event? Why do they occur at some time and place and not at others? Who leads the movements and what is the importance of leadership in them? Who are the followers and who, among them, the activists and who the more

* JÜRGEN HABERMAS, *Toward a Rational Society, Student Protest, Science, and Politics*, trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro, ix + 132 pp., Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1971, £1.50 hardback; 75p paperback.

LEWIS S. FEUER, *The Conflict of Generations, The Character and Significance of Student Movements*, xi + 543 pp., Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1969, £3.50.

AILEEN D. ROSS, *Student Unrest in India, A Comparative Approach*, xiv + 301 pp., McGill-Queen's University Press, London, 1969, £5.62½.

ARMSTEAD L. ROBINSON, CRAIG C. POSTER, and DONALD H. OGILVIE, eds., *Black Studies in the University, A Symposium*, xi + 231 pp., Yale University Press, New Haven and London, \$6.00.

BETTY YORBURG, *Utopia and Reality, A Collective Portrait of American Socialists*, x + 198 pp., Columbia University Press, London, 1969, £3.37½p.

ISRAEL KATZ and HAROLD SILVER, eds., *The University and Social Welfare*, papers delivered at the Colloquium held in Jerusalem, April 1967, xi + 251 pp., publication of the Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem and Oxford University Press, London, 1969, £2.50.

passive supporters? What are the processes which are common to the events (or, as some would prefer, what is their 'internal dialectic')? And so on. And no doubt readers of this *Journal* will specifically ask two more questions: are Jews over-represented in the events of the student revolt and, if so, why? (Some will not even ask the questions, but will assume that both facts and causes have been well established.)

First, some facts. Student participation, taking either violent or allegedly violent form, in the political activities of the wider society, and using the universities or other institutions of learning as bases from which to act, is no new or recent phenomenon. One can argue over its history, but it was certainly a very visible phenomenon in nineteenth-century western, central, and eastern Europe (though scarcely in Britain and the United States), and even in the non-metropolitan areas of European empires; and such events certainly recurred in those places in the first two or three decades of the twentieth century. Furthermore, this type of student political activism played—or is alleged, at least by its participants, to have played—an important part in the struggle for colonial freedom in Africa and the Middle and Far East, and elsewhere.

Nor is there anything very new in the expression of student power within universities, with criticisms of curricula, examination methods (and *results*), or even the demand for and achievement of participation in university decision-making; this type of protest has been common for some time in, for example, India and Latin America, while in some of the countries of the Latin American sub-continent a good deal of student representation and participation has been achieved.

What was special about the events of the 1960s in the United States, Western Europe, and Japan was the combination of three sets of student pressures: to influence wider political events and to use the universities as bases for these activities; to implicate universities in the 'perpetration of political crimes'; and to seek reforms of varying degrees of radicalism in the administration of universities so as to control the use of resources, to decide on the moral acceptability of their origins, to influence the procedures and content of teaching and assessment, and to make studies more 'relevant'. (The term 'relevance' is interestingly ambiguous. To some, studies should have more 'relevance' to the understanding of the social world in which they live, and this criticism applies particularly to the teaching of the social sciences and the humanities, though perhaps even to the natural sciences as well. To most of these critics, studies should also be more 'relevant' to the task of changing the world. However, to other critics studies should be less academic and more 'relevant' to career and job requirements. There are, of course, always some critics who would argue for greater 'relevance' in all three senses, on the assumption that it is one of the 'inner contradictions' of capitalist societies that universities not only teach

STUDENT REVOLT

little about the real world or how to change it, but even fail to provide the necessary education for the maintenance of an efficient capitalism and a contented class of capitalist managers, doctors, teachers, civil servants, etc. Clearly, this criticism has the best of all worlds.)

There can be much debate as to whether all the cases of university confrontation involving these three sets of pressures were spontaneous examples of parallel development, or whether diffusion—in the form of written ideas or of their human exponents in receipt of substantial travel grants—had a large part to play; but there is now little dispute about one thing: that there are certain common conditions in advanced industrial societies in which such events can occur, whether or not their occurrence is also influenced by contagion.

There are several principal forms of explanation of these events or types of event and most of the explanations can be readily recognized as convenient to those who expound them. At the one extreme there are explanations which readily lend themselves to the justification of revolt, and at the other there are those which equally well lend themselves to the justification of a punitive or, at least, suppressive attitude. The first type of explanation (and there is considerable variety within this type) is that given by the militant students and by some of their academic and other supporters. The central tenets of these explanations are as follows. Capitalist society has now reached its final stage (though doubtless there will be several more final stages to come) in which it requires ever repressive measures against the working class and the colonial third world. It also recognizes the need for an ever-increasing number of university graduates to man the bureaucratic system, and so it must provide for university and other educational expansion in which the educational process itself is either neglected or ignored at the expense of expansion itself; the system, nevertheless, manages to produce a class of revolutionary intellectuals whose task is to unmask it, to combat the new agencies of mental control and, possibly, join with manual, industrial, technical or other workers, such as teachers, as well as peasants in far away places, in bringing about a new form of society.

This theory does recognize that 'late-capitalist society', which is still alive and kicking rather brutally, may show some forms of apparent tolerance in sex and the arts; but this 'tolerance' is spurious and, in fact, repressive, since it serves to encourage the view that liberalism survives; however, where such 'tolerance' permits effective criticism it becomes yet another manifestation of the 'contradictions of capitalist society'. In the main, capitalist liberalism is being, or has already been, undermined and, given the fact that it needs to process and use the almost dehumanized products of education, it creates greater alienation of students from the system. However, most students, like most workers, suffer from 'false consciousness'. They really believe not only the content of what they are taught, but even accept some of the values with

which they are indoctrinated with much lack of subtlety. But, as with workers, this 'false consciousness' is dispelled among the mass of students as a result of confrontation with authority, which reveals the brutality of naked power which the cloak of legitimacy conceals. While such confrontations can be engineered, there is usually no need to do so: for the very demand for the rights preached by liberal capitalist society—such as the freedom of speech and demonstration—produce denials of these, which provoke protest. Protest, in turn, produces repressive measures, often involving the use of police on university sites. All of this leads to a recognition that the connexion between indifferent teaching, inefficient, dehumanized, and authoritarian education, and the tacit support by universities for wars of internal and external 'imperialism', is far from fortuitous.

This might sound like a caricature of the militant student view, for it is impossible to do justice to all variants of it; and any attempt to summarize a complex doctrine cannot but be something of a caricature, especially when the exponents of such a doctrine write in a language lending itself to it. But let one thing be said now: there is more than a grain of truth in this theory or model of student revolt, though it could be stated in rather a different form.

At the other extreme are the theories which explain the revolt largely in terms of the characteristics of students themselves, and perhaps of the social conditions which elicit these characteristics. One crude version is the 'Spock-generation' theory, which runs as follows: this is a generation which has been reared so permissively that it can tolerate neither direction from authority nor 'no' for an answer; thus, when it is told that there are certain rules which it must accept, it rebels; when its right to rebel is denied, it howls with infantile rage.

This theory, too, may contain a small grain of truth, though, like the former, it needs to be stated in rather different terms, and with rather different emphasis, to have any real explanatory value of other than a minority phenomenon: after all, there is little evidence that Spock-like child-rearing and adolescent treatment were at all widespread outside the United States some twenty or more years ago, and it is most unlikely that such methods of upbringing would have been found in Japan ten years ago, or even now.²

Neither Habermas nor Feuer, the two principal writers considered here, takes either of these extreme positions in their crude forms; however, Habermas's position is nearer to the first than to the second, if only because it is more sociological; while Feuer's position is nearer to the second than to the first, if only because it is more psychological. But there is a little more to it than that. Habermas, for all his pertinent criticisms of the militant view, has more sympathy for the goals inherent in it, whereas Feuer has little, and his theory is meant to rob the meaning of student radicalism of much of its credibility.

STUDENT REVOLT

Habermas's book, *Toward a Rational Society*, is a set of essays, albeit linked in orientation and interest; but it is the first three of the essays on the university and democracy, on the nature of contemporary student protest (with special reference to Germany), and a critical appraisal of the German movement, which are essentially relevant to this review. In these three essays Habermas sets out his own academic ideology, seeks to explain the particular character of the student protest movement in Germany, as well as the movement as a whole, and then offers a number of disclaimers in the form of criticism of the excesses of student revolutionaries.

Habermas poses his problem in the following way. Sociologists, he says, could readily understand and possibly even predict student radicalism in under-developed or developing societies, but they were taken by surprise when the phenomenon occurred also in highly developed industrial societies. In under-developed or developing societies, some students have, by virtue of their status, position and aspirations, broken with traditionalism, rebelled against the family, and see themselves (to some extent correctly) as the agents of further social change; the coincidence of their perception of a rapidly changing society with the expression of their own psycho-social needs encourages a sense of frustration and a rebellious attitude, and produces student activism, revolt, etc. In contrast, it has always been thought that students in an advanced industrial society see themselves necessary to its maintenance and experience no conflict between the demands of traditional particularism and the striving for universalistic values, because of the changes which have already occurred in the functions of the family and other tradition-preserving institutions. Nevertheless, argues Habermas, it is the very conditions of advanced industrial societies, especially capitalistic societies, which have brought about this revolt. Although each case can be looked at in specific historical terms, one can only explain the movement as a whole by seeking general characteristics common to them all. In Habermas's view, the general characteristic is the following: that students in an advanced and affluent society are among the first to perceive that the system works only too well according to its own criteria, but that it has assumed a life of its own so that it functions at the expense of the 'needs' of those who participate in it. Students perceive these things especially when they experience the glaring defects of their own institutions, which are supposed to train them to perform effectively in the occupational system, while also encouraging them to adopt an ideology of criticism which is necessary for the advancement of knowledge. This failure is particularly glaring in countries like Germany, but it can take a variety of forms. Habermas is fully aware that the perceived defects of the German system are very different from those of the American system, and so on. Nevertheless, he considers the students' perception to be a,

more or less, true one in all cases. Habermas does not disavow any reference to psychological factors and is quite willing to recognize a large element of phantasy which enters into the formulation of radical student ideologies and programmes, such as, for example, the assertion of a universality of interest between oppressed colonial peoples, the working class of advanced industrial societies, and the students themselves: in fact, in the later essays the use of terms like 'phantasy' becomes more frequent and indicates a growing distaste for some of the rhetoric of student radicalism.

However, Habermas is sure that there is an inherent need for growing democratization both in the university and in the wider society—and by this he means participatory democracy, not just representative democracy: for if there is to be a society based on the growing influence of science and other forms of rational discussion, criticism, and appraisal, then there must also be a growth of institutional forms which permit the development of such a culture. And if the encouragement of democratization can occur only at the cost of bringing about other radical changes in the social system—for example, a decreased emphasis on such values as economic growth—then the cost must be borne.

Whether due to deficiencies in the translation or to slight elements of obscurity in the original, there are parts of Habermas's argument which remain a little unclear, but its main tendencies and assertions are clear enough. For the most part, this is one of the most thoughtful and, indeed, brilliant discussions of the whole problem in all the literature, although there are clearly some weaknesses in it. For example, if one is to accept the hypothesis concerning recognition that the system works according to its own criteria, how does one explain the fact that in the ideologies of some radical student movements the system is asserted to be incapable of working according to its own criteria, by virtue of its own 'inner contradictions'? Is Habermas, in effect, saying that the student assertions are simply so much rationalizing rhetoric, while the truth lies not so much in what they say but in what they feel or sense? Second, what is exactly meant by the statement that a system works more or less effectively according to its own criteria? Surely this can only mean that a system works well or badly according to the criteria of a certain sector of society, since a social system cannot be said to have criteria for the evaluation of its own performance. Third, Habermas does not offer any criticism of the assertion that we can know what 'needs' people have which are distinct from those which are met, or are allegedly met, by a particular social system. Granted, there is a substantial literature, especially Marxist and neo-Marxist, which does claim that such 'needs' can be posited as existing, but one would have liked some evaluation of that view from Habermas. Thus, can the existence of the 'needs' be objectively

STUDENT REVOLT

established, or must they merely be asserted as part of a moral system? Fourth, does Habermas really consider that participatory democracy—or might one say populist democracy?—can be defended so easily, simply by arguing that it is a structural requirement in the service of the advancement of a scientific and rational culture? Does he really believe that the consensus reached by any majority decisions is a necessarily wise one? (Would he accept the re-introduction of the death penalty or censorship, or even the abolition of so-called obscene publications simply on the grounds that, after discussion, the majority of members of a society had concluded that such policies were necessary?) I doubt it very much. Consequently, I also doubt whether participatory democracy in the university can be taken to the *extremes* demanded by some student radicals.³ Perhaps Professor Habermas intended no such demand, and one can well sympathize with the statement of an extreme position when one views the degree of authoritarianism and personal detachment displayed by academics in Germany and in other European countries. (Of course, it is always easier to sympathize with other people's radical students than with one's own.)

Feuer's book, *The Conflict of Generations*, takes, as I have already mentioned, a rather different approach from that of Habermas. In Feuer's view, though radical student movements are consciously motivated by the highest moral ideals, they have been and are characterized by 'terrorism' and 'suicidalism': this is because at the basis of such movements are their roots in political phantasy rather than in the reality of the everyday economic process, such as is the case with the proletariat; and it is also for this reason that students are so easily placed under the spell of 'pure ideas'. The deep-rooted phantasy to which Feuer refers is that of overthrowing, or of possibly destroying, the figure of authority, the representative of the father; student revolts are, in essence, the acting out of Oedipal phantasies. However, Feuer is not a simple psychological reductionist, for his argument is that it is only in certain historical conditions that a process of 'de-authorization' occurs which is not, in itself, the product of student revolt but, for the most part, the condition of it, and is itself a function of changes in the wider social system. When 'de-authorization' occurs, the latent force of rebellion is released, while the psychological mechanisms may be actually strengthened, since the perception of the weakening of authority arouses anxiety and, hence, aggression. Feuer does, of course, raise the questions why students revolt more than others, and why in particular societies. The answer to the first of these questions is the familiar one that students are in a condition of 'status moratorium' (to use a concept of Erik H. Erickson), and this frees them to take actions, the possibilities of which others do not perceive; and, in addition, students have the time, the leisure, and the motive to play with ideas, and not only to indulge in phantasy thinking but to act out their phantasies,

because they do not feel themselves obliged or compelled to reckon the consequences of their actions.

Regardless of whether one accepts Feuer's thesis, one cannot but admire his enormous erudition and use of illustrative material from a variety of cases in which he analyses not only the events of student radical action, but also the imagery inherent in the phantasies expressed by some student leaders. After an introductory chapter on the causes and characteristics of student movements, Feuer moves on in the next three chapters to a description and discussion of the cases of Germany, Bosnia (and here especially the circumstances surrounding the action of Gavrilo Princip, the assassin of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand), and the Russian student movement with its 'heroic will to martyrdom'. These chapters are followed by a fifth which is on the revolt against 'gerontocracy' in traditional societies: Feuer, like Habermas, recognizes that there is considerable potential for student revolt in the more 'backward' societies; but he argues that it is unlikely to occur while these are effectively 'oppressive' and will take place only when they undergo dramatic 'de-authorization'. This chapter is one of the weakest in the book and provides a caricature rather than a characterization of so-called traditional societies, though it has some interesting things to say about the case of Japan. The sixth chapter, on the student élite of Europe, discusses generational unrest in capitalist and socialist societies and makes the interesting point that students played a relatively small part in resisting the emergence of fascism in Italy and Germany, or in opposing its development in France; and he even emphasizes how enthusiastic some student organizations were in supporting fascist movements, probably because these movements involved a radical rejection of certain traditional values, and appealed to the 'terroristic' and 'suicidal' elements in student radicalism. Chapters 7, 8, and 9 are devoted first to the background of the development of student radical movements in the United States and then to their emergence. Feuer gives a fascinating though, one might argue, clearly one-sided description and interpretation of those events in the United States; and the closer he approaches to Berkeley, the less detached he seems to be and the more hostile he permits himself to be in condemning student radicalism. Whatever view one wishes to take of the American movement and of the events at Berkeley, one must still expect from a social-scientific analysis that it will attempt to provide the most adequate model for explaining not only the origins of these events, but also the causes of their escalation and diffusion, and one might have expected from Feuer a greater emphasis on the political process of *interaction*, not only at the conscious level, but also at the *unconscious*. Feuer recognizes that university and other authorities do react to student radical activities, thereby creating a wider base for radical student support; but in all this analysis it is the students only who are

STUDENT REVOLT

motivated by the wish to act out unconscious phantasies. It does not seem to have occurred to Feuer, nor indeed to most others who have adopted a Freudian, or partly Freudian, approach to these matters, that those who are threatened may also have their own Freudian axes to grind. If the students are out to emasculate the teachers and administrators, then the latter may well react, or even over-react, to such an extent as to strengthen the process of equating phantasy with reality.

Feuer's last chapter is devoted to a discussion of alienation, which he calls 'the Marxism of student movements'. In fact, Feuer states that the concept of alienation is to student revolutionaries and radicals what the experience of exploitation is to the proletariat; and he rightly recognizes that the appeal of the theory of alienation corresponds to a genuine sense of it, at least on the part of some students.

In much, or most, of this book, Feuer tries to do justice to the idealism and 'purity' of the conscious motives of student movements, but concludes that they have, in most cases, if not all, done more damage to the cause of liberalism, democracy, or even of revolutionary change, than good, even where the students were alone in fighting or opposing despotic regimes: this is because such movements have never succeeded in escaping the fate of their unconscious roots in 'terrorism' and 'suicidalism'; the former being the acting out of violent aggression against authority, the latter being the expression of guilt at having done so.

One of the authors actually quoted by Feuer is Aileen D. Ross, whose *Student Unrest in India* attempts to put the Indian case in a wider comparative perspective. In fact, although the author contributes very little to our understanding of the wider problem, she does provide some very interesting information about India and its students. The impression one gets confirms some things that Feuer has to say: namely, that Indian students have been far more concerned, however ferociously, to demand changes within the university than in the wider society. The reason lies largely in their poverty, in their lack of facilities, and in their overwhelming anxiety to acquire the degrees which they hope will enable them to obtain the desired occupations for which they will have to compete fiercely. If Feuer is right in asserting that a lack of general political radicalism on the part of Indian student movements can be explained in terms of the fact that Indian traditionalism has not yet been truly 'de-authorized', then this raises an important question of how one knows that sufficient 'de-authorization' has occurred, unless one has actually observed its consequences.

No discussion of student revolt is complete without some reference to problems of race, especially in the United States. *Black Studies in the University* is, in fact, a symposium of a conference held at Yale to discuss the possibilities of meeting the demand for promoting these studies; and when this demand earns the support of scholars such as the anthro-

pologist Sidney W. Mintz and of political intellectuals such as McGeorge Bundy, one should take care not to dismiss it as a mere expression of ethnic and student irrationalism. In fact, the general effect of this book, despite some naive statements, is to convince one that a good deal could and should be done to correct the imbalance in our educational system in its approach to the black peoples of Africa and the Americas. However, it does not follow that this is also necessarily a demand for black separatism, which is a far more utopian political request.

Utopianism is commonly associated more with European than with American intellectual life, and it certainly would be true to say that American reformist movements in recent times have been governed far more by a philosophy of piecemeal engineering than by that of holistic social reconstruction. However, America for a long time had, and still has, a rather old-fashioned type of socialist movement, which is the subject of Betty Yorburg's *Utopia and Reality*. The author partly attempts to explain the conditions under which that movement arose, and why it has failed to realize its goal of ever achieving power within a parliamentary system, while also commenting, in considerable detail, on the subjective element in being a member of the American socialist movement; and it is this last element, in particular, which makes the book a rather useful and interesting one. Professor Yorburg has one or two things to say about generational differences, but very little to contribute to our understanding of the rise of the New Left, except perhaps by way of hinting that the parental generation of present radicals and revolutionaries may have been the rather disillusioned children of the elders who founded the socialist movement, and who still have greater faith in it than do their children who, in turn, have now spawned a generation which is rather angry that its grandparental elders have been betrayed. This is not exactly what the author says, but it seems to be implied here and there. At all events, it may explain why *some* young people have joined the radical or revolutionary student movement, or it may explain the *style* which some of them have adopted, and the direction in which it has taken them. In fact, one is reminded here of the thesis that a good deal of the radical movement among students might be explicable in terms of the 'red diapers' which they wore as infants. The argument is roughly as follows: if one counts the number of people who, in the forties and even thirties, were members of either the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, or of the 'progressive movement', and predicts from this how many children they would have been likely to have had by the sixties who are under the age of thirty or thereabouts, one partly explains the size of the student militant movement, on the assumption that the children of liberals or progressives or socialists or communists tend to move to the left of their parents.

STUDENT REVOLT

There are, of course, still those who believe that much of the explanation for student revolt lies in the fact that universities in many countries have tended to neglect student welfare and interests. This point is made in a trenchant and brilliant form in a paper by Richard Titmuss in *The University and Social Welfare*, which is a collection of papers delivered at a colloquium held in Jerusalem in April 1967. The burden of Titmuss's argument is, in fact, that too many university teachers find teaching—especially undergraduate teaching—a tiresome chore, as indicated by the use of such revealing phrases as 'teaching load'. The other essays in this book are concerned with such problems as the nature of academic freedom, the university and social welfare, the university in a socialist society, the university of the future, education for the professions, the university in Israel, the university and government, and the university and education for social work. All the papers are of considerable interest, but the most relevant here is Awraham Zloczower's contribution entitled 'The Limitations of the University in Creating a Socialist Society'; for this essay does, to some extent, reflect certain aspects of New Left thinking in that it emphasizes the need for, and the possibility of, university autonomy and self-regulation within a socialist state, and explicitly argues against the notion that a socialist state must be one which is over-centralized, over-bureaucratized, and over-concerned to curtail academic freedom. A further point worth making about this volume is that few of its authors see any harm in the university emphasizing specific training for the professions, administration, etc., as well as providing a more general training in ways of thinking and ways of devising and formulating values: for Professor Habermas, in the first chapter of his book, seems a little troubled by the possibility that universities might be seen too much as agents of practical education, whereas Professor Titmuss reminds one that that was the original conception of the university, that there is no incompatibility between the two goals of practical training and general education, and that, in fact, the two aims should inform each other.

What are we now to make of all this? It is clear that there are a number of sources of discontent which have promoted student radicalism and revolt: first, what Titmuss calls the relative inability of universities to be critical not only of other ideas and organizations but, indeed, of their own organizational structure, values, and educational ideas; second, the experience of relative deprivation of those who have, in fact, been provided with increasing benefits (I hesitate and tremble to use the word 'privileges') in the form of education, grants, etc., but whose expectations, partly based on what has been communicated to

them, have not been met; third, the emergence of permissiveness and, along with it, 'de-authorization'; fourth, the occurrence of wider political events within societies and outside them which some students have seen as either the deliberate consequences of evil or wrong-headed policies and ideologies, or else as the unintended consequences of uncontrolled complex systems which have taken on a monstrous life of their own; fifth, disillusionment with existing political parties and movements; and so on and so on. No doubt many or most of these factors have contributed to the movement, and although there has been some research on the subject, a good deal more is required to sort out the factors by comparative studies, such as those of Professor Feuer, though not necessarily informed by his particular theoretical approach.

Some last general questions remain. First, to what extent should one emphasize the social-psychological characteristics of students, especially the processes of socialization which have produced particular attitudes towards authority, and towards university authorities in particular? Clearly the simple-minded 'Spock hypothesis' is silly, since it cannot possibly explain events in Germany, Japan, and, in fact, most other societies outside the United States; but a more sophisticated and revised version of this thesis may well have *some* explanatory relevance. One could argue that, at least in some societies, a more permissive upbringing has resulted, in part, in a generation not having been socialized to deal with its own aggression against firm and consistent parents and parent surrogates, while, nevertheless, having exercised authority, consequently producing children who are torn by the knowledge, or at least the feeling, that they may act out aggression without ever succeeding in doing so effectively—a condition which could produce a low tolerance of authority, discipline, or denial. But if we are to look at a broader range of societies, it is more likely that the common general factor has been a greater inconsistency between different aspects of socialization, involving a conflict between an increasing degree of permissiveness with a continued expression of authority within the family, the school, the university, etc. However, this is just one set of factors, and in order to make them relevant to past cases, one would have to look for other forms of inconsistency in socialization; and this is where the trouble begins, for all forms of socialization can, in some respects, be characterized as 'inconsistent'.

The second general question which still remains is that of the degree to which the reaction of authority to student criticism and revolt can be said to be a major determinant of the creation, development, and growth of a movement, and of the escalation of its activities. Writers like Feuer, at least in considering the contemporary scene, seem to see everything in terms of the young acting out their phantasies, and of their elders reacting in terms of a more or less rational conscious political

STUDENT REVOLT

programme of either creating reforms or of maintaining legitimacy and order, with a minority of teachers succumbing to their own unfulfilled adolescent personalities, by over-identifying with the young rebels. But is it not possible that those who react punitively (however necessary at the rational level they may consider punitive action to be) may also be affected by phantasy thinking? May they not also be the prisoners of residual adolescent characteristics which they can only deny by punitive reaction and assertion of authority? All of this means that the analysis of the unconscious should either be considered irrelevant for both sides or relevant for both, but not for one at the expense of the other. Of course, a defender of the Feuer position could argue that adolescents, or late adolescents, are more prone to phantasy thinking and acting out than are their seniors; and that is probably right. However, it does not follow that these unconscious elements are altogether absent on the senior side, and that they lack relevance for explaining all sorts of aspects of what occurs. In short, what is sauce for the gosling may also be sauce for not only those ganders and geese who appear more obviously to behave like goslings, but also for those who may fear to hiss. One of the reasons may be not simply that the academic profession attracts a large number of those who wish to continue a more or less adolescent way of life (which sometimes occurs), but rather that the professional role, by bringing the academic into constant contact with the young, constantly reactivates the residual elements of adolescence in his personality; a process which may also occur with school-teachers and others who are in constant contact with adolescents at various stages of development.

Finally, there is the specific question concerning the role of young Jews in student militancy. The only author discussed here to mention it is Feuer, who argues that for young Jews the process of 'de-authorization' is always far more intense than for non-Jews;⁴ first, like others, they experience 'de-authorization' in the wider society; and second, they also experience 'de-authorization' within their own community. He could go on to say that when young Jews aspire to assimilate to the wider society through revolutionary movements, they are seeking to escape the humiliation of a third form of 'de-authorization': namely, their witnessing of the acts of bullying and domination to which their own figures of authority, such as fathers and teachers, may have been subjected. (One is reminded of Freud's story of witnessing his father being bullied and cuffed in the streets of Vienna by an antisemitic ruffian.) The fact is that we still do not know enough about the extent, quality, and nature of Jewish participation in such movements, though the impression of Jewish prominence is always there. It is also interesting to note that on more than one occasion Jewish participation in such movements has been followed by a reaction, partly against them, in favour of a more particularistic identification, in an attempt to radicalize

Jewish communities, or a Jewish state or society. In the past this was a mere dream; it is now more in the nature of an, at present, unrealizable political programme. However, if a total dream could become part reality, a part dream might become even more of a reality—or perhaps less of one.

NOTES

¹ J. A. Banks, *Sociology As A Vocation: An Inaugural Lecture delivered in the University of Leicester 18 February 1971*, Leicester University Press, Leicester, 1971.

² Unless one assumes that traditional Japanese middle-class child-rearing is, in some respects, Spock-like.

³ Which is not to say that I oppose student participation in university affairs; in fact, I have directly encouraged it.

⁴ There is, of course, a growing wealth of literature on this subject by other authors.

BOOK REVIEWS

MAX VORSPAN AND LLOYD P. GARTNER, *History of the Jews of Los Angeles*, xii + 362 pp, Regional History Series of the American Jewish History Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, 1970, \$8.50.

Los Angeles is the ultimate in city development in the age of the automobile; a metropolis whose constituent parts are linked or—if you prefer—slashed by giant freeways; a city whose social life is impossible without at least one automobile and inconvenient without two. It has been described as forty suburbs in search of a metropolis. The study of its Jewish community is therefore of interest because it shows how Jewish communal life has had to adapt itself to the most extreme form of western metropolitan living, the form towards which other metropolitan cities in America are developing; as well as British cities—unless they are stopped in time by planning. The book therefore portrays the conditions to which other Jewish communities in the west may increasingly have to adapt.

Because of the amorphous spread of the Los Angeles metropolitan area—the city itself covers only part of it—the historiography of its Jewish population is not an easy task. It is fortunate therefore that the American Jewish History Center included Los Angeles in its programme of communal histories, each entrusted to a combination of an enthusiastic local historian and an experienced professional who provides the continuity with similar studies. In this case, the local historian, Dr. Vorspan, is also a professor of American Jewish history and both he and Dr. Gartner have taught at the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University. The writers therefore have the maximum of expertise needed for this very difficult task and (apart from his perpetual complaint about the lack of maps in works of this kind) this reviewer finds it difficult to fault their scholarly yet readable presentation.

One can understand the growth of the Jewish community of Los Angeles only by relating it to the growth of the City. Until the 1870s Los Angeles was a small isolated urban area. The lure of economic opportunity in the newly settled west, and the California gold rush, drew adventurous Jews, especially German, to the area in the 1850s. But few stayed in Los Angeles, a settlement with neither port nor railway. Those who did stay were the 'merchants on Main Street' in the little township, and, perhaps for lack of competition, they achieved a civic leadership and social acceptance that their descendants must have envied but could not emulate.

It was the arrival of the railways in the 1870s that unleashed the growth of Los Angeles. There was an influx of settlers, a short-lived land boom in the 1880s, and the growth of a sprawling city. The nature of this influx is important because it was to determine the form of the city's later develop-

BOOK REVIEWS

ment. It was sparked off by the connexion of Los Angeles to the transcontinental railway systems in the 1870s, thus making the area accessible to migrants from the middle-west and eastern United States. The late nineteenth century migrants to Los Angeles were not European immigrants but established and comfortable American citizens, attracted to Southern California because they were impressed by its climate and believed it to be a pleasanter, softer place to live in. They were not like the proletarian masses swarming across the Atlantic for safety or livelihood to the eastern cities; what each of the newcomers to Los Angeles sought was a single-house plot, with a spacious garden, in an area separated from commercial and industrial uses. If I may quote from a book which appeared just too late for Vorspan and Gartner to make full use of (Robert M. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis—Los Angeles 1850-1930*) on the ideals of those who built up Los Angeles: 'Not for them multi-family dwellings confined to narrow plots, separated by cluttered streets and interspersed with commerce and industry. Their vision was epitomized by the residential suburb—spacious, affluent, clean, decent, permanent, predictable and homogeneous—and violated by the great city—congested, impoverished, filthy, immoral, transient, uncertain and heterogeneous. The late nineteenth and early twentieth century metropolis, as the newcomers in Los Angeles perceived it, was the receptacle for all European evils and the source of all American sins. It contradicted their long-cherished notions about the proper environment and compelled them to retreat to outskirts uncontaminated by urban vices and conducive to rural virtues. And though native Americans everywhere shared these sentiments, they formed a larger proportion of the populace in Los Angeles than in other great metropolises' (op. cit. p. 145).

This was the ideological basis for the development of Los Angeles. The ideals could be implemented because after 1885 electric tramways and then automobiles provided the means of communication; there were no major physical barriers to lateral expansion; and the public utilities were organized to facilitate this sprawling growth. Los Angeles developed until the early twentieth century primarily as a residential city, with only service industries for its own needs. Later industrial development was due to the climatic and topographical attractions of the area for the motion picture industry; the discovery of oil, which brought refineries and petro-chemical industry; and the opportunity for decentralization of industries like car-assembly or rubber manufacture for tyres to reduce transport costs to the huge consumer market in California. Yet even in the commercial sphere, the residential pattern influenced development. The central business district was largely offices, with shopping and industry decentralized to avoid the congestion first of street cars and then of automobiles. Almost by accident, the city of suburbia developed into a polycentric metropolis.

All this had its effect on the Jewish settlers. The original community, founded in 1861, mainly of German origin, engaged a young Warsaw-born Yeshiva-educated rabbi, Abraham W. Edelman, as communal factotum; as their members grew richer, their orthodoxy diminished; kashrut was observed by only a minority and by 1883 an organ was introduced. In 1885 they decided to adopt the Reform prayerbook and Rabbi Edelman resigned, to minister later to orthodox and conservative congregations in Los Angeles.

BOOK REVIEWS

This transition from nominal orthodoxy to reform in twenty years was characteristic of the new American communities of the second half of the nineteenth century. What was not so usual was that the Jewish settlers were mainly central European or American-born. Although some eastern European Jews came after 1900, the Jews of eastern European origin did not come *en masse* till after 1920, by which time most of them were acculturated to American ways.

Yet, in spite of the Los Angeles Jews being more 'American' than most, they suffered socially after about 1890 because of the predominantly East Coast and mid-western origin of the general population, which made Los Angeles predominantly a native White Protestant town. Whereas other towns with big European immigrant populations had a political system based on a balance of ethnic groups, Los Angeles was reactionary and restrictive in its administration, and Jews rarely occupied positions of civic prominence in the 1900-40 period; and the children even of prominent Jewish families were excluded from the social club to which their fathers belonged.

Yet the problems of Los Angeles Jewry before 1900, when the Jewish population was 2,500 or even in 1910 when it was 10,000, were those of a relatively small community. It was only after 1920 that it began to move fantastically into the big league. The figures starkly tell the tale: 1927, 65,000; 1941, 130,000; 1948, 260,000; 1959, nearly 400,000; by 1967, over 500,000. This more than paralleled a growth in the metropolitan area (I quote figures for the county rather than the city of Los Angeles) from half a million in 1910 to over 7 million in 1968. It will be seen that the proportion of Jews in the total population increased from around 1 to 2 per cent to about 7 per cent in this century.

Los Angeles now has America's second largest Jewish community in the fastest growing region of the United States (over 20 per cent in the single decade 1959-69). Apart from New York and greater Tel Aviv, Los Angeles must be the largest Jewish community in the world. Yet it is practically the newest of the world's great Jewish communities, 70 per cent of the community having arrived in the twenty-five years since the end of the Second World War. The immigrants were, like their predecessors, attracted by the climate (which they might previously have experienced as servicemen or war industry workers) and by the apparently never-ending economic expansion. The film industry, of course, involved a large number of Jews, but Jews were to some extent isolated in its Hollywood enclave from Jewish communal life in Los Angeles. The physical expansion, however, meant a continuous building boom which provided fortunes, or at least a livelihood, for a considerable slice of the Jewish population. For Los Angeles Jewry was increasingly prosperous. Entrepreneurs were followed by professional men: by 1959 it was estimated that 25 per cent of the employed Jewish heads of households were professional men or in analogous callings. In 1967, it was estimated that the median income of all Jewish households was over \$11,000 with 42 per cent earning over \$10,000 (compared with 24.5 per cent of all Los Angeles residents in 1960). The prevailing dispersed pattern of Los Angeles life led to the Jewish community being very widely spread, but even so the tendency of Jews towards concentration led to 70 per cent of Los

BOOK REVIEWS

Angeles Jews in 1965 residing in four major although widely spread areas, not surprisingly the most attractive residential areas in the metropolitan region.

But this concentration was only relative, and the community had to grapple with the dual problems of dispersion and a high proportion of newcomers. The authors cautiously do not assign reasons for some developments, but it seems to the present reviewer that the pattern of life in Los Angeles must be responsible for the weakness of traditional Judaism (since Sabbath observance must be extremely difficult in a city where no one walks) and the growth of a vast population of religiously unaffiliated Jews. Synagogue affiliation among Jewish households dropped from 34 per cent in the 1950s to 27 per cent in the 1960s. Only 6 per cent of Los Angeles Jews described themselves as Orthodox, 32 per cent as Conservative, 22 per cent as Reform, and 36 per cent as 'just Jewish'. (Compare this with the London post-1945 suburb of Edgware, where in 1962-63 Dr. Krausz found over 80 per cent were affiliated to synagogues—about 70 per cent to orthodox or nominally orthodox congregations.) That this class of unattached Jews is increasing is shown by the fact that, between the 1950s and 1960s, it is estimated that there were 35,000 new Jewish households, but only 1,500 new families affiliated to synagogues. Educational statistics show a similar story: a community of half a million had fewer than 30,000 children enrolled for Jewish education between the ages of five and fourteen (little more than a quarter of the potential enrolment), most of those attending only on Sunday mornings, with only a thousand in full-time Jewish education.

There are two positive achievements to set against the process of disintegration, and which may in the end result in stemming it. One is the achievement of organizational unity in the community through the merger in 1959 of the older, originally paternally and philanthropically run, Federation of Jewish Welfare Organizations with the more democratic Zionist-oriented Jewish Community Council. The other is the foundation of the University of Judaism by the Jewish Theological Seminary and of West Coast branches by both Yeshiva University and Hebrew Union College. These, in the authors' view, are leading to the creation in Los Angeles of a Jewish learned class. Bearing in mind the effect of these institutions and of courses at the University of California at Los Angeles, they feel that a Jewish community of over half a million is 'bound ultimately to erect monuments of scholarship and thought and art for its city and its world people'.

One wonders how far the optimism is justified. It would be unfair to criticize historians for not being prophets, and this book is a history of the Jews of Los Angeles, not a forecast of their future. Indeed, even the present condition of Jewish life in what Rayner Banham has termed *Autopia* (the world of the freeways) is examined cautiously, in broad perspective, because the society portrayed is too contemporary for the historian to be able to make a detached judgement. Thus the book indicates the increased scope of the problems in a Jewish community of over half a million: the range of welfare and other communal services, the budgets ranging into millions of dollars, the impact of Israel and how this was intensified by the emotive effect on fund-raising of the Six-day War, which increased communal giving from \$6,000,000 in a year to nearly \$17,000,000. The picture is of affluence in the

BOOK REVIEWS

sun but overshadowed by doubts about the political and social future because of racial tensions and a drift from the Jewish spiritual and intellectual heritage. Yet all the time the underlying question is there, to be pondered by all who live in the last decades of the twentieth century in cities becoming ever more motorized, ever more detached from traditional 'village' communities: in such an environment, can a positive Jewish approach to life continue? The authors recount and explain the growth of Los Angeles. It may be for students in other fields to draw from such data the inferences regarding the survival of Judaism not only in Los Angeles but in other cities of the west where similar conditions may increasingly prevail.

V. D. LIPMAN

MAX BROD, *Paganism—Christianity—Judaism, A Confession of Faith*, translated by William Wolf from the second German edition (1921), as revised by the author in 1968, x + 276 pp., University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1970, \$10.00.

The republishing of a book after fifty years can be justified if, during the interval, it has become a classic; if it is a pioneering work of scholarship; if it throws a good deal of light on social conditions in the time when it was written; or if the insights it contains have become especially relevant in the meantime. With the possible exception of the last unfortunately none of these reasons is applicable to Max Brod's confession of faith, dynamic though it is and attractively written.

Furthermore, this is very much a young man's book. Brod, not unaware of this, writes in his Foreword to the English translation: 'Fire, storm, and stress—fanaticism—are the prerogative of youth. This book of my own youth contains many thoughts that I chose to express more sharply than I would express them today. But this does not touch on the merits of the basic ideas. All I had to do when revising this book was to smooth out certain especially sharp and harsh points. For the rest, unless truth was at stake, I preferred not to obscure the passionate language of the young man through the circumspection of the later years.' Even with these reservations there is still too much of the sweeping generalization which seems endemic to works of this genre. Thus while it may be true that paganism is dedicated to the continuation of this world, the divine sphere being seen as a continuation of this world, is it true that Christianity is dedicated to the idea of the denial of this world and that Judaism neither affirms nor negates this world? To be sure, Brod qualifies these statements considerably, but we are then left with such a blurring of the original stark definitions as to make the distinctions based on these exceedingly vague. Instead of authors, Jewish and Christian, trying hard to see clear ethical differences between Judaism and Christianity, with implications of superiority in this sphere, would it not be preferable to acknowledge that the doctrinal differences are real but with ethical attitudes governed less by theological commitment than by individual temperament? Both Judaism and Christianity have produced world-affirmers as well as

BOOK REVIEWS

world-deniers. Why should this be at all a cause for surprise? The individual thinkers of both faiths approach these matters in terms of their own experience, disposition, and ethical stance, all of which contribute to the way they interpret the ethical demands of their faith.

Brod's central idea is the doctrine of 'noble and ignoble misfortune'. Only an insensitive clod sees all misfortune as demeaning. Man's situation as a finite creature with longings for the infinite makes tragedy a necessary dimension of his being. But, argues Brod, both paganism and Christianity, unlike Judaism, have failed to stress sufficiently the difference between that misfortune occasioned by man's basic predicament and that misfortune which should be combated in the name of humanity and the God who created man in His image. Man can pride himself that his head is bloody but unbowed only if the bloodiness could not have been avoided. We can learn to steer clear of the perils of a shallow liberalism on the one hand and a glorification of suffering for its own sake on the other, if we embrace noble misfortune while devoting ourselves to the struggle against ignoble misfortune.

Among the good things in the book is the epilogue on the Talmud. Brod here describes his own search for the wisdom of the Talmud, not to be discovered, as he says, by reading pleasant Talmudic anthologies but by years of intensive study of the work itself. 'Therefore the Talmud is not for weaklings. It wants to raise lions' souls, but lions of goodness and spiritual strength. Whatever animal forces there are in man flows here mysteriously towards higher functions. This does not mean that animal instincts are overlooked puritanically, but they reveal themselves openly and without a false shame.' Fine and true on the whole, but itself another generalization contradicted in part by more than one Talmudic passage.

LOUIS JACOBS

EUGÈNE FLEISCHMANN, *Le Christianisme 'mis à nu'. La critique juive du christianisme*, 242 pp., Librairie Plon, Paris, 1970, n.p.

In this learned and elegantly written book Professor Fleischmann considers the various forms which the Jewish critique of Christianity has taken from Moses Mendelsohn to Franz Rosenzweig. This is essentially a philosophical critique not a dialogue between ordinary believers, and it is impeded by the fact that orthodox Judaism has traditionally discouraged its people from bothering with the problem. Most of the critics surveyed here displayed either ignorance or incomprehension and were hampered by having to develop their views within a terminology forged by a culture originally saturated in Christianity. To escape this they tended either to treat Christianity in its original context as a Jewish sect or to look forward to a world of universal secular utopianism—initiated by the French Revolution—which Judaism could be claimed to foreshadow. Particularly for modern Jews the notion of taking refuge in religious precepts, leaving the precise modality of future redemption to Providence, was not an easily available option.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mostly the Jewish critics of Christianity surveyed here opted for a 'secular' solution, except for attempts to see particular Christian notions, such as Protestant individualism, as authentically Jewish in their origins. Defined by their opposition to official Christianity, they were always in danger of being culturally swamped by whatever else was opposed to official Christianity at any given time: deism, jacobinism, saint-simonianism, liberalism, romanticism. The secular solution also tended to take place in a context where a third arbiter had been introduced alongside the exclusive claims of the religious contenders: history. Much of the critique also depended on sociological premises and it is here, in the welding of Jewish positive evaluations of 'the world' with sociological generalizations about what is possible that much of the interest in the book lies.

For the Jews, Christianity was (variously) a converting religion superimposed on the true self, deriving its moral dynamic externally, needing mediations and the enchantments of art, especially music—or miracles. It was infiltrated by paganism and susceptible to pantheism. It devalued decent local and political loyalties, divided men up on religious criteria—thereby sanctifying hate, and placed a schizoid seed in men between heaven and earth, body and soul, spirituality and power, intellect and faith. Its doctrine of ultimate grace destroyed proximate justice; and the alliance of so 'unnatural' a system with secular power forced it into ad hoc tension-ridden compromises, and into hierarchical organization and the use of force to maintain itself.

The paradox is, of course, that the 'unnatural' religion of Christianity, psychologically perverse and sociologically unrealistic, is a universal religion, whereas Judaism with its sociological realism, remains particularistic. But then it is also possible to ask just how much of Christianity is Christian: so much of Christian history has exemplified just that civic moralism and devotion to precept and traditional rite which are part of the sociological realism of Judaism. In so many senses the history of Christianity is the history of Judaism.

DAVID MARTIN

JOHN D. GAY, *The Geography of Religion in England*, xviii + 334 pp., Duckworth, London, 1971, £3.95.

Apart from producing a few plausible generalizations, such as the idea that monotheism arises in deserts, a geography of religion sounds like an unpromising enterprise. That perhaps is because geography, narrowly conceived, offers so little in the way of abstract formulations which are intellectually interesting. Given the limitations of the perspective, and even if most of the interesting insights are more sociological than strictly geographical, it cannot be denied that Mr. Gay has produced an interesting book. It is not surprising, however, that the relationships that most readily fit what might be called a 'geography of religion' relate to the influence of religion on landscape and life-styles, rather than the reverse—and perhaps for this reason Mr. Gay is obliged to lament the widespread neglect of religion by

BOOK REVIEWS

geographers. For some of the possibilities that he discusses have wisely been ignored by other geographers—for instance, his claim that 'by making a comparative study of the religious practice of one social group within different regions, the influence of geographical factors . . . becomes apparent' (p. 7).

A considerable part of the book is devoted to such problems as the limited value of religious statistics, the denominational differences in their compilation, and the consequent problems of comparison between denominations. Perhaps it is the relative excellence of Methodist statistics that causes the author to devote as many pages to the Methodists as to the other three nonconformist denominations (Baptists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists) put together. The Roman Catholics receive nineteen pages (to the Methodists' twenty-four) while the Church of England must do with a mere sixteen. Yet Mr. Gay quotes, at the head of his chapter, that very odd claim of Leslie Paul that the number of worshippers makes the Church of England 'by far and away the most important social institution in the land'—as if trades unions, universities, the press and the BBC had never come into being.

What Mr. Gay provides for each of the movements he considers is a necessarily brief historical vignette, usually with reference to the first (and last) religious census in 1851 (to the inadequacies of which he also devotes a chapter), and an account of the present distribution of members. More briefly he deals with some (but not all) of the minor Christian groups, including the relatively tiny British-Israelite group but omitting the much larger Moral Re-Armament movement. Christian Scientists, Spiritualists, Seventh Day Adventists and Mormons he puts together, curiously, as 'Quasi-Christian Groups'. Brief as his outlines are they are sometimes also misleading. Is it a typical geographer's bias which causes him to explain the concentration of Christian Science practitioners in London by the remark, 'Practitioners based in London could easily travel considerable distances to see patients'? The whole point about Christian Science healing is that practitioners do not need to *see* patients, while their concentration in London has almost certainly nothing to do with their availability for out-of-town patients. He implies (pp. 191-2) that Brigham Young was the leader of Mormonism already in 1840, and in explaining the decline of Mormonism in England by the publication of the revelation concerning polygamy in 1852, he underestimates the importance of emigration from Britain to America that occurred in the decades which followed. The final chapter on the Jews is much more preoccupied with distribution and assimilation than with synagogue organization: 'orthodoxy' is loosely referred to but there is no discussion of religious organization and its social (or geographic) implications.

By far the most absorbing part of the book are the fifty-nine maps. Mr. Gay is well aware with what care they need to be interpreted, and, given his cautions, they are surely a unique, valuable, and fascinating collection.

BRYAN R. WILSON

BOOK REVIEWS

BRYAN WILSON, *Religious Sects, A Sociological Study*, 256 pp., World University Library, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1971, £1.75 hardback; 80p paperback.

The aim of the World University Library, to which this volume belongs, is popularization at a high standard. For a book on the sociology of sects, whom better to turn to than Dr. Wilson, who has pioneered the subject in Britain and encouraged others to till the same field? Here he covers familiar ground with an assured step, and ventures a little further with a chapter on sects in modern Japan. Having marked out his territory in a chapter on definition, he proceeds to subdivide it by a sevenfold classification of sects according to the way in which salvation is sought by the members. Thus sects may be conversionist, revolutionist (including the more familiar category of adventist), introversionist, reformist, utopian, manipulationist, or thaumaturgical (in his earlier works these last two types have been called gnostic). Each kind is brought to life by vivid description of one or two examples, but the point of the classification is, of course, not description but analysis. Can the different types be correlated with particular kinds of social context, or with different stages in the life-history of sects? The author accepts the view that sects arise in response to conditions of social change and disorganization, and tries valiantly to give some precision to this very general hypothesis by itemizing the different kinds of social change (for example, industrialization, urbanization, migration, detribalization, culture contact, scientific advance), and relating different kinds of sectarian response accordingly. In so doing he puts forward some interesting hypotheses which should be further testable, especially the view that the role of the charismatic leader is dispensable in sects arising in industrial society.

For all these efforts to relate sectarianism to social change, and particularly to social deprivation, the thesis is illustrated rather than tested. For the procedure is always to study the sect and then find the deprivation which supposedly gave rise to it. Might we not discover more about sects if we looked at all cases of comparable upset or deprivation, and then assessed how much and what kinds of sectarian response ensued? Dr. Wilson gives many figures, but none which relate the total number of sectarians to the population presumed to be at risk, for example, urban working class, culturally retarded peasants, detribalized Africans. At least in relation to the first group, in Europe and U.S.A. the proportion of sectarians has always been low, probably under 10 per cent, and lower than the proportion of the secularized or 'unchurched'. Why do not more proletarians benefit from the therapy of *gemeinschaftlich* sects? Is there some threshold of anomie below which the effort of any new religio-moral response is too great? Or is the secular labour movement an alternative and greater attraction?

We might also learn more of the sociology of sects if we studied those religious groups which suffered deprivation or encountered rapid social change with only very rare sectarian responses. The obvious comparison would be of Jews and Christians in medieval and modern Europe, and of Catholics and Protestants in post-Reformation Europe. (Wilson notes the contrast between Catholics and Protestants but hardly analyses it.) Within Orthodox Christianity there are also contrasts between the recurrent out-

BOOK REVIEWS

bursts of sectarianism in Russia and their absence in the Greek Church. It is odd that Dr. Wilson altogether omits mention of Russian sects.

In short there is obviously plenty of work ahead for the author and his colleagues. This book is an excellent progress report on what has been accomplished so far.

B. R. SCHARF

RAYMOND BOUDON, *The Uses of Structuralism*, translated from the French by Michalina Vaughan, xii + 159 pp., Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1971, £2.00.

MICHAEL LANE, ed., *Structuralism, A Reader*, 456 pp., Jonathan Cape, London, 1970, £3.75.

In the last few years there have appeared a number of books that propose to expound and illustrate something called 'structuralism' in the social sciences and linguistics. The two works under review are, by chance, complementary in that one (Lane) is more valuable for its illustrations and the other for its argument; one is fairly confident that a structuralist method exists while the other shows the difficulties in accepting such a view. Both writers are professional sociologists, one English, the other French. A good way to make use of the two books is to read some of the pieces in Lane (for example, Leach's 'The Legitimacy of Solomon: Some Structural Aspects of Old Testament History' and Jakobson and Lévi-Strauss's 'Charles Baudelaire's "Les Chats"'), turn to the last chapter of Dr. Boudon's book (it summarizes the book as a whole), read Dr. Lane's Introduction, and then try to tackle Dr. Boudon's main text (brief but dense). In the last task the reader will be much helped by the short but enlightening Introduction contributed by Professor Donald MacRae.

When he has got so far the reader will know that structuralism has scored its successes in linguistics and social anthropology, that in principle all the social sciences and some of the humanities (art, literature) are, so to say, within its jurisdiction, and that there is after all great doubt about its precise nature (is there one structuralism or are there several?) and about the extent to which it can proceed further. Dr. Boudon makes the point very well that the success of structuralist analysis depends upon both the nature of the object under analysis and the adequacy of the theory brought to the analysis. The linguists and the social anthropologists (when for example the latter deal with kinship systems) are fortunate in their data, for they respond in their self-containedness and relative simplicity to the scientist's efforts. The sociologists reaching for an understanding of huge systems (but that last word of course begs a question) have nothing comparable to show. (And one might add that in so far as they can produce some successes these may not be noticed as structuralist.)

The conclusion may be that structuralism will not take us far in general sociology (as distinct from some particular branches of it); but it does not follow that we ought to brush it aside as a mere fashion—fashion it may be,

BOOK REVIEWS

but not mere fashion. For structuralism has this virtue at least, that it is likely to lead specialists in this or that part of the social sciences to the problems of method and conceptualization underlying all those sciences, and to encourage a vision of themes unifying them. Scholars who have the intellectual stamina to follow Dr. Boudon's admirable example to embrace mathematics and sociology, linguistics and economics, political science and social anthropology, may acquire a clearer idea of their own problems by seeing them in the context of those of others. Structuralism may not exist in one sense; but in another it may afford a welcome holiday from the routine preoccupations of one's own discipline.

MAURICE FREEDMAN

EZRA MENDELSON, *Class Struggle in the Pale: The Formative Years of the Jewish Workers' Movement in Tsarist Russia*, xi + 180 pp., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970, £2.50.

Confining himself chiefly to the 1890s and stopping short of the 1905 Revolution, Dr. Mendelsohn has undertaken to delineate the rise of the labour movement among the Jews of the Pale of Settlement. He is not concerned with the ideology and practice of the Bund, within whose general scope his subject falls, and whose development he expressly bears in mind, but rather with the aspirations of Jewish workers entering the social democratic movement, and with the extent to which these aspirations were identified with the intentions of the Bundist intellectual leadership. He takes his account up to the eve of 1905 by which time, he asserts, the chief characteristics of the movement had crystallized. While this terminal date is perhaps to be regretted from the non-specialist's point of view, it is understandable from that of the author, since to have included 1905 would undoubtedly have overloaded the work as a dissertation, in which form it was originally written.

The Jewish proletariat differed from the Russian in a number of important ways which in themselves conditioned the structure and behaviour of the Jewish social democratic labour movement. As an example, by the time of Russia's major industrial upsurge in the last decade of the nineteenth century, the Jewish working masses of the Pale were already overwhelmingly urban. Indeed, Jews constituted fifty-two per cent of the overall urban population of Belorussia-Lithuania. Unlike the Russian workers, however, a substantial proportion of whom were peasants mobilized into mammoth new factories, the Jewish proletarian was in the main an artisan employed in small workshops dotted throughout the towns and shtetls of the Pale. As Mendelsohn and others have shown, this fragmentation was both the strength and weakness of the Jewish labour movement. On the one hand, the small workshops were outside the purview of the Factory Inspectorate and were thus more accessible to socialist agitation and propaganda. Furthermore, small numbers of workers, representing the total work force of an establishment, could make a more telling impact on their employer, and

BOOK REVIEWS

were thus able to achieve more gains more rapidly than the less penetrable hordes of their Russian comrades.

On the other hand, the master-journeyman relationship, which typified the artisanry, was perpetually disrupted by the reversal of roles, a change relatively easily wrought within the low-capital economic structure. (The ludicrously high number of tailors existed surely not as Mendelsohn says because of religious ordinances governing the use of fabrics, but because a tailor's 'means of production' consisted of a pair of scissors, a yardstick and a piece of chalk rolled up in a scrap of cloth, representing low capital investment and high geographical mobility.) As a result, gains were generally short-lived and, however dynamic he may have been in terms of strikes, boycotts, and protests, the overall economic advance made by the Jewish artisan was less spectacular than the truly impressive changes wrought by these activities in terms of political, cultural, and finally national consciousness.

Against this background Dr. Mendelsohn points out that the ideological confusion which reigned among the early generations of Jewish intellectuals seeking to awaken the masses was of little consequence to the workers, who were in search of self-improvement. Conversely, the aims of the workers were not at first of much concern to the intellectuals, who were primarily in search of workers whom they could turn into a new species, namely the worker-intellectual. What at first appeared as an affinity of aims soon became the chief obstacle to collaboration between intellectual and worker: self-improvement only facilitated the rise of the worker out of the ranks in which he was meant, thanks to his preparation in a 'circle', to have acted as a fomenting agent. Faced with failure in their 'circles', the socialist intellectuals dropped their programme of cultural elevation of the few and instead adopted a new tactic: agitation of the many on the basis of everyday economic grievances, conducted, not as in the 'circles' in pidgin Russian, but in the full-blooded vernacular of the masses, Yiddish.

Despite the eventual failure of this new method, a failure well documented by Dr. Mendelsohn, the policy of agitation, initiated for political revolutionary ends, though clothed in economic language, bore fruit of immense importance and durability. In order to make the workers understand the nature of economic exploitation, the socialists widened their educational circles and imbued their new pupils with superficial concepts of world history, political economy, science, and primitive metaphysics. It was the time of militant free thinking, and, transmitted with revolutionary zeal, these ideas were eagerly absorbed by the workers. Such gains were of the sort that could survive all manner of economic and political setbacks. As Mendelsohn remarks: 'A tailor might lose his twelve-hour day; he could not be so easily robbed, however, of what he learned at the... "Saturday reading"' (p. 125).

The book is written in a clear if unexciting manner; the bibliography is full, though as the author himself warns us more than once, the sources must be used with care, since most of them stem from the movement itself, in one or another of its ramifications; reference is made to, but no noticeable use of, a number of related monographs. The subtitle of the book is 'The Formative Years of the Jewish Workers' Movement in Tsarist Russia', yet it

BOOK REVIEWS

must be said, in conclusion, that very little of the treatment or content relates the central subject to its geographical and political framework, though perhaps this lacuna demonstrates contextually something about the direction in which the Jewish labour movement was moving at this crucial period in its history.

HAROLD SHUKMAN

J. D. Y. PEEL, *Herbert Spencer, The Evolution of a Sociologist*, xiii + 338 pp., Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1971, £3.50.

The only English sociologist to have exercised a decisive and formative influence in the development of the discipline is still Herbert Spencer. If, as Philip Abrams has said, British sociology has been built as a defence against Spencer, then the ramshackle nature of that edifice says little for the ability to find alternative foundations. Indeed, to the extent that these have been hewn out of prestigious systems of American or French origin, Spencer's mediated influence has been at work, largely unacknowledged. Parsons's tardy recognition that much of Spencer's programme anticipated his own, after his early dismissal of him as of no relevance, exemplifies this. But systematic sociological theorizing has recently won sufficient footing in Britain for Spencer to be accorded a sympathetic consideration, devoid of the embarrassment or obloquy which he has long been accorded in an empiricist ethos. J. D. Y. Peel has provided such a consideration in a book which is rich in scholarship, fertile in argument, firm in judgment, and compelling reading.

Peel goes to painstaking trouble to place Spencer in both intellectual and social context. He moves with great skill between the different levels and time orders of this context, between English nonconformity and radicalism, between the epistemology of Whewell and Mill and the phrenology of Gall, the Derby Philosophical Society, and the Mechanics' Institutes, between Charles Darwin and George Eliot. This provides the basis for understanding the early Spencer of the *Social Statics* and *First Principles*. The kernel of the book consists of three chapters on 'Evolution', 'The Organic Analogy', and 'Militancy and Industrialism'. These contain very valuable accounts of central themes in Spencer's work, elaborated with care to show how far he was from vulgar Spencerism. Peel shows that he was quite independent of Darwin, how intent he was on establishing the limits of organic analogies, how his concept of evolution served him more adequately in interpreting society than in understanding nature, how far he was from advocating a war of all against all. One is no longer inclined to smile condescendingly at Spencer's 'internuncial agencies' when it is pointed out that this concept anticipates the central theme of cybernetics. We must recognize that Spencer's often grotesque terminology is simply evidence of his determination to spring the conceptual limitations of his time in a courageous attempt to universalize sociological discourse.

Peel does not hesitate to illuminate Spencer's position by the light of modern debate. He makes frequent reference to the controversies over

BOOK REVIEWS

functionalism, holism, and methodological individualism, and the relevance of history to sociology. This amounts to a running assessment of Spencer's achievement. It concludes by arguing that we no longer need return to Spencer for his empirical findings and that in any case sociology is not cumulative in the way the natural sciences are. Spencer is to be seen as attempting to grasp the nature of the society of his time, his theories as products of particular purposes and subject matter. Such cumulation as there is amounts to refinement of models and methods, and therein no doubt we are to see the justification of Peel's own standpoint. The final two chapters are very suggestive on this theme and clearly must be a token of a book to come.

Peel's view of the relevance of looking back to Spencer is determined by his view of the general methodological and theoretical perspective of contemporary sociology. Hence the reader must not expect to find an account of the more descriptive parts of Spencer's sociology. But I did miss things which on Peel's own terms could have warranted more attention. Modern theory does tend to be problem-orientated and concerns itself relatively little with topics such as the proper subject matter of sociology, the nature of society, or the functional prerequisites of society. Today these are regarded often as worn out themes. But Spencer has much to say about them, especially in his discussion of 'The Inductions of Sociology' which gets less than its due. For instance, it is true that Spencer uses 'function' for any kind of activity but his theory does revolve around certain functions which he believes fulfil critical needs. He does have a substantive functional theory rather than a mere methodological principle. One may also regret that his sparkling *The Study of Sociology*, still in many ways the most attractive introduction to the subject, does not get more attention. But these requests for more are the demands of the glutton who has already enjoyed a munificent feast.

M. C. ALBROW

V. D. SEGRE, *Israel: A Society in Transition*, viii + 227 pp., Oxford University Press, London, 1971, £2.50.

In the Preface to his book Professor Segre tells us that, as an Italian Jew, he 'tended to look on Zionism as a Jewish version of the Italian Risorgimento'. This early sentence signals the rewards that await readers of this book. For it indicates the posture that Segre so successfully adopts: he has been both an 'insider' and an 'outsider' in Israeli affairs, and these two perspectives are well-meshed in his study. As an 'insider' he joined a *kibbutz* during the 1940s, was active in the Haganah, became associated with the Establishment, and later served as an Ambassador in the Israeli Foreign Service; as 'outsider' he spent some years reading at Oxford, and now teaches political science at Haifa University. Thus he can combine an intimate personal feel for people and situations with the quizzical glance and tough scepticism of the detached scholar. He is, moreover, an Italian, and his analysis benefits from the subtlety and high intelligence that one associates with the best Italian scholarship. A unique combination: a splendid book.

BOOK REVIEWS

The central theme in this study is the clashing of ideologies in contemporary Israel: the term 'transition' in the sub-title refers to the shift from what Segre calls the older *kibbutz*-centred 'plantocracy' to the modern urban-based industrialism. Thus it is the passage from an earlier pre-state sectarianism to the contemporary pragmatism that provides the focus for Segre's analysis. The book unfolds historically—Segre begins by considering the nineteenth-century European precursors of the Zionist movement, moves ahead to examine the *yishuv* as it emerged during the British mandate period, and then, in the last three chapters, considers the Jewish State from birth to the post-Sinai 1967 period. In other words, the book is phrased as a social and political history.

Now there is nothing particularly unusual about this, and, in fact, the ground that is covered has been looked at by many other scholars. What is special about Segre's analysis, however, is that he takes absolutely nothing for granted: the received wisdom is set aside and scrutinized anew, and Segre is thus able truly to break new ground. Several examples can best illustrate the book's contribution and originality. In reviewing Jewish-Arab relations during the Mandate period Segre accurately depicts their phantom-like quality: 'The Jews dressed, ate, spoke, behaved differently from the Arabs. Their conception of society, honour, feminine beauty, music, and the very meaning of life was different. It was not a question of a European dislike for Oriental life, as has been so often intimated. It was something very different and perhaps more dangerous: it was indifference. The Jews built their society as if the Arabs did not exist' (p. 100). Whether or not these ghostly relations were a cause of today's political predicaments, it is vital to strip away old myths as Segre does in order to see the reality of Arab-Jewish contacts for the better part of the past one hundred years. Segre also offers some fresh insights into the inner workings of the Israeli political elites, and more particularly, provides an understanding of the distinctive emphasis upon secrecy and gossip that pervades the higher circles. Within an officially egalitarian system 'gossip and secrecy served to distinguish those who knew more and thus could do more from those who were "not in the know"'. The ability to know and to act became a distinctive mark of the Israeli elite, with secrecy reinforcing activism and vice versa, and both strengthening the power of a bureaucracy which was highly politicized, independent of ideological orthodoxy, operating by fits and starts through a network of personal contacts and family relations far more efficient than the machinery of the government or of the parties' (p. 139). These two examples are among my own favourites, and other readers will undoubtedly find their own. There are too fine characterizations and keen *bon mots* (Trumpeldor is described as the 'Jewish Knight'), all, it should be emphasized, set together with careful scholarship and a fine ability to gauge the complex and paradoxical history of Zionism and of Israel.

Ideologies are, as I mentioned earlier, the focus for Segre's work, and if the book has a weakness it is the over-emphasis and decisive weight it gives to ideologies. Major political movements and wide-ranging societal orientations are associated with ideologies, and even more, with ideological disputes. The major disputes between Ben Gurion and Jabotinsky, Weizmann and Ben Gurion, and with great emphasis, the Lavon affair, are analysed in

BOOK REVIEWS

this study as if they were mainly the outgrowths of ideological positions. There is a kind of sweetness about this view. What it does not enough emphasize, I suppose, are the hot clashes of personality, the grasping after power, or the harshness of personal relationships, that must also have been a part of the elite history. Ideology certainly counts for a great deal in the Israeli scene—but not for everything.

But this is not a deep flaw in this generally excellent study. Segre has promised a second volume, an up-dating that will be devoted entirely to the decade between 1958 and 1968, a time during which 'a Jewish pluralistic metropolis in the Middle East' was formed. Given the high quality of his first book, the second will be eagerly awaited.

ALEX WEINGROD

ORLANDO FALS BORDA, *Subversion and Social Change in Colombia*, trans. by Jacqueline D. Skiles, xiv + 238 pp., Columbia University Press, London, 1970, £3.15.

Though one would hardly guess it from the title, the book is a kind of history of Colombia from precolonial times to our own. As the author is a professor of sociology, the book raises the problem of whether an acquaintance with the dominant currents of today's sociological theory helps to understand the past.

Unfortunately, Fals Borda's book contains few data which cannot be found better presented in standard works on Colombian or general Latin American history; its distinction consists in a pretentious terminology. For example, it is no news that the conquest and conversion of the Indians produced a new social order; which piece of information is dressed up by labelling this change as a 'dialectical refraction', its agents as 'disorgans' and 'conditioners', the new faith as 'prescriptively rigid countervalues', the new moral code as 'acritical counter-norms', the old tribal structure as 'topia nr 1', and the succeeding seignorial society as 'topia nr 2'. 'Topia', incidentally, means a social system which has existed or exists, as opposed to a utopia. Since in Fals Borda's vocabulary 'subversion' means bringing about any kind of change in society, the title of the book is pleonastic.

STANISLAV ANDRESKI

LLOYD P. GARTNER, ed. *Jewish Education in the United States, A Documentary History*. Classics in Education No. 41 (General Editor Lawrence A. Cermin), xv + 224 pp., Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1969, cloth, \$6.95; paperback \$2.75.

BOOK REVIEWS

ALEXANDER M. DUSHKIN with the assistance of NATHAN GREENBAUM, *Comparative Study of the Jewish Teacher Training Schools in the Diaspora*, x + 128 pp., Institute of Contemporary Jewry, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1970, n.p.

Professor Gartner's book is welcome both for its long and invaluable introduction and for the anthology of sources that follows. The introduction outlines the history of Jewish education in America and includes an annotated bibliography. It will be the springboard for anyone who undertakes the task of writing a definitive history of American Jewish education.

The sources assembled by the author begin with a letter of appointment, dated 1760, of a teacher to the Shearith Israel Congregation and cover the following two hundred years with memoirs of Sunday Schools and early Day Schools, inaugural addresses, surveys of Jewish education, and much else.

It is illuminating to see how long some problems have been with us. A Mr. I. L. Benjamin bemoans in 1860 the sad provision for the religious instruction of girls, 'these Jewish housewives and mothers of the future'. Five years later, a Reform rabbi pleads for Jewish Day Schools and rebuts the suggestion that they will be 'a dividing wall . . . between Jewish and non-Jewish children', while a few pages further on we find the plea that 'unsectarian education is the hope and salvation of the Jew'. In 1880 Professor B. A. Abrams castigates the Sabbath school teachers. 'How many', he asks, 'deserve the name teacher?' In 1886 another rabbi fresh from Hungary notes with despair: 'The thirteenth birthday is the greatest holiday among our Jewish brethren—from that day on, the youth will regard his teacher as a useless tool.'

The anthology has rescued some gems from oblivion. Kaufmann Kohler, giving his inaugural presidential address at Hebrew Union College in 1903, declares: 'It is not enough that Bible and Talmud, Halakah and Haggadah . . . be taught; they must all be turned into vitalizing sparks of truth.' Nearer our own day Professor Marvin Fox takes to task those who canvass support for Jewish Day Schools on the grounds that they 'are not materially different from other schools'. On the contrary: 'Their strength is not in their similarities to other schools, but in their differences.'

Dr. Dushkin's work is quite different. He examines seventy-eight Jewish Teacher Training Schools under a microscope, tabulating everything in no fewer than sixty-one tables. It is all there, the age of the students, the economic status of their families, their fathers' occupations, their parents' attitude towards career choice, the Jewish education of their teachers, the adequacy of the buildings they work in. It is all intended to provide the essential data required by all who have to grapple with the problem, but Dr. Dushkin does not leave it there. He concludes with two useful chapters, one summarizing his findings and the other listing the implications of his findings and his conclusions.

HAROLD LEVY

BOOK REVIEWS

JOHN A. GARRARD, *The English and Immigration, A Comparative Study of the Jewish Influx 1880-1910*, xi + 244 pp., published for the Institute of Race Relations by Oxford University Press, London, 1971, £3.25.

It is always unwise to try to tempt readers to look at a piece of scholarship by dressing it up in topical clothes. Mr. Garrard's study of the origins of the Aliens Act of 1905 and of its political repercussions notably on the Left is a useful and serious contribution to history. What he has to say on the role of the Liberal, Socialist, and Trade Union leadership when confronted with the prejudices (real or alleged) of their supporters in a form that challenged fundamental ideological commitments has wider relevance. To be willing to accept the need for some curbs upon an immigration admittedly substantially Jewish, while avoiding the charge of being antisemitic involved verbal contortions that are illuminating. Mr. Garrard is also successful in showing how fortunate the Liberal government was in inheriting a piece of legislation already in effect; its deterrent aspects may have helped to curb the flow of immigrants whose lesser numbers helped to account for diminishing anxiety even in the areas of their greatest concentration; and the renewal of persecution in Russia made the plea for maintaining the tradition of political asylum hard to resist.

Mr. Garrard chooses, however, on the most insubstantial of evidence to compare the situation at that time with that which has faced the contemporary Left in Britain on the subject of coloured immigration. It is of course true that, once again, the political leadership has had to take into account working class and trade union attitudes which do not precisely conform to the dictates of international brotherhood. Mr. Garrard, whose sympathies are obviously with the ideological Left, is inclined to question the reality of working class prejudice as set out for instance in Professor S. M. Lipset's *Political Man* and to emphasize instead the attachment, in this country at any rate, of the working class to the 'norms of tolerance' and to traditional democratic procedures. But he does not seriously examine the other side of the argument, and is seemingly unaware of the work that has been done or is being done on racial and other forms of prejudice from a psycho-dynamic point of view.

If that were true he would I think find it hard to be so confident that the immigration of Jews and 'coloured men' presents a unique problem partly because of the bad conscience that antisemitism and racialism produce in the advocates of restriction. In retrospect the Huguenots may well appear a net gain to the British community; but did they at the time of their arrival? Were the Irish as easily assimilated as Mr. Garrard suggests?

Indeed, even if we take the Jewish and coloured immigrant cases together, there are on Mr. Garrard's own showing significant differences. The latent antisemitism among some socialists could find vent in attacking 'rich' Jews particularly at the time of the South African wars; anti-imperialism cannot as easily be combined with anti-coloured sentiment.

MAX BELOFF

BOOK REVIEWS

JACQUES GUTWIRTH, *Vie juive traditionnelle, Ethnologie d'une communauté hassidique*, 488 pp., Editions de Minuit, Paris, 1970, 30F.

The two most important aspects of this book are indicated in its subtitle: it is about Hassidim (not so much about Hassidism) and it is based upon a study carried out in *ethnologie* (or, as we should say in English, social anthropology)—a technique for the study of the exotic applied to the exotic. For, as Professor André Leroi-Gourhan aptly says in his Preface to the book, social anthropology being preferably practised on the 'other' and the 'distant', it is in this study unusually applied to the 'other' and the 'close at hand'. It is not of course that the Hassidim are totally exotic to the scholar who studies them; he has close connexions with the city where he undertook his field work (cf. his paper, 'Antwerp Jewry Today' in Vol. 10, No. 1, June 1968, of this *Journal*); and he clearly has too much Jewish culture, including a command of Yiddish, to look upon his 'subject' as completely strange. But, adopting the style of the anthropologist, he has observed and discussed his Hassidim 'objectively', even as, again as an anthropologist, he writes upon the basis of an extended and penetrating investigation of their social life.

To allay suspicion, let it be said to non-specialists at once that there is nothing pretentious about the book, and that the theoretical apparatus, such as it is, makes few demands upon the non-anthropological reader. Certainly, nobody reading the brief *Avant-propos* should be put off by the obeisance to Marx, Leroi-Gourhan, and Piaget—they may have been important for the development of Dr. Gutwirth's ideas, but he does not appear to have written this book to prove his indebtedness. Indeed, the account is straightforward and minutely informative.

We begin with an introduction to the Belzer Hassidim of Antwerp (they numbered just over four hundred people in 1963), are shown the history that lies behind the community of Polish and Hungarian origins, and are treated to a detailed description of its numbers, distribution, and economic structure. If these pages (that is, the first five chapters) may be regarded as introductory, we begin at Chapter VI, 'Organisation et cadre de la vie communautaire', to understand how the Belzer Hassidic community of Antwerp is ordered (structured) and organized. It has (or at any rate had in 1963) a *dayin* ('judge'), committee of five members, and two *gabouim*; it maintains schools, a ritual bath, and of course a *shtibel* which, while it is not the sole mechanism for bringing the members of the community together, is the natural centre of their collective life. (The Belzer Hassidim are brought daily into touch by their economic activities: largely connected with the trade in uncut diamonds.) We are next taken through chapters dealing with the physical appearance of men, the daily, weekly, and annual religious cycles, the cult of the *rebbe*, the socialization of boys, women, marriage, the general system of social relationships, and 'Temps, espace et technique' (where there is the mark of Dr. Gutwirth's training under Professor Leroi-Gourhan).

So little has been written about Hassidic life by social scientists with first-hand knowledge of it that even if Dr. Gutwirth had confined himself to a relatively unanalytical description he would have done us a great service. But he does more, for he is concerned very properly with the problem of the

BOOK REVIEWS

relationship between a Hassidic community and the local Jewry to which it is connected (note, for example, the significance of the flanking of the 'traditionalists' by the 'hypertraditionalists' on the one side and the 'hypotraditionalists' on the other); and with the problem of the community's relationship with wider Jewry and with the civil society that englobes it. He is inclined to speculate upon the reasons for the persistence of a religious-ethnic group so much (to go by appearances) in contradiction with the world about it. On all these matters Dr. Gutwirth has something interesting to say, and it is obvious that he has read widely enough to be able to generalize in a scholarly manner. If many aspects of the problems remain obscure, it is not Dr. Gutwirth's fault, for the problems are complex and demand for their solution a much deeper understanding not only of Judaism but also of the nature of the industrial society within which it survives.

It would be a very good thing if somebody published an English version of this book, for, sad fact though it may be, it is a fact that works on Jewry not available in English get a poor hearing. And Dr. Gutwirth's study deserves to be widely read.

MAURICE FREEDMAN

SIMON N. HERMAN, *American Students in Israel*, viii + 236 pp., Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y. and London, 1970, \$7.50 or £3.60.

The explicit organization of this book is from left to right. In fourteen chapters and 68 tables, the latter constituting its research apparatus, the author moves, perhaps a shade too smoothly, from the fact of an American-Jewish student presence in Israel to that consciousness of the Holocaust which constitutes, in all probability, the single most powerful organizing factor in both the existence of Israel and the students' presence in that country. Therefore, it may be said that this book has an implicit organization that is exactly the reverse of its explicit one; the book may be more deeply read if we begin at the end and read from right to left. Indeed, the implicit and real organization of the book raises a more general problem about writing and publication in the social sciences, for in this, as in many other instances, the interpretation of the tables seems almost perfunctory. Perhaps a great deal of paper could be saved if the data were published and the interpretation left to the reader himself. Too often, the scholar's interpretation interferes with the response of the reader to the object he shares with the author, that is, the data themselves. In this case, it is advisable to read the book according to its implicit organization, from right to left.

Read in the Hebrew way, Professor Herman's research probe raises a unique problem in the history of immigration: the problem of a generation of young probationers, ostensibly coming to study, but, in reality, testing their relation to a nation-state at once their host and yet also probationer to those young who have come, not least, to study the nation-state itself. The key chapter thus becomes the ninth: "The intention to settle . . . the "push" and the "pull".'

Professor Herman's scientific method constricts his analysis, but even

BOOK REVIEWS

writing constipated by an overdose of methodology cannot but convey the powerful tensions contracting the time American-Jewish students spend in Israel. The text is splintered into too many bits and pieces to sustain a report that reflects the tensions in their complex American and Israeli polarities. Great problems are grouped into the space of two paragraphs under conceptual rubrics that are then marked by the perfunctory treatment given the concepts themselves. But Professor Herman had a difficult task. It would have taken a genius of Kafka's conciseness to say even part of what there is to say in the little section on 'Decision and Identity' (pp. 118-19). As it stands, that section serves mainly to illustrate the detached quality of the analysis. The final sentence of that section is too straightforwardly simple; it says that despite the fact that most of the students did not reach a final decision about returning, the constant pressures on them to choose among alternative courses of action helped them to clarify the nature of their Jewish identity. How so?, we may ask. Perhaps the keeping open of such profoundly opposing and imperious alternatives as America and Israel is itself a 'final' decision. The probationary attitude towards both alternatives may be a decisive life-act, part of a deeper reluctance to take the existence of either the two nation-states, or one's place in them, for granted.

The tables block Professor Herman's probes before they can go deep enough. The fourteen chapters march bravely past one abyss after another, at double-quick time, rather like some of the students themselves. The methodological blinkers prevent any full vision of the data.

If such studies can be said to have a serious weakness, then the seriousness of this one lies in the method that is not at all special to it. The quick learner might well go quickly through the first 194 pages and concentrate on the tables (pp. 195-221) for the real interest of the book.

PHILIP RIEFF

MEYER W. WEISGAL, gen. ed. (ed. of Eng. edn. Barnet Litvinoff), *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Vol. II, Series A, November 1902-August 1903, xlvi + 489 pp., Oxford University Press, London, 1971, £3.50.

In this second volume of Weizmann's letters less than a year is covered, from November 1902 to August 1903. There are fewer personal letters, and the interest concentrates on the long and frustrating battle to secure support for the project of a Jewish university, and for the activity of the Democratic Fraction within the Zionist movement. The volume contains much valuable material on the situation of Jewish students throughout Europe, and the plans for a Jewish academic institution. There is no doubt in Weizmann's mind that it must ultimately be in Palestine, but he is prepared for a temporary start in Europe. The programme on which he is working is described in a letter to Simon Guinzburg at Saratov (no. 203), and the opposition to it of assimilationists—at the moment in Warsaw—in one to Catherine Dorfman in Zurich (no. 314).

The difficulties of the political struggle are well illustrated by the long

BOOK REVIEWS

letters to Isaac Rothstein in Rostov (no. 161 of 4.1.1903), A. Idelson and M. Kroll in Moscow (no. 272 of 17.2.1903), but above all, by the long report which Weizmann wrote to Herzl himself (after the Kishinev pogrom) describing the general situation of Zionism in the world, especially in Russia, and of the struggles and conflicts within the movement.

What all this activity cost him in his own health comes out touchingly in letters to his future wife, Vera Khatzmian (nos. 303-10).

JAMES PARKES

F. WILDER-OKLADEK, *The Return Movement of Jews to Austria after the Second World War, With special consideration of the return from Israel*, xiv + 130 pp., publication of the Research Group for European Migration Problems, XVI, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1969, n.p.

Given the paucity, in post-war western European countries, of official statistics relating to religious affiliation, Jewish demographic studies have tended to fall into two categories: those drawing on material available in communal records and often adopting techniques more appropriate to the reconstruction of historical development (for example, balancing estimates of recorded births against those of recorded deaths to establish approximate rates of population growth); and second, sample surveys with a demographic bias conducted in the main with a view to defining Jewish communal needs and presented in a manner appropriate to the requirements of the organization financing the research. Research integrating both these approaches and written against a sociological background is rare. Bearing this situation in mind, one is predisposed to welcome this present pioneer study. The work mainly emphasizes the development of the Jewish population which returned to Austria after 1945; it is examined against a theory relating to migratory movements and is compared with the experience, as documented by other researchers, of a similarly-situated group in Germany. In her examination of the Austrian position, Mrs. Wilder-Okladek has drawn on the documentary evidence available in both Israel and Austria and has supplemented it with a questionnaire study covering a sample of the 'returnees', paying particular attention to those who returned after a stay in Israel: such returnees, it is thought, must have experienced much conflict in deciding to resettle in Austria (where they had suffered) after having lived in what was presumably their spiritual home.

The difficulties met in pursuing the study (non-response of would-be interviewees, withdrawal of co-operation by communal authorities) must have made continuation of the research at times seem futile—one can only presume that the study was conducted over a number of years since no dates are made explicit for the timing of either the documentary research or the questionnaire study—and the author is to be commended for her perseverance and for the fact that she has been able to produce much good material, particularly in the case studies.

However, although one appreciates these problems, it is difficult to be

BOOK REVIEWS

uncritical about the presentation and analysis of the material. Thus, while the distinction between returnees (those who lived in Austria before 1938 and returned after 1945) and immigrants (those who came to Austria from other countries) is crucial to the discussion, it is left to the reader to discover the exact meaning of the terms (further confused by reference to Austrians and non-Austrians) by examining the appended statistics and by particularly close reading of the text. Furthermore, much is made of the differing experience of the Austrian and German repatriates, but there is no reference to the communal organization in those countries: one feels that some analysis of their respective pre- and post-war communal structures would have been helpful in accounting for the differences in the treatment afforded to the two groups. As regards presentation, it is regrettable that the author did not check all her page references and tables. The reader is sometimes referred to another page in the text, but turns to it in vain (for instance, on p. 92 in the discussion on returnees from Israel who 'quoted homesickness as a reason of return' we are referred to p. 81 for a comparison with other returnees giving the same reason—only to find no mention of the subject on that page); or we are referred to tables in the appendix, but fail to find them (for example, on p. 78, note 3, there is a reference to Tables D/16 and D/17—but these tables do not seem to have been printed).

Compared with even the eroding national populations of Western Jewry, the Austrian Jewish community is, as Mrs. Wilder-Okladek stresses, probably unique in its age-structure and in its rate of numerical decline. From the evidence given here, it obviously includes many individuals whose experiences would be invaluable in explaining why people return to inhospitable environments. The research material reproduced in the interviews quoted and in the case studies only serves to whet the appetite for a more rigorous discussion of the psychological state of both the community and the individuals who go to make it up.

MARLENA SCHMOOL

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

I should not like to leave uncorrected the impression the review of my *Jews and Freemasons* by Max Beloff must have created in the reader's mind. That Professor Beloff presented me to the reader as someone whose 'instincts would seem to be those of the antiquarian rather than of the historian or sociologist' would not have perturbed me, since interpretation of this remark is dependent on one's idea of what constitutes an historian. Beloff apparently found reading the detailed reports of contacts between Jews and Freemasons too burdensome. But is not the presentation of those significant details which combine to make up the chain of events of history the basic assignment of any historical study? This is especially so in cases where the facts were, until now, unknown. The subject of Jews and Freemasons, moreover, had never been treated historically 'before Dr. Katz embarked upon his studies', as Beloff so benevolently concedes. Of course, had the treatment of the subject been confined to the mere recording of events, the epithet 'antiquarian' would have been deserved. The reader of the review will, unfortunately, get the impression that the book does not go beyond this level, for Beloff omits to mention that in addition to the running analysis interwoven throughout, the book concludes with three chapters which epitomize the subject and attempt to point out its 'historical significance' (the title, indeed, of one of these chapters).

Indeed, Professor Beloff makes use of some of the observations stated in the book—although without giving the reader the slightest hint of their source. On the contrary, they are presented in a controversial manner: 'Dr. Katz in ignoring the fact that western and central Europe in the period of which he writes had been divided from the religious point of view by the effects of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation' was thus unable to appreciate the differences between the attitudes of Masons in Catholic and Protestant countries. So Professor Beloff has to do this for the benefit of the reader! Similarly, in another paragraph: 'Since Dr. Katz nowhere tells us what the lodges did in respect of their members,' so Beloff will supply information as to what attracted the Jews. But all he says, on both these occasions, is neatly abstracted from the book's analytical chapters (see pages 211-12, 224-5).

As indicated by the above quotation from the review, Professor Beloff thinks that in *Jews and Freemasons* I failed to conform to the principle that Jewish history must be written against the background of general European history. The principle is a sound one and it serves as one of the yardsticks for Jewish historiography. I would accept this criticism if it were applied to my other published works which deal with internal Jewish affairs. But what sense does it make to offer a general history in a book whose theme is the contact, and even confusion, between Jews and Gentiles? General society

CORRESPONDENCE

here is not the background to, but rather an integral part of, the process. Indeed the book deals more with non-Jews than with Jews. To have depicted the whole history, starting with the Reformation and anti-Reformation would have been superfluous when I assumed that the basic facts of earlier European history were known; nor did I want to relegate to mere background that which is in fact part of the substance of the era which I have undertaken to discuss. Professor Beloff has taken a cliché of historical criticism and misapplied it.

Your reviewer finds two inaccuracies in my presentation of French history. In one of these instances, the inaccuracy is his: I have not, as he claims, designated the Action Française as 'the inheritor of the ideas of Edward Drumont', but only said that it was, 'the inheritor of his anti-Semitic and anti-Masonic ideology'. And this is true.

Professor Beloff is correct in stating that 'despite the book's title, the content is very heavily oriented towards Germany with France having only a subsidiary role, with England and Holland getting only sparse mention'. He and other critics who seized on this point could not know that the original Hebrew version's title made no mention of Europe; this was added at the request of the publishers, Harvard University Press, who were afraid of misleading the American reader into believing that the book dealt with the American scene. Nevertheless, the careful reader could have gathered from my repeated statements in the Introduction and elsewhere that the book is for the most part concerned with Germany. The reason for this is simple, for Germany was the only country in which the participation of Jews in the Masonic movement persisted to present a problem during the period under discussion. In all other western countries, the problem either disappeared or was reduced to a marginal one only, as Jews were accepted in principle. Only at the beginning, after the emergence of the movement in the eighteenth century, was the acceptability of the Jews questioned in England, Holland, and other countries. This phase I have described in detail (and Professor Beloff found this tedious). During the nineteenth century the Masons in all the other western countries, and even in America, urged their German brethren to live up to the basic Masonic principle of universal brotherhood. In France, however, the connexion between Jews and Freemasons once again became problematic at the end of the nineteenth century, when they began to be classed together in antisemitic and anti-Masonic propaganda. But even in this phase, Germany stands out: 'Only in that country did a movement arise and adopt the slogan "Jews and Freemasons" as the point of departure in a campaign to destroy both.'

This leads me to the concluding paragraph of Max Beloff's review. He seems to be sceptical as to whether the whole theme can be conceived of as history proper. Then, on second thoughts, he adds: 'Perhaps Dr. Katz implies that just because the issue was one of content rather than of form, it can be taken as symbolical of the whole process and of its terrible aftermath. It is therefore perhaps a little more than a footnote to history, but not very much more.' I am not sure whether I understand the first of these two sentences. What has the question of content versus form to do with viewing Jewish-Masonic relationships as a symbol? The second sentence I do understand and resent most strongly. Why is the theme of this book not history

CORRESPONDENCE

proper? The attempt of a minority group to be accepted by the majority, the ideological struggle paving the way to acceptance, and the resistance to such acceptance—which runs different courses in different countries—do these not constitute social and intellectual history? Finally, the juxtaposition of Jews and Freemasons in a slogan which became one of the incendiary cries of Jewish defamation, leading ultimately to the extermination of the greater part of European Jewry—is this not political history?

JACOB KATZ.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

CHRONICLE

The Statistical and Demographic Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews reports that 3,872 persons were married in synagogues in Britain in 1970. This is the highest annual number since 1958. (In last June's issue of this *Journal*, p. 125, it was stated that there had been 3,806 synagogue marriages in 1969, and 3,646 in the previous year. In fact, these figures referred to the number of *persons* marrying, not to the number of marriages.)

The research Unit gives the following details about the ratio of Orthodox to Progressive marriages: Within the Progressive sector, the Liberal proportion has continued to fall, while the Reform proportion has this year risen significantly; the proportions for recent years are as follows:

| | 1970 % | 1966-9 % | 1961-5 % |
|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Orthodox | 81.0 | 82.1 | 80.9 |
| Reform | 12.7 | 10.8 | 10.6 |
| Liberal | 6.3 | 7.1 | 8.5 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |

*

South Africa's *Jewish Herald* reported, on 31 May, that there are more than 6,000 pupils in the Republic's Jewish Day Schools, and that over 7,000 Jewish children go to afternoon classes. It comments that, since there are 23,000 Jewish children of school age in the country and some 14,000 of them are enrolled in Jewish schools, South Africa's Jewish Community has the highest percentage of Jewish children receiving Jewish education in the entire Western world. For example, in Western Europe only 40 per cent receive any sort of Jewish education, mostly in the afternoon schools and up to Barmitzvah age only. In the U.S., Canada and Australia it is roughly 50 per cent.

*

At the end of 1970, Israel's population (the administered territories excluded) numbered almost three million inhabitants: 2,560,000 Jews, 326,000 Moslems, 76,000 Christians, and 36,000 others.

Forty-five per cent of the Jews were native-born. Nearly half (47 per cent) of the total number of Jews born in Israel had fathers who were born in Africa or Asia; the fathers of 36 per cent of those born in Israel were born in Europe or the Americas, while the remaining 17 per cent of the native-born were children of men also born in Israel.

*

CHRONICLE

The May 1971 issue of the *Congress Digest* (World Jewish Congress, Geneva) reports that there are now fewer than 2,000 Jews in Cuba, where the Jewish community numbered 14,000 before the revolution. The majority of them (1,400) are in Havana. There are five synagogues which hold Shabbat services, and Jewish educational activities have been maintained. Cuba and Israel have diplomatic relations at ambassadorial level.

*

The *Statistical Yearbook of the Tel-Aviv-Yafo Municipality 1970*, published in 1971, gives the following data.

Demography

At the end of 1969 the municipality's population was 382,000; it has been declining steadily since 1963, when it had reached the record figure of 394,400. The decline is due to migration out of the city. In 1969 the Jewish population was 376,000 (13.1 per cent of the entire Jewish population of Israel); the non-Jewish segment, almost equally divided between Muslims and Christians, numbers 6,600 and is concentrated largely in Yafo.

There has been a striking ageing of the population: those aged 65 and over accounted in 1967 for 10.6 per cent of the total population; in 1965 the percentage was 9.2, while in 1961 it was 6.9. One factor in the ageing of the population is the migration of younger people to the outer suburbs or to neighbouring towns; another factor is that people are living longer.

There has been a slight decline in the size of households: from an average of 3.5 persons per household in 1962 to an average of 3.2 in 1969.

Labour force

Whereas Tel-Aviv-Yafo's population accounts for only 13.1 per cent of Israel's total population, the municipality's labour force accounts for 25 per cent of the country's gainfully employed personnel. There has been a steady increase in the number of women employed in the city: from 42,000 in 1961, to 57,400 in 1965, to 70,200 in 1969. Women gainfully employed in the municipality account for 25 per cent of the total female labour force of the country; they constitute 42 per cent of the national female labour force employed in commerce.

There are 236,400 persons employed in the municipality, but only slightly more than half that number (133,400) live in it. Of the 103,000 who commute, 19,200 are residents of Ramat Gan; 15,900 live in Bat Yam; 15,000 in Holon; and 10,000 in Givatayim.

Education

In 1969-70 there were 87,500 pupils in 484 educational institutions approved by the Ministry of Education and Culture; 61,230 pupils were enrolled in schools run by the Municipality. In 1970-71 the number fell slightly to 60,900. There has been increasing migration of families with young children to towns outside the city, and this fact together with a decline in the birth rate has resulted in a decline in the total number of school-children in the Municipality. On the other hand, there has been an increase in the number of schools and kindergartens with a welcome reduction in

CHRONICLE

the size of classes. In 1961 there were, on average, 36 children in a kindergarten class; today there are 30. In elementary schools, the average number was 33; it fell to 29 in 1965, and to 27 in 1970.

There has been an increase in the total number of pupils in recognized secondary schools: from 18,708 in 1965 to 21,500 in 1970.

There were 11,800 students in Tel-Aviv University in 1971 compared with 6,700 in 1967. The Faculty of Law enrolment in 1967 was 900; by 1971, it had reached 1,150.

There are 44 libraries in the Municipality, 9 of which are reference libraries.

Health Services

Tel-Aviv-Yafo has 15 hospitals with a total of 1,940 beds. In 1969 there were 5 beds for every thousand inhabitants, a great improvement on 1961, when the figure was 3.9 per thousand.

There are 20 Mother and Child Centres in the Municipality.

Hotels

There were 61 hotels in the city in 1970; 41 of these (with a total of 2,620 rooms) were recommended for tourists. In 1965 only 31 hotels (with a total of 1,860 rooms) fell into that category.

Consumer goods

In 1969, over 90 per cent of households owned an electric refrigerator and a wireless set; 86 per cent had a gas cooker; 40.5 per cent had a sewing machine; and about 30 per cent had a washing machine and a gramophone. The percentage of homes with a television set more than trebled: from 10.3 per cent in 1968 to 32.7 per cent in 1969.

There were telephones in 46.5 per cent of the Municipality's households.

*

The June 1971 issue of *Israel Book World* states that thirty countries exhibited publications at the 1971 Jerusalem International Book Fair: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, England, France, Germany, Guatemala, Holland, Honduras, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Malagasy, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rumania, Spain, Switzerland, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

There was a display of 24,000 books from 755 publishers. The first Jerusalem International Book Fair took place in 1963.

*

Last July the Hebrew University of Jerusalem awarded 140 Ph.D. degrees—the largest number since the foundation of the University. The doctorates were in the following disciplines: 58 in science; 32 in the humanities; 23 in medicine; 20 in agriculture; and 7 in the social sciences.

The highest number of master's degrees, 150, were in the sciences, followed by 99 in the social sciences, 92 in the arts, 49 in agriculture, 24 in medicine, and 14 in law.

CHRONICLE

The number of students engaged in doctoral research has been growing steadily: there were 797 in 1968/69; 933 in 1969/70; and 1,121 in 1970/71.

*

It was reported last July that the Technion's Board of Governors had received donations amounting to \$525,000 towards a Fund to help 2,000 students from the Oriental communities to enter Israel's universities each year. The donations were made by four American members of the Board of Governors, who undertook to raise a further \$500,000 in the United States by the end of 1971. The first group of students benefiting under this scheme should be enrolled for the 1972/73 academic year. The four Governors announced that the Finance Ministry has promised to enlarge the Fund with a contribution of \$4,000,000 over the next five years.

*

The Yemenite Community Committee in Jerusalem has announced the award of 37 scholarships at the Hebrew University and at various Yeshivot to students of Yemenite origin. The Fund for these scholarships was set up three years ago by Mr. Shmuel Bedithe in memory of his father. The donation is being matched by the Friends of the Hebrew University.

*

Last June, 226 students at the Haifa Technion were awarded higher degrees: 55 doctorates and 171 master's. More than 70 per cent of Israel's engineers and applied scientists are Technion graduates.

*

An article in *The Israel Digest* of 23 July gives the following details about Israel's programmes of international co-operation with developing countries in Africa, Asia, and South America. More than a thousand citizens from various countries are trained in Israel every year; they attend courses which will enable them to become 'farm managers, agricultural extension officers, irrigation engineers, agricultural planners and so on'. The programmes 'cover a wide scope, the major area being that of expanding food production. . . . Israeli experts in forty foreign countries are advising their hosts on egg production, increasing milk yields, growing citrus fruits and vegetables, cultivating corn and cotton, etc.'

The aim is to replace the Israeli expert with a local resident; an Israeli in Africa is quoted as saying 'Our object is to serve, to teach and then to leave.'

An international association of 15,000 'alumni' of training courses in Israel groups local 'Shalom' societies through which the individual members keep in touch with one another and with the country in which they studied.

*

The Yonina Talmon Fund and the Hebrew University last June announced that the 1971 Yonina Talmon Prize had been awarded to Mrs. Barbara Brown Frankel for her essay 'The City in Black Kinship: A Comparison of Rural Past and Urban Present'. The Yonina Talmon Prize is

CHRONICLE

awarded to an author of an unpublished essay in one of three fields in which Yonina Talmon made seminal contributions: kinship and the family, including gerontological aspects of the family; the sociology of the kibbutz and collective settlements; and the sociology of religion. This is the first award of the Yonina Talmon Fund.

MIDDLE EASTERN STUDIES

Volume Eight

January 1972

Number One

THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS IN ENGLISH
PROTESTANT THOUGHT 1790-1840

Mayir Vereté

THE GROWTH OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES IN IRAN
1900-1966

Julian Bharier

THE OPENING OF THE RED SEA TO BRITISH SHIPS
IN THE LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

David Kimche

THE LEWIS AFFAIR AND THE FORTUNES OF
AL-MUQTATAF

the late Nadia Farag

THE ABSORPTION OF ORIENTALS INTO ISRAELI
BUREAUCRACY

Nimrod Raphaeli

THE OFFICE OF SEYH UL-ISLAM AND THE TANZIMAT—
A PROSOPOGRAPHIC ENQUIRY

Norman Itzkowitz and Joel Shinder

AFGHANI IN PARIS: A NOTE

Elie Kedourie

THE YOUNG TURKS

Andrew Mango

BOOK REVIEWS

Published three times a year by:

FRANK CASS & CO. LTD.
67 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON WC1B 3BT

Annual Subscription: £6 Single Issues: £2

The English and Immigration 1880-1910

JOHN A. GARRARD

This volume considers the reactions of the English, and in particular of the left wing, to the Jewish immigration around the turn of the century. Comparison is made with the recent coloured Commonwealth immigration, and similarities are seen. In both cases the political left wing finds itself defending the presence of the newcomers against a Conservative Party appearing as the champion of the ordinary British voter, and in both cases the immigrants are regarded as racially separate and become the objects of hostility. £3.25 *Institute of Race Relations*

Israel: A Society in Transition

V. D. SEGRE

The author discusses the development of the Jewish community in Palestine, and later Israel, as well as Israel's relations with her Arab neighbours and the developing countries. £2.50

Israel's Parliament

The Law of the Knesset

E. LIKHOVSKI

This analysis of Israel's unwritten and basically flexible constitution traces the Zionist and British traditions which together have provided the fundamental notions of the Israeli system of parliamentary government; it is particularly concerned with the legal and conventional rules which determine the election of the Knesset, Israel's Parliament, and the Knesset's own rules of procedure. £4.25



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Adam, Heribert, ed., *South Africa, Sociological Perspectives*, xii + 340 pp., Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1971, £3.50.
- Ancel, Marc, *Suspended Sentence* (A report presented by the Department of Criminal Science of the Institute of Comparative Law, University of Paris), x + 102 pp., Heinemann Educ. Books, London, 1971, £1.50.
- Banks, J. A., *Sociology as a Vocation, An Inaugural Lecture delivered in the University of Leicester 18 February 1971*, 26 pp., Leicester Univ. Press, Leicester, 1971, 24 pp.
- Bauer, Yehuda, *Flight and Rescue: Brichah, The organized escape of the Jewish survivors of Eastern Europe, 1944-1948*, x + 369 pp., Contemporary Jewish Civilization Series, Moshe Davis, ed., Random House, New York, 1970, \$8.95.
- Bott, Elizabeth, *Family and Social Network, Roles, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families* (second edn.), Preface by Max Gluckman, xxx + 363 pp., Tavistock Publications, London, 1971, £3.25 hardback; £1.50 paperback.
- Brandel-Syrier, Mia, *Reeflown elite, a study of social mobility in a modern African community on the Reef*, Foreword by Max Marwick, xxxviii + 335 + 15 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1971, £3.50.
- Brandenburg, Alois Günter, *Systemzwang und Autonomie, Gesellschaft und Persönlichkeit in der soziologischen Theorie von Talcott Parsons*, 240 pp., Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag, Düsseldorf, 1971, DM 34.
- Cortina, Frank Michael, *Stroke a Slain Warrior*, x + 231 pp., Columbia Univ. Press, New York and London, 1970, \$6.95.
- Department of Education and Science, *Camping*, Education Pamphlet Number 58, iv + 72 pp., H.M.S.O., London, 1971, 65p.
- Desroche, H. and Séguy, J., eds., *Introduction aux sciences humaines des religions*, 280 pp., Editions Cujas, Paris, 1970, 30 F.
- Douglas, Jack D., ed., *Understanding Everyday Life, Toward the reconstruction of sociological knowledge*, xii + 358 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1971, £4.20.
- Eliav, Mordechai, *Love of Zion and Men of Hod: German Jewry and the Settlement of Eretz-Israel in the 19th Century* (Hebrew), 442 pp., published for the Institute for Zionist Research, Tel Aviv University, by Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House Ltd., 1970, n.p.
- Feinsilver, Lillian Mermin, *The Taste of Yiddish*, 437 pp., Thomas Yoseloff, New York and London, 1970, £4.00.
- Fisch, Harold, *The Dual Image, The Figure of the Jew in English and American Literature*, 149 pp., World Jewish Library, London, 1971, £2.00 hardback; 80p paperback.
- Foucault, Michel, *Madness and Civilization, A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, xiv + 299 pp., translated from the French by Richard Howard, Tavistock Publications, London, 1971, £1.00.
- Frankenstein, Carl, *Varieties of Juvenile Delinquency*, xii + 252 pp., Gordon & Breach, London, New York, and Paris, 1970, £6.00 or \$14.50.
- Frankenstein, Carl, *Impaired Intelligence, Pathology and Rehabilitation*, xii + 244 pp., Gordon & Breach, London, New York, and Paris, 1970, £6.00 or \$14.50.
- Fuller, Watson, ed., *The Social Impact of Modern Biology*, viii + 256 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1971, £1.00 cloth; 50p paperback.
- Hoinig, Sidney B., *Solomon Zeitlin: Scholar Laureate, An Annotated Bibliography, 1915-1970 with Appreciations of His Writings*, Foreword by Zalman Shazar, x + 296 pp., published jointly by Bitzaron, New York and Dropsie University, Alumni Association, Philadelphia, 1971, \$10.00.
- Howard, Alan, *Learning to be Rotuman, Enculturation in the South Pacific*, xiv + 184 pp., Teachers College Press, New York, 1970, \$7.25 cloth; \$4.95 paperback.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Krausz, Ernest, *Ethnic Minorities in Britain*, 175 pp., MacGibbon & Kee, London, 1971, £2.25.
- Kublin, Hyman, *Studies of the Chinese Jews, Selections from Journals East and West*, x + 218 pp., Paragon Book Reprint Corp., New York, 1971, \$11.00.
- Kublin, Hyman, *Jews in Old China, Some Western Views*, xxii + 295 pp., Paragon Book Reprint Corp., New York, 1971, \$12.00.
- Lissak, Moshe, *Social Mobility in Israel Society*, xii + 122 pp., Israel Universities Press, Jerusalem, 1969, n.p.
- Martin, J. P. and Webster, D., *The Social Consequences of Conviction*, xvi + 384 pp., Heinemann Educ. Books, London, 1971, £4.50.
- Mulkay, M. J., *Functionalism, exchange and theoretical strategy*, x + 260 + 15 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1971, £2.70.
- Nelson, Alvin F., *The Development of Lester Ward's World View* (rev. and reprinted 1970), viii + 67 pp., Branch-Smith, Inc., Fort Worth, Texas, 1971, \$3.95.
- Noy, Dov and Ben-Ami, Isaac, eds., *Folklore Research Center Studies, Volume I*, x + 116 pp. (English) + xiv + 423 pp. (Hebrew), The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1970, and distributed by Oxford Univ. Press, London, £6.25.
- Osipov, G. V. ed., *Industry and Labour in the U.S.S.R.*, Studies in Soviet Society, Introduction by Maurice Hookham, ix + 297 pp., Tavistock Publications London, £1.00.
- Piepe, Anthony, *Knowledge and Social Order, The relationship between human knowledge and the construction of social theory*, 81 pp., Heinemann Educ. Books, London, 1971, £1.50.
- Pinker, Robert, *Social Theory & Social Policy*, xiv + 226 pp., Heinemann Educ. Books, London, 1971, £2.00.
- Pollack, Herman, *Jewish Folkways in Germanic Lands (1648-1806)*, Studies in Aspects of Daily Life, xx + 410 pp., The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1971, £7.00.
- Shapiro, Yonathan, *Leadership of the American Zionist Organization 1897-1930*, xiv + 295 pp., The Univ. of Illinois Press, Urbana, Ill., 1971, \$9.50.
- Shokeid, Moshe, *The dual heritage, Immigrants from the Atlas mountains in an Israeli village*, xxix + 245 pp., Manchester Univ. Press, Manchester, 1971, £3.00.
- Smith, Bruce L. R., *The Rand Corporation, Wissenschaftliche Politik-Beratung in den USA*, 197 pp., Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag, Düsseldorf, 1971, DM 44.
- Sparks, Richard F., *Local Prisons, The Crisis in the English Penal System*, Cambridge Studies in Criminology, Volume XXX, xi + 147 pp., Heinemann Educ. Books, London, 1971, £2.50.
- Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, *Statistical Yearbook of the Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, 1970*, xci + 525 pp., Tel Aviv, 1971, n.p.
- Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, *Tel Aviv-Yafo Population 1967* (Hebrew and English), Research and Statistical Department, Special Survey No. 36, xxiii + 49 pp., November 1970, n.p.
- Tel Aviv-Yafo Municipality, *Hospitalized Patients—Tel Aviv-Yafo 1966-1967* (Hebrew and English), Research and Statistical Department, Special Survey No. 37, xxxv + 72 pp., December 1970, n.p.
- Weber, Max, *Le judaïsme antique*, translated by Freddy Raphaël, Recherches en Sciences Humaines No. 31, 615 pp., Librairie Plon, Paris, 1970, n.p.
- Zimmer, Eric, *Harmony and Discord, An Analysis of the Decline of Jewish Self-Government in 15th Century Central Europe*, 264 pp., Yeshiva Univ. Press, New York, 1970, \$5.95.
- Zoll, Ralf, ed., *Manipulation der Meinungsbildung Zum Problem Hergestellter Öffentlichkeit*, Kritik no. 4; 372 pp. Westdeutscher, Opladen, 1971, n.p.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

- BLACKSTONE, Tessa Ann Vosper; Ph.D. Lecturer in Social Administration at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Chief publications: 'The Plowden Report', *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. XVIII, no. 3, September, 1967; 'The Distribution of Nursery Schools in England and Wales', *Social and Economic Administration*, vol. 4, no. 1, January, 1970; co-author, with Kathleen Gales, Roger Hadley, and Wyn Lewis, *Students in Conflict, L.S.E. 1967*, London, 1970; *A Fair Start: The Provision of Pre-School Education*, London, 1971; co-author, with Roger Hadley, 'Student protest in a British University: some comparisons with American research', *Comparative Education Review*, February, 1971. Is currently engaged in a study of university teachers.
- COHEN, Percy S.; B. Comm., B.Sc. (Econ.), Ph.D. Professor of Sociology in the University of London at the London School of Economics and Political Science; Dean of Undergraduate Studies at the L.S.E., 1967-1971. Chief publications: *Modern Social Theory*, London, 1968, and various articles in *The J.J.S.*, *British Journal of Sociology*, *Man*, *Race*, etc. Currently engaged in research into teaching at the London School of Economics; and for the Institute of Jewish Affairs, London, in a study of 'Jewish Radicals' and 'Radical Jews'.
- GARTNER, Lloyd P.; B.A., M.A., Ph.D. Associate Professor of History at the City College of the City University of New York; Visiting Professor at the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1970-1972. Chief publications: *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914*, London and Detroit, 1960; co-author, *History of the Jews of Milwaukee*, Philadelphia, 1963; 'Roumania, America, and World Jewry: Consul Peixotto in Bucharest, 1870-1876', *American Jewish Historical Quarterly*, vol. LVIII, no. 1, September, 1968; *Jewish Education in the United States: A Documentary History*, New York, 1969; co-author, *History of the Jews of Los Angeles*, San Marino, California and Philadelphia, 1970.
- MAIBAUM, Mathew, A.B., M.P.A. Currently engaged in a study of a Jewish community in California for a doctorate in clinical psychology at the University of California in Los Angeles.
- SCHMOOL, Marlena; B. Soc. Sc. (E.P.S.). Research Officer, Statistical and Demographic Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews, London. Chief publications: co-author, 'Statistics of Jewish Marriages in Great Britain: 1901-1965', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 9, no. 2, December, 1967; co-author, 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population 1960-65', *J.J.S.*, vol. 10, no. 1, June, 1968; 'Register of Social Research on the Anglo-Jewish Community', *J.J.S.*, vol. 10, no. 2, December, 1968; co-author, 'Synagogue Marriages in Great Britain 1966-8', *J.J.S.*, vol. 12, no. 1, June, 1970; co-author, 'Statistics of Milah and the Jewish Birth-Rate in Britain', *J.J.S.*, vol. 12, no. 2,

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

December, 1970. Currently engaged in statistical studies of Anglo-Jewry and in research into the structure and role of the Anglo-Jewish Rabbinate.

WASSERSTEIN, Bernard, B.A. Student of Nuffield College, Oxford. Currently engaged in research for a doctoral thesis entitled 'British officials and the Population of Palestine, 1917-1939: A Study in Colonial Relationships'.

A MUST FOR THE JEWISH BOOKSHELF

THE DUAL IMAGE

A Study of the Jew in English Literature

By Harold Fisch

Critics have generally focused on the black or hostile Jewish stereotype in English literature. In this book, Professor Fisch takes up the subject anew, emphasizing the radical ambiguity which marks the portrait of the Jew from the Middle Ages onward.

This is the only book to scan the entire field of Jewish portraiture in the English language from Chaucer to the present day, taking in both Jewish and non-Jewish authors. Special sections are devoted to such major classics as *The Merchant of Venice*, *Daniel Deronda*, and *Ulysses*. The later chapters trace the important changes brought about by the Holocaust and the rise of the State of Israel.

Professor Harold Fisch, a former lecturer in English at the University of Leeds, is a departmental editor of the new *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, and has been Rector of Bar-Ilan University in Israel since 1968.

(Hardback £2 Paperback 80p)

From Booksellers or direct from **WORLD JEWISH LIBRARY** —

55 New Cavendish Street, London W1M 8BT

(01-935 0335/9)