

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by William Heinemann Ltd

VOLUME XXIII : NUMBER 2 : DECEMBER 1981

CONTENTS

Ethnic Group Prejudice and Class in Israel
YACOV ROFÉ and LEONARD WELLER

Repentant Delinquents. A Religious Approach to
Rehabilitation
GERALD CROMER

Jewish Self-Defence During the Russian Pogroms of
1903-1906
SHLOMO LAMBROZA

German Jews and Antisemitism (Review Article)
JULIUS CARLEBACH

A Composite Portrait of Israel (Review Article)
WALTER P. ZENNER

Book Reviews

Chronicle

Editor : Judith Freedman

ISSN 0021-6534

CHANGE OF SPONSORSHIP OF THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

The Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress founded the *J.J.S.* in 1959; the Editorial in the first issue stated:

'This Journal has been brought into being in order to provide an international vehicle for serious writing on Jewish social affairs . . . Academically we address ourselves not only to sociologists, but to social scientists in general, to historians, to philosophers, and to students of comparative religion. . . . We should like to stress both that the Journal is editorially independent and that the opinions expressed by authors are their own responsibility.'

With great regret, for financial reasons, the World Jewish Congress relinquished its sponsorship of the *J.J.S.* as from the last issue of 1980.

Private funds are establishing a Maurice Freedman Research Trust, primarily to sponsor the *J.J.S.* from 1981 onwards as an independent organ affiliated to no institution. There will be no change in the editorship or aims of the Journal, which is to appear as in the past twice yearly — in June and December — and by amicable agreement with the W.J.C. under the same title. William Heinemann Ltd will continue to be the publishers.

The new address is:

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY
187 GLOUCESTER PLACE
LONDON NW1 6BU
ENGLAND

TELEPHONE: 01 262 8939

Enquiries regarding subscriptions and back numbers should henceforth be sent to the above address.

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Volume XXIII : Number 2 : December 1981

CONTENTS

Ethnic Group Prejudice and Class in Israel YACOV ROFÉ and LEONARD WELLER	101
Repentant Delinquents. A Religious Approach to Rehabilitation GERALD CROMER	113
Jewish Self-Defence During the Russian Pogroms of 1903-1906 SHLOMO LAMBROZA	123
German Jews and Antisemitism (Review Article) JULIUS CARLEBACH	135
A Composite Portrait of Israel (Review Article) WALTER P. ZENNER	141
Book Reviews	147
Chronicle	159
Books Received	163
Notes on Contributors	165

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY, IN JUNE AND DECEMBER

by William Heinemann Ltd

Founded by the World Jewish Congress in 1959

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION £8.00 (U.S. \$18.00) POST FREE

SINGLE COPIES £4.50 (U.S. \$10.00)

Applications for subscriptions should be sent to The Jewish Journal of Sociology,
187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England

EDITOR Judith Freedman

ADVISORY BOARD

R. Bachi (<i>Israel</i>)	Meyer Fortes (<i>Britain</i>)
Howard Brotz (<i>Canada</i>)	Nathan Glazer (<i>U.S.A.</i>)
Percy S. Cohen (<i>Britain</i>)	Jacques Gutwirth (<i>France</i>)
Moshe Davis (<i>Israel</i>)	S. J. Prais (<i>Britain</i>)
S. N. Eisenstadt (<i>Israel</i>)	

© THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY 1981

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY W. S. MANEY & SON LTD, LEEDS

BOOKS REVIEWED

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Page</i>
James Fawcett	<i>The International Protection of Minorities</i>	Israel Finestein	147
Solomon B. Freehof	<i>New Reform Responsa</i>	Louis Jacobs	147
Israel Goldstein	<i>Jewish Justice and Conciliation</i>	Israel Finestein	149
Aaron Levine	<i>Free Enterprise and Jewish Law</i>	Isaac Levy	152
Emanuel Marx, ed.	<i>A Composite Portrait of Israel</i>	Walter P. Zenner	141
Donald L. Niewyk	<i>The Jews in Weimar Germany</i>	Julius Carlebach	135
Harold Pollins	<i>A History of the Jewish Working Men's Club and Institute 1874-1912</i>	J. Freedman	155
Sanford Ragins	<i>Jewish Responses to Anti-Semitism in Germany 1870-1914</i>	Julius Carlebach	135
Alan Unterman	<i>Jews. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices</i>	Louis Jacobs	156

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Papers submitted to *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* should be addressed to the Editor at 187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England. The papers must be original. They should not have been published previously, or be committed to publication elsewhere, in any language. When a paper has been accepted for publication, the author may not publish it elsewhere in any language, without the written consent of the Editor of the *J.S.S.*

MSS (please send at least two copies) 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*

Place titles of articles within single inverted commas. Underline the title of the book or journal in which the article appears. 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.

ETHNIC GROUP PREJUDICE AND CLASS IN ISRAEL

Yacov Rofé and Leonard Weller

IN the United States, most researchers contend that anti-Black sentiment and behaviour reflect racial prejudice.¹ But Blalock has inquired whether racial prejudice may not have been confused with class prejudice in empirical research: 'The common practice in the field of race relations has been to assume that whenever one finds definite anti-Negro responses this is an indicator of minority prejudice'.² He goes on to state that it is a simple fact that the vast majority of Negroes are members of the lower classes whereas most Whites, with whom a middle-class respondent has had contact, are middle-class. 'If the respondent is asked whether he would be willing to work with a Negro or to eat at the same restaurant as a Negro, it is not unreasonable to assume that the mental image produced is that of a lower-class Negro'.³ The reluctance to interact with a Negro then may be due to his lower social status and not to racism *per se*. Since ethnic and racial backgrounds are critical elements in the determination of class position, it has been empirically difficult to separate them.

Blalock did not develop this thesis, but it is certainly consistent with both a sociological and a social-psychological perspective. Higher ranking groups impose status inequalities upon lower ranking groups in an endeavour to maintain the status hierarchies.⁴ This is achieved by the delimiting of the scope and content of interaction between the higher and lower social classes.⁵ Status-sensitive people maximize the social distance between themselves and those of lower position.⁶ The attribution of negative characteristics to those with whom we interact less is an easy next step. Furthermore, we are more apt to admire or respect successful persons and to despise or dislike the under-achievers.⁷

Friendship with someone of lower status would be seen as a poor exchange, as a loss of status without suitable return,⁸ and it may even occasion discomfort since we like those who are similar to us⁹ and are more at ease in situations with which we are familiar.¹⁰ People with similar values reward each other through consensual validation,¹¹ and pleasant behaviour is more agreeable than unpleasant behaviour.¹² The sociological literature is replete with the findings that while there is a similarity of attitudes, values, and modes of behaviour within social

classes, there are parallel differences between social classes.¹³ In this context, high social distance may be an attempt to minimize cognitive dissimilar attitudes and beliefs. In the middle class, both children and adults may avoid members of the working class whom they tend to associate with undesirable attributes.¹⁴

The few American studies which have raised the question of whether prejudice against Blacks is not also a class phenomenon (since Blacks are overwhelmingly in the lower social strata) have demonstrated that this prejudice is a product of both racial and class prejudice.¹⁵ We know of no study which has shown prejudice against a minority group to be solely a function of class status. This paper examines whether in Israeli society prejudice against Jews of Oriental origin is based not on ethnic or cultural evaluations but on the class structure.

Before Israel was established, the country's Jewish population consisted almost entirely of immigrants from Europe: only about 15 per cent had come from Africa or Asia. After 1948, there was a mass immigration of Jews from Islamic countries and their absorption into Israeli society and its economic system proved particularly difficult. Israelis of Oriental origin have lower incomes than those of Western descent, and since they also have larger families, the gap in the standards of living is even wider. The proportion of Oriental Jews in professional occupations is disproportionately low, as is the number at academic secondary schools and in institutions of higher learning.¹⁶

Yochanan Peres carried out the most complete study to date on ethnic prejudice in Israel, sampling 675 high school boys and girls aged 16 and 17 years. He noted that more than half (58 per cent) the pupils of European origin stated that they would prefer to marry a member of their own group; 35 per cent would not choose to be friends with Oriental Jews; and 40 per cent would not care to be their neighbours.¹⁷ Other researchers reported in the 1960s that Oriental Jews stated that they would prefer to associate with Western Jews;¹⁸ and Judith Shuval, in a paper entitled 'Self-Rejection among North African Immigrants',¹⁹ showed that her respondents did not want to live near other Oriental Jews, preferring instead 'European' neighbours.

No published Israeli study has empirically examined the possibility that Jews of Western origin prefer to associate with their own ethnic group because of the social class similarity. Most researchers have been content to document the degree of prejudice, while sometimes noting that it is ethnically based.²⁰ The outstanding exception is Shuval who, as early as 1956, interpreted (but did not demonstrate) her survey findings of hostility towards Moroccan and Iraqi Jews in terms of focusing generalized hostility on to the lowest status groups.²¹

Since Jews have been the victims of prejudice for so long, and since in Israel the prevalent ideology condemns prejudice,²² Blalock's observations about the class nature of prejudice might well be more pertinent

PREJUDICE AND CLASS IN ISRAEL

to Israeli than to American society. If this is in fact the case, then when a Western Israeli evaluates a Western Jew more positively than he does an Oriental Jew, he is simply expressing a preference for a middle-class person. He will say that he would choose to marry, befriend, or work with another Western Jewish person perhaps because the latter (unlike an Israeli of Oriental descent) is of the same social status. We therefore decided to test the following two hypotheses:

- (1) When subjects know only the ethnic origin of a person but not his social class, both Western and Oriental Jews are more positive toward, and prefer, Jews of Western origin — as all studies hitherto have shown.
- (2) However, no significant difference would be found in the attitudes of either Westerners or Orientals to members of either group when these individuals are of the same social class as the respondent's.

This second hypothesis might be correct for Westerners only when the Oriental Jew is a member of the upper (or perhaps middle) classes because he is then regarded as an achiever or over-achiever in spite of his ethnic drawback, and therefore worthy of special acclaim.

Methodology and procedure

Our respondents were 426 students in three high schools in the Tel-Aviv area. They were aged 15 to 17 years; 294 were of Western origin and 132 were of Oriental descent. The unequal numbers in the two groups reflect the higher percentage of Western pupils in high schools. The study was carried out in 1979.

Attitudes towards a Westerner and an Oriental were elicited in two situations: (*a*) where only the country of origin was specified; and (*b*) where social class as well as the country of origin were designated. If Western Jews hold negative attitudes towards Oriental Jews not because of the latter's lower social class but because of their ethnicity, then they should be more negative towards Orientals not only in situation *a* but also in situation *b*. However, if Westerners prefer other Westerners to Orientals because of the former's higher status, no significant differences would be found when the Oriental is of the same social class as the Western respondent's (situation *b*), but a Westerner would be preferred when the social class is not given (situation *a*).

Respondents read brief descriptions of nine persons; each description gave details of country of origin, age, and in some cases number of children. For example:

- (1) An upper-class description: 'The man is a doctor of physics and mathematics; he is a University lecturer and 29 years old; his

YACOV ROFÉ AND LEONARD WELLER

mother was born in Iran (or Czechoslovakia) and his father in Iraq (or Hungary)'.

- (2) A middle-class description: 'The man is an income tax clerk, 27 years old; his mother was born in Czechoslovakia (or Morocco) and his father in Romania (or Tunisia)'.
- (3) A lower-class description: 'The man is financially supported by the Department of Welfare, is 36 years old, has six children, and was born in Yemen (or Russia)'.
- (4) A control group description: 'The man is 35 years old and was born in Hungary (or Iran)'.

There were two sets of descriptions. In half of each set, it was stated that the person described (or his parents) had been born in a Western country, while in the other half the country of birth was in Africa or Asia. The two sets were identical, except that those who were described in one set as of Western origin were described in the second set as of Oriental origin, and vice versa.

In two descriptions, the person was a member of the upper class: university lecturer or aircraft pilot; in two other descriptions, he was a middle-class person: clerk or high school teacher; and in three descriptions, he had a lower-class status: a welfare recipient, a hairdresser's assistant who had completed only seven years of elementary school, or a burglar. In the two descriptions which served as the control group, no social class information was given — as in example 4 above. The two sets were assigned randomly to the respondents, who were given identical descriptions, except that half of them were told that the person under discussion was of Western extraction, while for the other half he was of Oriental origin.

The subjects evaluated each of the nine individuals described by giving marks on a seven-point scale on 18 bipolar scales according to the Semantic Differential Technique;²³ they also indicated whether they would be ready to become friendly with these individuals and to be their neighbours.

Statistical analysis

The evaluations of the respondents on the 18 bipolar scales were subjected to factor analysis, which resulted in determining the following four principal factors: Self-control, Pleasantness, Intelligence, and Social Distance. The items in each of these factors were:

SELF-CONTROL peaceful-aggressive, kind-cruel, polite-impolite,
 calm-hot tempered, compliant-stubborn, quiet-noisy, clean-dirty.

PREJUDICE AND CLASS IN ISRAEL

PLEASANTNESS pleasant-unpleasant, beautiful-ugly, friendly-unfriendly, delicate-rugged, happy-sad, honest-dishonest, masculine-feminine.

INTELLIGENCE intelligent-ignorant, clever-dumb, educated-uneducated, quick to grasp things-slow to grasp things.

SOCIAL DISTANCE readiness to be friendly with the person described and to be his neighbour.

In the analysis of variance, these four factors comprised the dependent variable, that is, the subjects' overall evaluation of the description. We used analysis of variance with multiple regression:²⁴

All effects, including main effects, covariate effects and any interaction effects, will be assessed simultaneously as in multiple regression. Each effect is the additional contribution to the explained variation after adjusting for all other effects . . . Thus, A main effects are assessed after adjusting for B main effects and AB interaction; B main effects are assessed after adjusting for A and B main effects.

The independent variables in the analysis of variance were: Ethnic Origin of the Description (EOD), Eastern or Western; Ethnic Origin of the Subject (EOS), Eastern or Western; and Sex of the Subject. In these analyses, the main effect, EOD, the double interaction $EOD \times EOS$ and the triple interaction, $EOD \times EOS \times Sex$, are the critical analyses, for they inform us whether or not the subject's evaluation was determined by the ethnic background of the person under discussion. The remaining results, that is, the main effects, EOS and Sex, and the interactions, $EOD \times Sex$ and $EOS \times Sex$, are not related to the hypotheses and will be reported at the end of the Results section.

Results

The results of the analysis of variance for the control group (the two descriptions where only ethnic origin but not social class were indicated) are presented in the first part of Table 1. Since for these two descriptions, and these two descriptions only, the social class was not given, it was expected that Jews of Western extraction would be rated more highly than Oriental Jews.

The table shows that for Description 1, the main effect of the ethnic origin of the descriptions was highly significant in factors 1 (Self-control) and 3 (Intelligence) and not significant in factors 2 (Pleasantness) and 4 (Social Distance); in factor 4, the interaction $EOD \times EOS$ (ethnic origin of the descriptions and of the subjects) was significant. In Description 2, the main effect, EOD, was highly significant in all four factors. The mean scores for the Western and Eastern descriptions in the first description were: 2.85 vs. 3.85 for factor 1 (Self-control) and 2.95 vs. 3.53 for factor 3 (Intelligence). In the second description, the

TABLE 1. *F Scores in the Analyses of Variance with Multiple Regression*

Source	CONTROL															
	Description 1				Description 2				Lecturer				Pilot			
	Factors				Factors				Factors				Factors			
<i>df</i>	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Ethnic Origin of Description (EOD)	45.13‡	2.66	17.10‡	0.16	84.73‡	15.40‡	77.07‡	46.25‡					0.43	2.52	2.63	4.90*
Ethnic Origin of Subject (EOS)	4.48*	0.15	0.02	1.27	1.77	8.17	2.81	11.24‡	0.08	1.39	0.01	0.00	0.90	0.32	0.75	1.95
Sex	5.22*	11.80‡	16.98‡	3.32	4.48	6.21	2.83	0.90	4.00*	22.88‡	7.40	9.03‡	1.69	7.59‡	1.35	1.38
EOD × EOS	0.07	2.60	0.00	4.68*	0.60	1.19	1.13	2.68	0.02	0.05	1.43	0.04	2.81	0.01	0.03	1.08
EOD × Sex	0.79	1.15	0.01	3.01	1.24	0.00	0.05	0.00	1.23	0.05	0.55	0.02	0.12	0.61	0.01	1.05
EOS × Sex	1.28	0.03	0.26	0.14	0.08	1.22	0.20	0.38	0.28	2.31	0.55	0.34	1.04	1.48	2.25	1.82
EOD × EOS × Sex	0.05	0.80	1.45	2.45	0.78	0.69	1.21	1.18	0.38	0.05	2.65	0.77	0.35	0.13	1.62	0.00
<i>df</i> of Residual	412				406				418				418			

Source	MIDDLE CLASS												LOWER CLASS											
	Teacher				Clerk				Hairdresser				Welfare Recipient				Burglar							
	Factors				Factors				Factors				Factors				Factors							
<i>df</i>	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4				
Ethnic Origin of Description (EOD)	2.04	11.48‡	11.75‡	13.32‡	0.00	0.10	2.51	0.57	1.33	0.02	0.02	0.02	10.02‡	35.31‡	0.04	15.56‡	8.11‡	9.60‡	27.78‡	0.10				
Ethnic Origin of Subject (EOS)	1.69	1.92	2.30	0.05	0.40	0.60	1.54	2.74	0.17	0.80	3.29	0.46	2.05	4.05*	3.16	0.68	0.14	1.39	0.65	0.39				
Sex	2.95	3.63	5.92*	5.79*	5.81*	11.48‡	1.18	5.25*	2.49	0.87	0.18	1.29	0.04	0.36	0.26	0.57	1.44	1.78	9.51‡	0.25				
EOD × EOS	0.88	4.70*	1.22	10.47‡	1.75	6.28*	3.64	7.84‡	0.76	0.81	0.89	0.18	3.28	4.90*	2.80	8.89‡	0.05	0.01	0.01	1.53				
EOD × Sex	2.69	1.73	7.72‡	12.82‡	0.03	0.77	0.97	1.37	1.92	6.81‡	5.98*	0.70	5.93*	7.00	7.05‡	4.90*	4.67	3.69	7.54‡	0.01				
EOS × Sex	6.01*	8.91‡	10.91‡	2.53	0.04	0.30	2.73	0.06	0.48	0.55	0.11	0.91	2.18	0.84	1.62	0.02	0.02	0.04	2.92	3.71				
EOD × EOS × Sex	0.02	0.05	0.18	3.08	1.21	2.82	1.59	0.62	1.73	0.99	1.69	0.25	4.55*	4.78*	3.88*	3.66	2.71	0.72	2.43	0.29				
<i>df</i> of Residual	412				413				416				414				417							

*Significant at the .05 level.
 †Significant at the .01 level.
 ‡Significant at the .001 level.

NOTE: Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4 represent Self-control, Pleasantness, Intelligence, and Social Distance, respectively.

PREJUDICE AND CLASS IN ISRAEL

mean scores of the four factors for the Western and Eastern descriptions, respectively, were: Self-control (factor 1) 2.58, 3.93; Pleasantness (factor 2) 2.84, 3.46; Intelligence (factor 3), 2.46, 3.96; and Social Distance (factor 4) 2.29, 4.09. Low scores indicate a positive attitude. In these six significant comparisons, the Western description was always rated more positively than the Eastern description, by both the Western and the Eastern subjects. The mean scores of the interaction $EOD \times EOS$ in Social Distance (factor 4) of the first description showed that the Westerners rated the Western description more positively than the Eastern description (2.64 vs. 3.04; $t = 2.05$, $df = 289$, $p < .05$), while there was no significant difference for the evaluation by the Eastern subjects of the Western and Eastern descriptions (3.08 vs. 3.29). Thus, Westerners evaluated the Western description more positively in seven out of eight descriptions, while the Easterners evaluated the Westerners more positively in six out of eight descriptions. These results show that when subjects of both ethnic groups are *unaware* of the person's social class, they are more positive towards a Westerner than towards an Oriental.

In all the remaining descriptions, the social class of the person was given as well as his ethnicity. Half the subjects were informed that the person under discussion was of Eastern origin, while the other half were told that he was of Western origin.

The second part of the table presents the results of the analysis of variance of the four factors of each of the two higher social class descriptions. The main effect, EOD, was significant only in one case: Social Distance (factor 4) in the second figure (the pilot); the mean score for the Western description was 1.55, and for the Eastern description 1.41 ($F = 4.9$; $df = 1,413$; $p < .05$), showing that the attitude towards the Eastern description was more positive on the part of both the Western and the Eastern subjects. The finding of no significant difference for the other seven comparisons is a clear demonstration that Oriental and Western Jews are evaluated similarly when they are of the same higher social class.

Part 3 of the table presents the results of the analysis of variance of the same four factors for each of the two middle-class descriptions. The main effect, EOD, was significant for Pleasantness, Intelligence, and Social Distance (factors 2, 3, and 4) for the first description (teacher); the mean scores for the Western and the Eastern descriptions, respectively, were: 2.82, 2.55 for Pleasantness, 2.25, 2.04 for Intelligence; and 2.48, 2.29 for Social Distance. In each of these comparisons, the Eastern description was evaluated more positively by both ethnic groups. In the other five comparisons, there were no significant differences for EOD. The table further shows that the interaction $EOD \times EOS$ was significant in Pleasantness and Social Distance (factors 2 and 4) of both descriptions. For these interactions we examined, by

means of t tests, whether Western subjects evaluated the Western description differently from the Eastern description. Only in Pleasantness of the second description (clerk) did the Westerners evaluate the Western description more positively than the Eastern description ($t = 2.29$, $df = 288$, $p < .05$); in all other cases they evaluated the two descriptions similarly. We may, therefore, conclude that for the Westerners, Jews of Western extraction are *not* preferred to Jews of Oriental origin, when both the latter and the former are known to be members of the middle classes.

We also examined whether in the above significant interactions the Oriental subjects evaluated the Western and the Eastern descriptions differently. The results showed that the Orientals evaluated the Eastern description more positively than the Western description in Pleasantness ($t = 3.05$, $df = 130$, $p < .01$) and in Social Distance ($t = 2.61$, $df = 130$, $p < .01$) of the first description, and in Social Distance of the second description ($t = 2.46$, $df = 129$, $p < .05$). In Pleasantness of the second description, no significant difference was found in the evaluation of the two descriptions by the Easterners. The results of both the main effects and the interactions indicate that Orientals prefer Jews of their own origin to Jews of Western extraction when all concerned are members of the middle classes.

The last part of the table presents the results of the analysis of variance of the four factors for each of the three lower-class descriptions: hairdresser, welfare recipient, and burglar. The main effect EOD (ethnic origin of the description) was significant in six of the twelve comparisons. In the case of the welfare recipient, the mean scores of the significant factors for the Western and Eastern descriptions, respectively, were: Self-control (factor 1) 3.53, 3.28; Pleasantness (factor 2) 3.59, 2.98; and Social Distance (factor 4) 3.68, 3.18. In the case of the burglar, the mean scores of the Western and Eastern descriptions for the three significant factors were; Self-control (factor 1) 4.98, 5.25; Pleasantness (factor 2) 4.18, 4.44; and Intelligence (factor 3) 3.79, 4.49. These means indicate that while the Eastern description in the case of the welfare recipient was evaluated more positively than the Western description by both ethnic groups on Self-control, Pleasantness, and Social Distance, the Western description in the case of the burglar was evaluated more positively than the Eastern description on Self-control, Pleasantness, and Intelligence by both ethnic groups. The interaction EOD \times EOS in the case of the welfare recipient was significant for Pleasantness and Social Distance, whereas the interaction EOD \times EOS \times Sex was significant for Self-control, Pleasantness, and Intelligence (factors 1, 2, and 3). Only in Pleasantness did Westerners evaluate the Eastern description more positively than the Western description ($t = 3.95$, $df = 290$, $p < .01$), while in Self-control, Intelligence, and Social Distance they evaluated the two descriptions

PREJUDICE AND CLASS IN ISRAEL

similarly. The Orientals, particularly the boys, significantly evaluated the Eastern description more positively than the Western description on all the four factors. These findings, that half of the comparisons were non-significant and that those which were significant were divided equally in terms of attitudes towards the two ethnic groups, lead to the conclusion that also in the lower classes, Jews of Western origin are not preferred to Jews of Oriental origin.

The findings concerning the main effect of Sex showed that this variable was significant in 13 out of 36 comparisons; except for one case, the girls always evaluated both the Western and the Eastern descriptions more positively than did the boys. The interaction EOD \times Sex was significant in eight comparisons, but the mean scores showed no consistent pattern.

Conclusion

The overall finding is that Western Jews are not preferred to Oriental Jews when the comparison is made within the *same* social class. Our respondents showed that negative attitudes towards Jews of Oriental origin result from their lower social status and are not based on ethnicity *per se* — in contrast to the accepted view that such attitudes reflect ethnic prejudice.

Further, when Oriental subjects were unaware of the person's social class, they were more positive towards a Western Jew than towards an Israeli of Oriental descent. However, when told that the Western and the Oriental persons described were of the same social class, Oriental respondents showed the same attitudes to both and in some cases even tended to prefer the Oriental. This finding is at variance with the suggestion that owing to feelings of ethnic inferiority, Orientals are more apt to reject their ethnic identity.²⁵

We believe that previous research workers in this field might have been misled by the method which they nearly all employed. In their questionnaires, a respondent was asked to evaluate (or to state his willingness to relate to) a person of Oriental descent, without any information about that person's social class. The respondent probably assumed that the Oriental was likely to be a member of the lower social classes (since the majority of Oriental Jews are in that position), and for that reason may have expressed a reluctance to befriend him.

Blalock has noted: 'The respondent's total prejudice score . . . may be high for any combination of three reasons: (1) he perceives Negroes to have very low status; (2) he strongly prefers Whites to Negroes of comparable general status, or (3) he tends generally to reject persons with lower status than his own'.²⁶ In terms of Israeli society, our study has shown that when Orientals are of a status comparable to that of Westerners, they are equally acceptable. An Oriental Jew is rejected if

he is believed to be of lower status. We therefore agree with Blalock and think it advisable that where there are negative reactions to an ethnic or racial group on the basis of social class, the term 'prejudice' should be replaced by the more neutral term, 'attitude'.²⁷ A preference for a person of one's own ethnic group may be based on a *realistic* assessment of that individual's personality, values, and general behaviour, and not on prejudice.

Finally, we are aware that there are limitations inherent in the nature of the kind of sample we used in our study. However, virtually all the studies of prejudice in Israel, as well as most other general experimental studies, have used a student population. To that extent, our results are comparable to those of other research workers.²⁸

NOTES

¹ John Stewart Robey, 'The Politics of School Desegregation', Ph.D. thesis, University of Georgia, 1970, and Beth E. Vanfossen, 'Variables related to resistance to desegregation in the South', *Social Forces*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1968, pp. 39-44.

² Hubert M. Blalock, *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*, New York, 1967, p. 199.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

⁴ James M. Beshers, *Urban Social Structure*, New York, 1962, p. 128.

⁵ Michael W. Giles, Douglas S. Gatlin, and Everett F. Cataldo, 'Racial and class prejudice: their relative effects on protest against school desegregation', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 41, no. 1, April 1976, pp. 280-88.

⁶ Edward O. Laumann, *Prestige and Association in an Urban Community*, New York, 1966, p. 106.

⁷ Elliott Aronson, 'Some antecedents of interpersonal attraction', in William J. Arnold and David Levine, eds, *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1969, pp. 143-73.

⁸ John W. Thibaut and Harold H. Kelley, *The Social Psychology of Groups*, New York, 1959, pp. 222-38.

⁹ Donn Byrne and Don Nelson, 'Attraction as a function of attitude similarity-dissimilarity: the effect of topic importance', *Psychonomic Science*, vol. 1, no. 5, 1964, pp. 93-94. See also Paul R. Blada, 'Toward a clarification of the role of cognitive and affective processes in a similarity-attraction relationship', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1974, pp. 368-73.

¹⁰ R. B. Zanjoc, 'Attitudinal effects of mere exposure', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Monograph Supplement, 1968, part 2, pp. 1-27.

¹¹ Donn Byrne, 'Attitudes and Attraction', in Leonard Berkowitz, ed., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 4, New York, 1969, pp. 35-89.

¹² See Aronson, in Arnold and Levine, eds, *op. cit.*

¹³ Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, *Sociology* (fifth edition), New York, 1973, pp. 163-205.

¹⁴ Ralph Epstein and S. S. Komorita, 'Parental discipline, stimulus characteristics of outgroups, and social distance in children', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1965, pp. 416-20.

¹⁵ Harry C. Triandis and Leigh Minturn Triandis, 'Race, social class, religion and nationality as determinants of social distance', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, vol. 61, no. 1, 1960, pp. 110-18. See also Frank R. Westie and Margaret L. Westie, 'The

PREJUDICE AND CLASS IN ISRAEL

social distance pyramid: relations between caste and class', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 63, 1957, pp. 190-96.

¹⁶ Moshe Lissak, *Social Mobility in Israel*, Jerusalem, 1969, pp. 8-45; and Leonard Weller, *Sociology in Israel*, London, 1974, pp. 50-94. See also Judith Bernstein and Aaron Antonovsky, 'The Integration of Ethnic Groups in Israel', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 23, no. 1, June 1981, pp. 5-23.

¹⁷ Yochanan Peres, *Ethnic Identity and Inter-Ethnic Relations*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Hebrew University, 1968, and Peres, 'Ethnic Relations in Israel', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 76, no. 2, 1971, pp. 1021-47.

¹⁸ See Peres, *Ethnic Identity and Inter-Ethnic Relations*, op. cit., and Leah Adar and Chaim Adler, *Education for Values in Schools for Immigrant Children in Israel* (in Hebrew), School of Education of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1965, pp. 99-100, 114-30.

¹⁹ Judith T. Shuval, 'Self-rejection among North African immigrants to Israel', *The Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines*, vol. 4, 1966, pp. 101-10.

²⁰ See, for example, Y. Peres, *Ethnic Relations in Israel* (in Hebrew), Tel-Aviv, 1976, pp. 148-59, and Sammy Smooha, *Israel. Pluralism and Conflict*, London, 1978, pp. 189-91, 194-95.

²¹ Judith T. Shuval, 'Patterns in inter-group tension and affinity', *International Social Science Bulletin*, 1956, vol. 8, pp. 75-123.

²² Peres, *Ethnic Relations in Israel*, op. cit., p. 150.

²³ Charles Egerton Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, *The Measurement of Meaning*, Urbana, Ill., 1975. These investigators developed a method, known as Semantic Differential Technique, for evaluating various objects or concepts. The respondent is asked to evaluate an object on a six- or seven-point scale ranging from +3 to -3. For example, in the present research, the subject is asked to indicate on a seven-point scale to what extent the person described is kind-cruel, clean-dirty, etc.

²⁴ Norman H. Nie, Hadlai C. Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bet, *Statistical Package for Social Sciences*, New York, 1975, pp. 414, 418-19.

²⁵ See Weller, op. cit., pp. 124-42, and Peres, *Ethnic Relations in Israel*, op. cit., pp. 83-89.

²⁶ Blalock, op. cit., p. 203.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ This study was supported by Grant No. 01-257 of the Research Authority of Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel. We acknowledge, with appreciation, comments on the paper by the following colleagues: Yehuda Amir, Michael Harrison, Ernest Krausz, and Nissan Rubin. We are also grateful for the statistical advice given to us by Dr Mitchell Snyder of the Bar-Ilan Computer Center.

REPENTANT DELINQUENTS. A RELIGIOUS APPROACH TO REHABILITATION

Gerald Cromer

A NUMBER of newspaper articles on Yeshivat Or Hahayim (The Light of Life Talmudic Academy) in the Bukharan Quarter of Jerusalem drew the attention of professionals and laymen alike to the revolutionary way in which the founder, Rabbi Reuven Elbaz, is trying to tackle the local delinquency problem.¹ By attracting criminals, young and old, to the yeshiva, he had reputedly drawn them away from their delinquent life-style and led them to a complete acceptance of traditional Judaism. Many of those who came into contact with Kavod Harav (The Honourable Rabbi), as he is affectionately called by his followers, had apparently become *ba'alei teshuvah* (repentants) in the true sense of the term.

I therefore decided to undertake a research study of the yeshiva with the twofold aim of investigating the validity of the rabbi's claims and, if those claims were substantiated, to discover the reasons for his success. Information was gathered by means of participant observation of the yeshiva over a period of four months (April–July 1978) and in-depth interviews with Rav Elbaz and 20 repentant delinquents.²

I

Autobiographies and biographies alike are characterized by a rite of consistency:³ past and present are aligned so as to provide a sense of unity and coherence. This process is particularly marked in the case of criminals and deviants. Their misdemeanours initially serve as the basis for a master status⁴ or pivotal category⁵ that becomes a determining trait and defines 'who the person is'. Then, by a process of retrospective interpretation⁶ sufficient evidence is always found to support the conclusion that the person concerned has always been of unsavoury character. As Garfinkel succinctly put it, 'The former identity stands as accidental; the new identity is the basic reality. What he is now is what after all he was all along.'⁷

The deviants themselves tend to adopt an equally negative view of their past. It is invariably recounted as a sad tale⁸ in order to explain,

and thereby deny responsibility for, their present predicament. The *ba'alei teshuvah* of Rav Elbaz's yeshiva, however, were engaged in an entirely different type of retrospective interpretation. Since all those interviewed were intent on emphasizing the extent of their metamorphosis, they made a complete dichotomy between their life before and after coming into contact with Rav Elbaz. The former was invariably portrayed as a period without meaning and with progressive deterioration; the latter as a time of regeneration and newly-found purpose in life. The autobiographical accounts of the *ba'alei teshuvah* are therefore best described as happy tales. Things may have been bad in the past, but all's well that ends well.

This symbolic ordering of events⁹ made it somewhat difficult to discover the former life-style of the *ba'alei teshuvah*. Although their major interests — crime, drugs, women, and football — were easily ascertained, their significance proved much more difficult to assess. All the repentants now regarded these activities as symptomatic of their decadent past. They found it impossible to suspend judgement and adopt an appreciative stance.¹⁰

Nevertheless, the repentants did manage to convey the fact that their old leisure pursuits had been invested with a certain hidden meaning. Chasing women, supporting the Jerusalem Betar football team, engaging in crime, and getting high on drugs were all regarded as particularly effective ways of 'living it up' and 'being king'. Each of these activities was characterized by what Goffman has referred to as over-determination — that is, it was pursued with a vigour and at a personal cost that cannot be accounted for simply by the intrinsic pleasure involved.¹¹ The interest in, or, to be more precise, obsession with these activities was due above all to the various extrinsic benefits that they afforded. What is important is the state of mind and self-image which they engendered.

It is therefore not surprising that the abandonment of these pursuits was acknowledged to have been the most difficult aspect of the repentant's self-reconstitution process. The *ba'alei teshuvah* were often at great pains to point out how hard it had been to give them up, and the deep satisfaction they had felt after eventually having done so.¹² Even then, however, they were fully aware of the fact that the battle was not over. Old habits continued to exercise a certain attraction and the repentants emphasized the need to be on constant guard against drifting back into their old life-style. The most effective way of doing so was by adopting fresh patterns of behaviour and, in turn, becoming ritually involved in the new self.¹³

The major technique which Rav Elbaz uses to attract delinquents and marginal youth to traditional Judaism is based on the biblical idea of 'O taste and see that the Lord is good' (Psalms 34. 8). Just an inkling of the religious alternative will, the Rav believes, provide sufficient

REPENTANT DELINQUENTS

impetus for them to become more involved in the life of both the Torah in general and Yeshivat Or Hahayim in particular. The *ba'alei teshuvah* I interviewed confirmed that this is, in fact, what happened to them. As they became more engrossed in the standard activities of the yeshiva (studying, praying, observance of the Sabbath and the festivals) and those of a more unique nature (particularly the various types of missionary work),¹⁴ the attraction of their previous life-style steadily waned.

Very soon after coming into contact with Rav Elbaz, the delinquents begin to spend a great deal of time and energy passing on his message to their peers. At first sight this was rather surprising since many of those concerned had not even decided to 'do *teshuvah*' themselves. On closer examination, however, it became clear that this uncertainty is, in fact, one of the major reasons why they get involved in the various outreach programmes of the yeshiva. Missionary work constitutes an integral part of the delinquents' own self-reconstitution process. Taking part in these activities alongside more mature *ba'alei teshuvah* helps them both to crystallize their self identity and to strengthen their ties with fellow repentants. Success, in the form of new adherents to the cause, helps convince them of the rightness of their hitherto tentative decision to give up delinquency and accept the yoke of the Torah.¹⁵

Involvement in the new self is not only achieved by means of becoming engrossed in particular activities. The ritualization of the self-reconstitution process as a whole has a similar effect. Constant use of the twin concepts of *yetzer hatov* and *yetzer hara'* (the good and the evil inclination, respectively) leads to both the objectivation and personification of these impulses. The struggle to repent is portrayed by Rav Elbaz, and experienced by his followers, as a conflict between two diametrically opposed parts of the personality. Henceforth the major aim in life is to get involved in the battle and ensure the victory of good over evil.

In fact, this ongoing struggle provides the basis for the new self-image of the delinquents. Even after becoming completely observant they rarely describe themselves as orthodox Jews. In common with other reformed deviants, the *ba'alei teshuvah* are acutely aware of the fact that they can easily revert to their old habits.¹⁶ Their new identity is, and, it seems, will continue to be, based on the struggle to avoid this eventuality. Being a repentant is a life-style in its own right rather than just a stepping stone from the secular to the religious world.

II

A widely held notion among professionals and laymen alike is that criminals and deviants are highly resistant to change.¹⁷ Once they have broken the law or offended social norms, they are generally regarded as

likely to continue doing so. Only a small minority adopt a more flexible attitude towards those who have strayed from the 'straight and narrow'. On encountering a deviant Actor these normal-smiths as John Lofland has very aptly described them,¹⁸

communicate to him the message that, despite what Actor thinks of himself, despite what normal and deviant others think of him, there lurks within him underneath, after all, essentially a normal Actor. Normal-smiths may communicate this message not directly but indirectly through their aggressive imputation to Actor of a *capacity to change*. Considered generally, normal-smiths conceive of human beings as those kinds of objects which are capable of profound or radical change within rather short periods of time. They believe that deviant Actors can be quickly transformed into a variety of normal.

Rav Elbaz is a staunch believer in both the essential normality of delinquents and their ability to turn over a new leaf. In common with the more evangelical Christian clergy, he abides by the dictum of 'hating the act but loving the sinner'. Not surprisingly, however, the rabbi's attitudes are deeply influenced by his traditional Jewish background. They are characterized, above all, by a particularistic belief in the special spiritual potential of each and every Jew.

Crime and deviance, Rav Elbaz believes, are the bitter fruits of contemporary disbelief. Only by returning to God can delinquents mend their ways. But this is not quite as difficult as one would imagine. All those with whom the 'magic rabbi' comes into contact with are in fact spiritual beings. To reform them is simply to help them find their true essence. The delinquents, like every other Jew, have a spark of God in them. All that is necessary is to set it alight.

According to Rav Elbaz, the spark of God often takes the form of a certain amount of dissatisfaction and self-questioning. Rather than sow doubts in the delinquent's mind, he therefore only has to play on existing ones. This is done, initially at least, by preaching to large gatherings of local youth. Although the subject matter of these public addresses is very varied, the 'sermons' tend to follow a standard pattern. After lambasting a particular aspect of secular Israeli society and showing how it inevitably leads to crime and delinquency, Rav Elbaz goes on to sing the praises of the religious alternative. In each case the former is portrayed as a social disease; the latter as its only cure.

However, this creation of dissatisfaction with the delinquent lifestyle is accompanied by a great deal of affection for those who have adopted it. This is particularly important because as all the *ba'alei teshuvah* I interviewed pointed out, they desperately needed somebody to talk to. The social workers, probation officers, and other members of the social control establishment with whom they had been in contact, were regarded as either unable, or even unwilling, to help them in this

REPENTANT DELINQUENTS

respect. The rabbi's door; on the other hand, is open literally 24 hours a day. Every request for either practical aid or personal advice is met with a sympathetic ear. In fact, many of those interviewed felt that Rav Elbaz understood them better than they did themselves.

Despite the wide plethora of delinquency prevention programmes, there is a common streak that runs through almost all of them. Owing to technical and occupational considerations, contact between social workers and their clients tends to be both relatively infrequent and of a highly formal nature. Large case loads and professional propriety preclude the possibility of establishing a personal relationship. With few exceptions, the treatment is characterized instead by what John Lofland has described as spurious intimacy.¹⁹ And under such conditions, he argues, people-changers are unlikely to have any significant effect on their clientele. They have neither the time nor the inclination to provide the conditions under which the pivotally deviant at least stands a chance of 'going straight'.

Rav Elbaz, on the other hand, adopts an approach which is totally different from that of the professional social control establishment. He tries wherever possible to develop close ties with all those who enter his yeshiva. The relationship between rabbi and disciple is characterized by warmth.²⁰ Not only does Kavod Harav relate to each and every delinquent as a 'full person', he also projects himself as a 'whole human being'. Consequently, the spurious intimacy of traditional social work cedes pride of place to a real rapport between helper and helped.

The difference between rabbi and professional becomes even more marked if one takes into account the underlying premises on which their work is based.²¹ Advocates of liberal reform,²² for instance, firmly believe that 'delivering the fruits of the Great Society to all with equal opportunity is indispensable to the reduction of delinquency'.²³ Rav Elbaz, on the other hand, is convinced that economic advancement has no effect on the problem.²⁴ Only the rejection of materialistic desires and the adoption of spiritual values will enable young law-breakers to halt their drift into delinquency. He therefore demands a much more radical change from the delinquents than his professional counterparts do. In Mertonian terms, they are encouraged to adopt a rebellious stance rather than simply return to the prevailing conformist one.²⁵ Members of the yeshiva are urged to change their cultural goals and not just the means to achieve them. But by demanding this complete reorganization of self, Rav Elbaz inadvertently enables his followers to retain and even develop one aspect of their old life-style — the hostility towards straight society continues unabated.

Before coming into contact with Rav Elbaz the members of the yeshiva waged an ongoing battle with the forces of law and order; now they are engaged in a crusade against those who continue to reject the yoke of the Torah. The basic mood, however, remains the same. Their

hostility is not eliminated; it is simply diverted into different channels.²⁶ And, paradoxically as it may seem, it is this element of continuity that enables the delinquents to undergo such a profound change in other respects. Despite their metamorphosis they remain outsiders. Society is still divided into them and us.²⁷

III

This paper has been presented at two conferences.²⁸ Although greeted with a great deal of interest, on both occasions it was also severely criticized for not including any details of the personal and social characteristics of the repentant delinquents. No attempt is made here, however, to remedy the situation. In fact, the purpose of this concluding section is to explain, perhaps even justify, the research methodology used.

The objectivist style of enquiry can provide only a very limited understanding of religious conversion or repentance.²⁹ This is due to the fact that 'a sociological perspective which concerns itself solely with the sociocultural background to reported conversion experiences confuses ecology with etiology'.³⁰ While it may succeed in giving a statistical analysis of the situation, it cannot provide an explanation of its inner dynamics. That can only be achieved by adopting a naturalistic approach, one of the major aims of which is 'to comprehend and to illuminate the subject's view and to interpret the world as it appears to him'.³¹

Reference has already been made to the difficulties involved in relying on the repentants' highly selective recollection of their past. The information gathered is, to a large extent at least, 'not data relating to pre-conversion but is data relating to post-conversion identity'.³² From an overall point of view, however, this is by no means a drawback. In fact, exactly the opposite is the case. Conversion experience and personal accounts of it are in a relationship of reciprocal origination. Consequently the latter can, or to be more precise must, be analysed as 'an inextricable part of the events they purport to describe'.³³

Once this approach is adopted, it becomes very clear that the happy tales referred to above are not simply a mirror of the repentant's symbolic death and rebirth;³⁴ they are also an integral part of that process. By engaging in this particular kind of retrospective interpretation the *ba'alei teshuvah* create the sort of self-image that constitutes a *sine qua non* of repentance: they render themselves as 'typically convertible and hence as the type of person who would typically have the opportunity to cite motives for conversion'.³⁵

REPENTANT DELINQUENTS

In the case of the repentant delinquents at Yeshivat Or Hahayim, however, this interaction was found to be just one example of a much broader relationship between the linguistic patterns of the *ba'alei teshuvah* and their self-reconstitution process as a whole. Whilst a comprehensive analysis of this aspect of transformative labelling³⁶ is beyond the confines of this paper, it is important to point out, at least in brief, those findings that are particularly relevant to the arguments presented so far.³⁷

The constant use of the twin concepts of the good and the evil inclinations (*yetzer hatov* and *yetzer hara'*) is one of the major reasons why the delinquents are forced to face up to the fact that their behaviour is an integral part of the self rather than something that can be disowned at will. Consequently they can no longer evade responsibility for their actions by resorting to a whole gamut of excuses and/or justifications.³⁸ Their misdeeds must be attributed, instead, to the evil inclination at work within them. This, in turn, enables and even prompts them both to feel guilty about their past behaviour and to try to do better in the future. As a result, the two essentials of repentance — remorse and resolution — are brought into play, and the transformative labelling can begin.³⁹

However, doubts continue to occur throughout the self-reconstitution process and there is a need for efficient ways of dealing with them. One of the most important of these is what Lionel Trilling has called the language of non-thought.⁴⁰ Thus the *ba'alei teshuvah* constantly used the words religious and secular (*dati* and *chiloni*) and stressed the dichotomy between them. They believed that everything could be understood and explained with the help of these two ultimate terms.⁴¹ Nevertheless, they often feel that they need to use a number of thought-terminating clichés.⁴² These take a variety of forms but quotations from the Bible, various rabbinic sources, and the sayings of Rav Elbaz himself are the ones they use most frequently. They, too, are regarded as a way of clinching any argument concerning their newly adopted life-style. Thus the language of non-thought as a whole not only eliminates the need for engaging in further thought or discussion; it often precludes the possibility of doing so.

The *ba'alei teshuvah* often resort to this particular type of language when trying to persuade other delinquents to follow in their footsteps. However, the accounts of their own rehabilitation play an even more important role in their missionary activities. The repentant delinquents' happy tales referred to above not only fulfil the obvious role of showing the unconverted that it is in fact possible to break the seemingly inescapable grip of delinquency; they also provide a justification for their missionary activities.

As Jean-Baptiste Clamence notes in Albert Camus's *The Fall*: ' . . . one had to overwhelm oneself to have the right to judge others. . . . one

had to . . . practise the profession of penitent to end up as a judge. . . . The more I accuse myself, the more I have a right to judge you. . . . How intoxicating to feel like God the Father and to hand out definitive testimonials of bad character and habits'.⁴³

Clearly, the repentant delinquents' patterns of speech play a very active role in the self-reconstitution process. Not only do they enable the *ba'alei teshuvah* to come to terms with the past and to turn over a new leaf; they also help them forestall doubts that are bound to occur during their transformative labelling. Even the justification of missionary activities by frequent repetition of the happy tales is important in this respect because, as has already been pointed out, they are an integral part of the repentant's own self-reconstitution process. Consequently Taylor's concept of reciprocal origination⁴⁴ must be widened considerably. The interaction between the accounts of repentance and the process itself is only one example of an ongoing relationship between speech and action.

NOTES

¹ With the exception of one series of articles (*Ha-Arets*, 10–12 March 1978), the press coverage of this yeshiva has been very favourable indeed. See, for instance, *Ma'ariv*, 28 October 1977.

² Not all the students at the yeshiva are former delinquents or even *ba'alei teshuvah*. This paper, however, is only concerned with those who fall into both these categories.

³ John Lofland, *Deviance and Identity*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969, pp. 124–27.

⁴ Howard Becker, *Outsiders*, Glencoe, Ill., 1963, pp. 33–34.

⁵ Lofland, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

⁶ John I. Kitsuse, 'Societal Reaction to Deviant Behaviour: Problems of Theory and Method', *Social Problems*, vol. 9, no. 3, Winter 1962, p. 253.

⁷ Harold Garfinkel, 'Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 61, no. 4, January 1956, p. 422.

⁸ Marvin B. Scott and Stanford M. Lyman, 'Accounts', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 33, no. 1, February 1968, p. 52.

⁹ Anselm L. Strauss, *Mirrors and Masks*, Glencoe, Ill., 1959, p. 145.

¹⁰ David Matza, *Becoming Deviant*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969, pp. 24–25.

¹¹ Erving Goffman, *Asylums*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1968, p. 274.

¹² The most graphic description of this type of struggle can be found in *Ha-Arets*, 27 January 1978.

¹³ Theodore R. Sabrin and Nathan Adler, 'Self-Reconstitution Process: A Preliminary Report', *Psychoanalytic Review*, vol. 57, no. 4, Winter 1970–71, pp. 612–13.

¹⁴ For further details of these missionary activities, see *Ha-Arets*, 27 January 1978.

¹⁵ The potential effect of the missionary activities on both the repentant delinquents and their ex-partners in crime can be most clearly understood with the help of Donald Cressey's work on the theory of differential association. See, for instance, his 'Changing Criminals: The Application of the Theory of Differential Association', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 61, no. 2, September 1955, pp. 116–20.

¹⁶ See, for instance, Gerald Cromer 'Gamblers Anonymous in Israel: A Participant Observation Study of a Self-Help Group', *International Journal of the Addictions*, vol. 13, no. 7, 1978, pp. 1069–77.

REPENTANT DELINQUENTS

¹⁷ For an illuminating account of the origins of this belief in the irreversibility of human nature, see Kai T. Erikson, *Wayward Puritans*, New York, 1966, pp. 195–205.

¹⁸ Lofland, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 276. A number of programmes have been set up with the specific aim of trying to counter this situation. In each case the volunteers are expected to help the juvenile delinquents under their aegis by simply befriending them.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 273–75.

²¹ Nevertheless, the apparent success of Rav Elbaz's methods has prompted a number of professional social workers to investigate the possibility of adopting them. See, for instance, Yochanan Peled, *Repentance as a Means of Delinquency Prevention* (in Hebrew), Israeli Prison Service, Jerusalem, 1978.

²² This school of thought is described in great detail in Edwin Schur, *Radical Nonintervention*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973, pp. 84–114.

²³ Virginia M. Burns and Leonard W. Stern, 'The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency' in Task Force Report, *Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1967, p. 361.

²⁴ The yeshiva does make a concerted effort to find suitable employment for its students. However, they are taught to regard their gainful occupation as simply a way of making a living. Even after leaving the yeshiva, the study of Torah must always be their major occupation.

²⁵ Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Glencoe, Ill., 1957, pp. 139–57. It can be argued that the repentant delinquents fall into the category of retreatism rather than rebellion. Whilst I do not agree with this point of view it may be advisable to use two other Mertonian terms — nonconformity and aberrant behaviour — in order to avoid any confusion. For an explanation of these concepts, see Robert K. Merton, 'Social Problems and Sociological Theory', in Robert K. Merton and Robert A. Nisbet, *Contemporary Social Problems*, New York, 1966, pp. 808–11.

²⁶ In a study of community drama, I have indicated the extent to which this type of diversion, albeit in a completely different direction, can help prevent delinquency: see 'Drama as Catharsis and Catalyst: Two Ways of Preventing Delinquency', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1978, pp. 91–96. However, an alternative point of view based on an analysis of the Meter Baba cult's work with drug users is described by Thomas Robbins in 'Eastern Mysticism and the Resocialization of Drug Users', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 8, no. 2, Summer 1969, pp. 308–17.

²⁷ The fact that both Rav Elbaz and the overwhelming majority of his followers are of Sephardi origin also engenders a feeling of them and us *vis-à-vis* the Ashkenazi establishment. Further research is needed, however, to discover the exact role that this ethnic dimension plays in the rehabilitation process as a whole.

²⁸ Preliminary results of the study were presented at the Second National Conference of the Israel Criminological Association, Jerusalem, 1978, and this paper was also read at a seminar on Deviance and Repentance, Ramat Gan, 1979.

²⁹ There are, of course, important substantive differences between these two self-reconstitution processes. However, the methodological issues raised by those who have studied conversion are equally relevant to the analysis of repentance. The terms are therefore used interchangeably in the discussion that follows.

³⁰ Brian Taylor, 'Conversion and Cognition: An Area for Empirical Study in the Microsociology of Religious Knowledge', *Social Compass*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1976, p. 10.

³¹ Matza, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

³² Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

³³ Brian Taylor, 'Recollection and Membership: Converts' Talk and Ratiocination of Commonality', *Sociology*, vol. 12, no. 2, May 1978, p. 322.

³⁴ Sabrin and Adler, *op. cit.*, pp. 606–10.

GERALD CROMER

³⁵ Taylor, 'Conversion and Cognition . . .', op. cit., p. 18.

³⁶ Mordechai Rotenberg, 'Self-Labeling: A Missing Link in the Societal Reaction Theory of Deviance', *Sociological Review*, vol. 22, no. 3, August 1974, pp. 343-44.

³⁷ For further details of this aspect of the study see Gerald Cromer, 'Linguistic Aspects of Transformative Labelling: The Case of Repentant Delinquents', *Mental Health and Society*, vol. 5, nos. 3-4, 1978, pp. 186-93.

³⁸ Scott and Lyman, op. cit., p. 47.

³⁹ The argument presented in this paragraph is similar, in many respects at least, to that used by Sykes and Matza to explain the onset of delinquency. See, for instance, their 'Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 22, no. 6, May 1957, pp. 664-70.

⁴⁰ See Robert J. Lifton, *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1967, p. 489.

⁴¹ Richard Weaver, 'Ultimate Terms in Contemporary Rhetoric', *Perspectives*, vol. 11, nos. 1-2, 1955, p. 141.

⁴² Lifton, op. cit., p. 488.

⁴³ Albert Camus, *The Fall*, translated by Justin O'Brien, London, 1957, pp. 102-04. This is not to suggest, of course, that their judgement of others is characterized by the same type of duplicity as that of Camus's judge-penitent.

⁴⁴ Taylor, 'Recollection and Membership . . .', op. cit., p. 322.

JEWISH SELF-DEFENCE DURING THE RUSSIAN POGROMS OF 1903-1906

Shlomo Lambroza

THE years 1903-06 were a period of turmoil for the Russian empire, encompassing the Russo-Japanese War and the Revolution of 1905. Russia was then clearly a society in flux. Its Jews were accused of contributing to the precarious state of the Empire: economically, as exploiters of the Russian *narod* and politically, as a main constituent of the revolutionary movement. They were readily identified as outsiders, and they became the targets and victims of a series of pogroms that began with the Kishinev massacre of April 1903 and ended with the Belostok pogrom of June 1906.

The Bund, the radical Jewish workers' organization, reacted by urging the Jewish community to abandon its passive, non-violent, and accommodating policies. It extolled the virtues of physical resistance and self-defence and it gave the Jewish worker a new pride by asking him to emulate David, Joshua, and other biblical heroes. One Bundist declared, 'The soul of the ancient Jewish heroes, wandering in the world of chaos, has finally found its place.'¹

The Bund set about organizing self-defence groups; it supplied arms, men, and — most important — organization in combating the waves of pogroms. It argued that effective resistance required an armed group that would pose as great a threat to would-be pogromists as the latter posed to Jews. The only solution, as the Bund publication *Di Arbeter Shitime* stated, was to 'answer force with force'.² The Jewish community was not as averse to armed resistance as it was to the revolutionary aims of the Bund. It was not anxious to play into the hands of the antisemitic press and the League of the Russian People which had branded Jews as revolutionaries. In fact, Jewish participation in insurgency was minimal: at its height, the Bund's membership accounted for less than three per cent of the total Jewish proletariat. Even if one adds the Jews who were in radical political circles outside the Bund, the number remains small. One estimate puts it at 40,000 out of a total Jewish community of four million and a Jewish working class of 1.53 million.³

Nevertheless, since anti-Jewish propaganda had proved effective, to support the Bund on the issue of defence would only add fuel to the fire by giving the notion that all Jews were revolutionaries even more credibility. Alternative solutions had been advocated. The Zionist groups were in favour of increased emigration, but this offered no immediate assistance to the problem at hand.⁴ Others, especially the religiously orthodox, urged greater co-operation with the authorities. They also argued that pogroms were a manifestation of the will of God, and therefore one had to endure them. One rabbi said that Jews should submit, they should be 'as quiet as water and lower than the grass'.⁵

The Bund's proposal for organized resistance remained the most realistic; and it established in 1902 self-defence groups, *boevye otriady* (abbreviated to B.O.). There had been some defensive units during the pogroms of the 1880s, but they had been not nearly as well organized as the Bund squads proved to be.⁶ *Poale-Tsion* (Zionist workers) also boasted that they had established defence groups as early as 1902. Squads had been initially formed to stand guard during meetings. Only after the Fifth Congress of the Bund in 1903 were the B.O. transformed into anti-pogrom defence units, in large part as a reaction to the Kishinev massacre. The Bund issued a directive to all its branches to be ready to offer resistance at the first sign of a pogrom.⁷

One Bundist commented:⁸

For centuries the Jew had lived like a slave. He considered suffering and silence his highest virtues. When his blood was shed, he fell like a dumb animal under the hand of the slaughterer, without struggle, without resistance. . . .

But now the Jewish workers would show that in them was reborn the old brave spirit of ancient Jewish heroes. They would have a new self-image and a new sense of personal dignity. The hero of the defence squads and the symbol of the new consciousness was Hirsh Lekert, a shoemaker's apprentice.

In May 1902, General von Wahl who was governor of Vilno called in troops to disperse a political rally in the town. During the ensuing struggle, several protesters were injured and many were arrested; 26 of the latter were sentenced to be whipped. The majority of them, 20, were Jews. The Bund was enraged at this blow to the pride and dignity of Jews. It reacted by advocating an even more aggressive policy and published a leaflet which stated:⁹

We fight with peaceful means . . . but patience has its limits. It would not be our fault if popular vengeance, hatred and resentment take violent forms . . . Wahl himself has pointed the way . . . Vengeance shall fall on each of you. . . .

Hirsh Lekert was spurred to action, and attempted to assassinate von Wahl, who only suffered a superficial wound. Lekert was hanged,¹⁰ but he had shown that Jews were now capable of retaliation.

SELF-DEFENCE DURING RUSSIAN POGROMS

The official organ of the Bund, *Di Arbeter Shtime*, told its members that when there were pogroms, '... we must come out with arms in hand, organize ourselves and fight to our last drop of blood. Only when we show our strength will we force everyone to respect our honour.'¹¹ The Bund was supported in this stand by *Poale-Tsion* and the Socialist-Zionists: they were all agreed that an energetic self-defence was the only practical answer to pogroms. But the Jewish community was not easily persuaded, fearing that an aggressive policy of self-defence would only exacerbate the situation.¹² The Bund therefore redoubled its efforts to convince Jews generally of the validity of its arguments.

The Bund's squads were put to the test in 1903. As news spread of an impending pogrom in Gomel, Zionists and Bundists joined forces to plan defence strategies. When the pogrom broke out, the defenders were at first able to contain the riot. However, their success was short-lived, for soldiers who had been called in did little to stop the looting — in fact, it was reported that they joined in the pillaging of Jewish shops.¹³ Nevertheless, the defenders were proud of their intervention and one who was present commented:¹⁴

I can tell you one thing about the pogrom in Gomel, despite the suffering it was good for the soul. There are no longer the former, downtrodden, timid Jews. A new-born unprecedented type appeared on the scene — a man who defends his dignity.

The Bund's partial success at Gomel led an increasing number of Jewish communities to organize self-defence groups, recruiting members who were in occupations requiring physical strength — such as stevedores and butchers. Each group consisted of two units: the core defenders or *kampf-grupe* who were the permanent members, and the easily mobilized reserves. The more weapons were available, the greater was the size of the core group. In 1906, a Bund survey reported that there were about 550 men available for defence: Mogilev, 45–50; Belostok, 55; Kishinev, 20; Odessa, 100; Dvinsk, 20; Vitebsk, 55; Brest Litovsk, 75; Riga, 25; Kovno, 20; Vilno, 75; and Minsk, 60.¹⁵ These appear to have been the core defenders only, and some estimates claim that in fact there were twice that number available (1,100) and that the reserves were as high as 8,000–10,000.¹⁶

Not all members of a *kampf-grupe* were necessarily Bundists or necessarily Jewish. Although the Bund was in charge of the defence squads, the latter included volunteers from *Poale-Tsion*, the socialist-Zionists, and sometimes from the Russian, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian Social Democrats and workers. However, the Zionists continued to stress that there was no safe future for Jews in Russia. A *Poale-Tsion* pamphlet observed, 'What do we achieve with self-defence? ... self-defence cannot deliver us completely from the evil which causes these pogroms, it could only lessen their evil ...'.¹⁷

The Bund organized each squad into two groups of ten men called *desiatki*. To every *desiatka* was assigned a *nachalnik* (leader), who was in charge of arranging meetings in his home and who had to collect and to store weapons. The most favoured was the revolver, because it was small, easily concealed, and easily smuggled into the Pale. Usually, young women would journey to Belgium, to the Browning factory in Liège, and return with the revolvers hidden in their clothes; women were not likely to be searched as thoroughly as men. By 1905, the Bund had amassed an arsenal of *shpayers* (spitters, a slang term for revolvers), home-made bombs, knouts, clubs, knives, and spring whips. The Bund's survey in 1906 reported more than 500 revolvers.¹⁸

The start of the mobilization pogroms in September 1904 had underscored the need for a rigorous self-defence programme. The Russo-Japanese war had resulted in a series of defeats for the Russian Empire, with vast numbers of men dying in Manchuria. There was generally a far from enthusiastic response to mobilization orders. Meanwhile, the antisemitic press alleged that Jews were supplying intelligence reports to the Japanese, that Jewish bankers were financing the enemy, and that Jews were deserting from the war front.

Mobilization frequently entailed the congregation of peasants and young men in small towns; their anxieties about going to war and the rumours based on assertions in the antisemitic press triggered off pogroms. There is little evidence that the local authorities made any serious attempt to suppress these assaults; perhaps some of the officials sympathized with the attackers or did not dare to use force against armed soldiers.

Consequently, Jewish self-defence units were organized to fight the mobilization pogroms; they were effective in the town of Berdichev in Volhynia.¹⁹

Under the influence of self-defence the mood of the Jews changed. There was no sign of fear. On the contrary, everyone prepared for self-defence. The attitude of the population . . . was two-sided. On the one hand, there was greater respect for the 'strutski' as the socialists among us are called; on the other hand there were fears that the strutski would appear with their red banners.

This ambivalent attitude towards the defenders was often manifested; the local Jews admired the men, but were fearful of associating with revolutionaries. In the case of Stolpce, the *Poale-Tsion* heard that a pogrom was likely to occur in the town and joined forces with the Bund to organize defence and collect funds. Meetings were held at local synagogues to obtain volunteers and contributions, and appeals were also made in neighbouring districts. All was going well until the police were informed of the secret meetings. Police intimidation and fear of reprisals curtailed attendance at meetings as well as financial support,

SELF-DEFENCE DURING RUSSIAN POGROMS

and members of the squads had to call instead at the homes of potential contributors. One of the defenders related how it was learnt that a pogrom was planned for the following Sunday:²⁰

This time we were ready. . . . We saw peasant women coming into town with empty wagons, and we knew they were coming to loot. . . . In the morning, our comrades were on the street ready with iron rods, lead bars, and whips with rounded pieces of lead at their tips. The commandants of the units of ten, armed with revolvers, stationed themselves at many points in the marketplace. At noon, when the peasants poured out of the white church, rabid and worked up, ready to assault the Jews, one of the outside agitators gave the signal and started to lead the peasants to break into the shops. Then all at once our unit commanders fired their revolvers — in the air, not hurting anyone. The shots came from all sides of the marketplace, creating panic and confusion among the crowd of attackers. The horses broke wild, the peasant women began screaming as though they were being slaughtered. One wagon collided with another. With what seemed their last gasp, the peasants ran in fear from the Jews firing all over the marketplace. It took only a few minutes before the marketplace was emptied of the aroused pogromists.

Another successful defence occurred in the town of Derechin, where the squad was largely composed of the young men of the town, called *kleyn-bund*. The pogrom started during a market day, when the peasants had come to town to sell their goods, and suddenly while it was still early morning they began looting Jewish shops. The *kleyn-bund* had cans filled with kerosene ready to be set aflame, and they threw them at the carts laden with hay. The blaze spread to nearly a hundred carts, while the defenders discharged their revolvers into the air, frightening the peasants further. Within a short time the pogrom was over.²¹

In spite of limited resources, Jewish defence was effective because it was well organized. There was close communication between towns, and units were constantly in a state of alert and ready to move to a threatened area:²²

Twice during that period we used our organized strength. The first time, we were alerted to come to the aid of the nearby town of Swierzna, across the Nicmen . . . We assembled our self-defense and set out . . . When we arrived at Swierzna toward evening, fatigued and battered, but ready to fight, we found a ghost town. All the shops were barricaded, the streets silent and empty . . . We went from cellar to cellar . . . informing the Jews in hiding that the danger was over, their defenders had arrived.

If the defenders could not always stop a pogrom, they tried at least to contain it by protecting the sectors which they believed to be most vulnerable. In Rovno, for instance, they saved the Jewish market area in 1904. At the first sign of trouble, all shops were closed down and their windows boarded while armed defenders came from all parts of the town. But the soldiers also came, and there was a fierce battle between

looters, defenders, and troops which lasted several hours. Eight Jews were wounded, one of them seriously; and there were 90 wounded soldiers, 12 of them seriously injured.²³ A defender later stated, '... the mood in town is generally cheerful, especially among the workers. Everybody is discussing the necessity of self-defence'.²⁴

The revolution of 1905 aroused political fervour throughout the Pale. The *yidische gas* (Jewish street) seemed alive with political activism. The assaults and instigations by local officials to embark on pogroms only strengthened the resolve of the Jewish revolutionaries. During the reactionary phase of the revolution (from October 1905 to January 1906), rightists joined forces with the military and police to suppress liberals, intellectuals, and Jews. The Jews reacted by forming a defence coalition with radical socialist groups; and this led to a significant increase in the number of non-Jewish defenders. For the Bund, 'The struggle against antisemitism . . . was therefore also directed against the ruling class and for socialism. Thus the two struggles were one.'²⁵ Even Zionists temporarily relegated their concern with establishing a Jewish State in order to help with the more pressing needs of the Pale, to join with the Bund in the fight against organized pogroms. A Bund member commented:²⁶

It became a battle against the organizers of the pogroms — the Russian government. The battle against the pogroms stripped the masks from the faces of their organizers and revealed the truth to the world.

The defence of Zhitomir in 1905 became a legend among Bund members. The June 1905 issue of their publication, *Posledniia Izvestiia*, printed a participant's report of the events. Preparations were made well in advance. The *kampf-grupe* was divided into two units of 25 men, and an additional reserve of 400 stood in readiness. Local students and the *Poale-Tsion* co-operated; and arms, daggers, whips, and home-made bombs were distributed. The Socialist revolutionaries set up their own separate defence measures. When the fighting broke out, the defence behaved valiantly and defeated the pogromists. One of the inhabitants commented, 'If not for the self-defence, Zhitomir would have been another Kishinev.' It was said that more Christians than Jews were killed.²⁷

The bleakest aspect of the Zhitomir affair was not the pogrom but the tragedy which had occurred immediately before. When word of an impending attack began to circulate, neighbouring towns were called upon to lend support. Fourteen young men set out from Chudnov and as they entered the town of Troyanov, en route, they were stopped by a crowd of angry peasants who fell upon them and brutally killed most of them. The Jews of Troyanov offered neither protection nor sanctuary to the youthful defenders. The Bund was so angered that no defence was made available to the Jews of Troyanov throughout 1905.²⁸

SELF-DEFENCE DURING RUSSIAN POGROMS

The defenders were not always able to engage in full-scale battles. In Odessa, for example, the well-armed well-organized squads were effective only in containing the pogrom;²⁹ and the same was true of Belostok, which suffered the last of the large-scale pogroms to occur in the Pale. So-called patriotic organizations — such as the League of the Russian People (popularly called the Black Hundreds) and the Society of Monarchists — were determined to destroy all vestiges of the revolution in the town of Belostok, and they enlisted systematically peasants, workers, and hooligans. The B.O. was clearly not large enough to defend the entire city and decided that the main objective would be to prevent the looting of Jewish shops. They feared that any more drastic action might incite the authorities to call in the troops. They were successful and on that occasion there were no deaths and only two persons were injured. But it was soon evident that an uneasy tension prevailed in the town. Then some months later, in June 1906, there was another pogrom said to have been instigated by local police, the army, and patriotic groups intent on teaching the Jews of Belostok a lesson. This time the defenders did not hold back; they used guns, hand grenades, and bombs but were not as successful as they had been the previous year. The unprotected area of the Jewish quarter was destroyed, 200 Jews were killed, 700 were wounded, 169 shops and houses were plundered, and damage was estimated at 200,000 roubles.³⁰

It became increasingly obvious in 1905–06 that the B.O. units alone could not fight the attackers, since the police and the army participated in the assaults. The Bund had issued a general call to arms to all Jewish workers in May 1905:³¹

It must become a general rule that each worker who considers himself part of the struggle should carry a revolver in his pocket . . . And as tens of thousands of workers will go out on the streets and each one feels he is prepared for the struggle then the uprising will take on a different appearance. Arm yourself. Learn how to handle a weapon.

Some members of the Bund went as far as to advocate retaliation for pogroms by bombing town areas or assassinating local officials, but terrorism had never been the Bund's policy and these suggestions were rejected. However, a change of tactics and a bolder strategy were recommended:³²

To fight a hooligan a revolver was enough. But to fight the military one needs dynamite. With a hooligan you can fight in the open spaces, but against the military you must fight from behind barricades.

It was also decided to establish a highly organized group to gather intelligence and act as a co-ordinating unit. The group was named *Mayim* (Hebrew for water) and it carefully planned defence and emergency procedures for many cities of the Pale, preparing street

maps, shelter areas for women and children, and smuggling arms and munitions to local self-defence groups, with the aim of aborting impending pogroms. *Mayim* was the élite fighting unit of the Bund, a militant cadre of defenders who saw themselves as the vanguard of the revolution. Indeed, the group increasingly laid emphasis on the merits of armed revolution rather than on the ideals of self-defence. But the Jewish community generally did not favour armed revolution, and the conservative elements withdrew their support of the Bund's defence squads. As a result of both external and internal pressures, the Bund reduced *Mayim* to a unit which was to be concerned only with the gathering of information.³³

Not all defensive actions by the Jews of the Pale were led by the Bund, *Poale-Tsion*, or the Socialist-Zionists. In small towns and shtetls, especially those in the south where the Bund was less active, Jews simply banded together to protect their property. There were fights with the local inhabitants, but these rarely developed into armed conflicts. In the small town of Genichesk (Taurida, in the Crimea), a skirmish occurred in 1905 after a peasant's cart, laden with hay, broke an axle in front of a Jewish butcher's shop. Angry words quickly led to blows and a hostile crowd soon gathered, as was to be expected. However, Jewish shopkeepers who came to the aid of the butcher were able to contain the outbreak. The incident was more a scuffle between a score of men than an actual pogrom.³⁴

In Ismail (Bessarabia), the taverns of the town were owned and managed by Jews. In one of these inns, a soldier and a Moldavian quarrelled and a fight ensued. The innkeeper feared that his premises might be damaged, ejected all his customers, and closed his tavern. This action aroused resentment and the next day a group of men assembled and began throwing stones at the tavern and at other Jewish shops nearby. The proprietors closed the shops and fought off the attackers. In this case, the police came quickly and the chief of police took the time and trouble to explain to the crowd exactly what had happened in the tavern the previous day. The mob dispersed.³⁵

Such incidents show that Jews of the Pale, even when they were not organized into defence squads, did attempt to resist assaults. They had done so during the pogroms of the 1880s. The Bund's achievement was to fire the defenders with a new spirit and a sense of pride. Simon Dubnow commented:³⁶

The past decades have taught us that our fate depends not on our environment but on ourselves, on our will and our national effort. The new pogroms have engraved the watchword 'self-help' in flaming letters on the Jewish nation. It is as if a powerful electric charge has passed through the body of our humiliated people. . . . The principles of self-help and self-defense have never been as clear to all classes of our people, from the highest to the lowest strata, as at the present moment.

SELF-DEFENCE DURING RUSSIAN POGROMS

The new aggressive attitude of the Bund came to be accepted whole-heartedly by many Jewish communities. After a looting and pillaging spree in the town of Derechin, the pogromists went out of the city with their booty. The self-defence squad — which had been unable to mobilize in time to stop the plundering — caught up with the peasants in a neighbouring town and recovered the goods, which they returned to the Jewish shopkeepers. One onlooker said, 'Good, good kinderlekh [children]! God help you, it is a mitsve to save our things. It doesn't matter that you travelled a little on the Shabbos.'³⁷

By the end of October 1905, the joint activities of the Bund, *Poale-Tsion*, the Socialist-Zionists, and other self-defence groups had won over many of the segments of the Jewish community which had initially hesitated to support them. When asked for a donation for self-defence, Maxim Vinaver, lawyer and member of the 1905 Duma as well as proponent of Jewish rights, handed over a blank cheque with the comment, 'After all, we are all Bundists'.³⁸

But a few months later, by the middle of 1906, the attitude of the Jews of the Pale had come full circle. They were intimidated by the Black Hundreds and by police participation in pogroms, and largely withdrew their support of the defence squads. Meetings were poorly attended, contributions diminished, and membership of reserve units was curtailed. Guns were returned to group leaders by those who no longer wanted any part of armed resistance. One leader had to dispose of several dozen returned revolvers; he hired a rowing boat and dropped the guns into the middle of a river.³⁹ The Jewish community had been willing to provide financial, physical, and spiritual support for defence — but was not equally prepared to do so for revolution. When the Bund attempted to use its self-defence units as a proto-revolutionary militia, it lost many of its supporters. Leonard Rowe has commented, '... the force organized to resist violence against Jews was considered more than a defense organization. In the eyes of the Bund, it was the nucleus and the vanguard of the revolution that was bound to come.'⁴⁰

Some sectors of the Jewish community believed that the pogroms of 1905–06 had been attempts to drown the Revolution in Jewish blood, and they turned against the Bund in the hope that they might thus undo the ready association of Jews with the revolutionary movement. One group of rabbis decided that they would attempt to co-operate with the authorities in order to destroy the Bund, whose activities they condemned as revolutionary. As a result, groups were organized to disrupt Bund meetings; they were known as *slegar bands* and were also referred to as the 'Jewish Black Hundreds'. An issue of *Folkstsaytung* bitterly denounced these activities in February 1906, claiming that these self-labelled Friends of Israel were gangs working under the direction of the police, who beat and arrested workers:⁴¹

SHLOMO LAMBROZA

In Greshke four workers were arrested in this way. In Czernikow all workers whom they happened upon were arrested, even children 10–12 years old. [They] . . . invaded workers' quarters and embarked on a pogrom. The workers had an evening school where they learned to read and write, but the Jewish hooligans completely destroyed it.

One of the consequences of well-armed self-defence squads was that there would be greater risk to life and limb since rifles, revolvers, and bombs would be used. Moreover, when the pogromists knew that the Jews were prepared to do battle, they would come armed, and when the fighting broke out the local authorities would usually call in the troops and the police, who did not often hesitate to use their guns. We saw earlier that in the Belostok pogrom 200 Jews were killed and 700 were wounded. Relations between Jews and other local inhabitants had been kept under control by Belostok's police chief, Derkatcheff. He was murdered in May 1906 and without any supporting evidence the Jews were blamed for his death. The accusation made little sense, since local Jews owed him a great debt, and indeed expressed the wish to send a wreath to be placed on his coffin. A police officer was outraged and threatened:⁴²

What, a wreath from Jews! Never! We are Christians, not Jews, vampires. You kill us and afterwards you come with wreaths. No! I shall not allow it. . . . If you will, in spite of my warning, put a wreath on the coffin, you will regret it within two days, and the whole Jewish population will regret it.

Tension quickly mounted. The Bund in Belostok was accused of affiliating with local anarchists, and the Black Hundreds issued pamphlets to the troops and to the police stating that ' . . . one must kill the conspirators, that the Imperial Duma was Jewish, and the revolutionaries are opposed to the Czar.'⁴³

As Derkatcheff's funeral procession moved through the streets, shots were fired from rooftops. According to the 'Report of the Duma Commission on the Bialystok Massacre':⁴⁴

As though at a pre-arranged signal the pogrom arose in different places. With extraordinary speed the rumor spread that a Greek Orthodox Pope and a Polish priest were killed, that Jews had fired on the ikons, that they had murdered a Christian woman; and similar horrible stories . . . officers believed these statements and threatened the Jews with revenge.

Belostok was not a unique case. Odessa, Minsk, and Kiev all had pogroms which lasted two or three days and all had well-organized defence units. When the troops were called in, their orders were to disperse the crowds and put an end to the pogrom by whatever means. The Chief of Staff's orders to the head of Odessa's military garrison were clear:⁴⁵

- (1) Take the most effective measures against those houses from which shots are fired and bombs are thrown, if necessary destroying them.

SELF-DEFENCE DURING RUSSIAN POGROMS

- (2) Shoot at the robbers, and after each incident report to the commander the number killed and wounded.

While it must be admitted that armed defence squads almost certainly led to more bloodshed, it must also be remembered that in other instances these squads had a deterrent effect. They were comparatively helpless against the troops, but they were effective in many cases in neutralizing or even stopping peasant lootings and market-place disturbances which might have escalated into pogroms.

Vigilance was increased as conditions worsened in 1905. Whereas in 1903-04 only one-fifth of the areas which experienced pogroms had self-defence, by 1905 the proportion had risen to nearly one-third.⁴⁶ Moreover, it may well be that there were in fact many defence efforts which were not reported, or which were recorded in letters and other communications that have been lost or destroyed. It is clearly impossible to arrive at an accurate estimate of the number of serious injuries, deaths, and material losses which Jews would have suffered if they had been known to be unprotected.

Perhaps the greatest service rendered by the Bund organizers of self-defence was the new sense of dignity which Jewish communities acquired in their bold resistance, and their realization that they had to overcome political and other differences in order to present a united front. It may well be that they found greater pride in being ready to fight their oppressors to the death than in following the advice of the rabbi who had urged that they be 'quiet as water and lower than the grass'.

NOTES

¹ A. Litvak quoted in Shalma Mendelsohn, *Shloyme Mendelson, Zayn lebn un shafn*, New York, 1949, p. 419.

² See Henry J. Tobias, *The Jewish Bund in Russia: From Its Origins to 1905*, Stanford, Calif., 1972, p. 247.

³ Yakov Lestschinsky, *Dos sovietische yidntum: zayn fargangenhayt un gegenwart*, Yidisher Kemfer, New York, 1941, pp. 22-24. For Jews in the revolutionary movement, see S. Dimanshtein, *Di revolutsyonere bavegung twishn di yidishe masn in der revolutsye fun 1905 yor*, Moscow, 1929; and L. Rubinov, 'Yidisher selbstshuts in dorem-rusland beys di yorn fun der ershter revolutsye', in *Fun Nuenten Ovar*, vol. 1, New York, 1938, pp. 322-32.

⁴ John Mill, *Pyonern un Boyer. Memuarn*, New York, 1949, p. 132. See also *Posledniia Izvestiia* (hereafter *PI*) 21 May 1903, reporting speech by Theodor Herzl.

⁵ R. Abramovitch, *In tsvey revolutsyes: di geshikhte fun a dor*, vol. 1, Farlag Arbeter-Ring, New York, 1944, p. 95.

⁶ E. Tcherikover, 'New Materials on the Pogroms in Russia in the Early Eighties', in *Historische Shrifn*, vol. 2, New York, 1937, pp. 444-65. See also Mark Vishniak, 'Di yidn in rusland un di pogromen in di 80er yorn', in E. Tcherikover, *Geshikhte fun der yidisher arbeter-bavegung in di fareynikte shtatn*, YIVO, New York, 1943.

⁷ Yakov Shatsky, *Geshikhte fun yidn in varshe*, vol. 3, YIVO, New York, 1953, p. 98.

⁸ S. Mendelsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

⁹ *Tovarishchi rabochii*, May 1902, p. 248.

¹⁰ Tobias, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-52.

¹¹ *Di Arbeter Shtime*, 30 October 1902, no. 19.

¹² The governor of Mogilev openly stated that the presence of the Bund was the primary cause of the pogrom; see Mill, op. cit., p. 131; and S. Dubnow, ed., *Materialy dlia istorii antievreiskikh pogromov v Rossii*, vol. 1, Petrograd, 1919, p. xxii.

¹³ Archives of the Alliance Israélite Universelle (hereafter AAIU), URSS, Dossier Mogilev. See also B. A. Kreverom, ed., *Gomelskii protsess*, St Petersburg, 1907; and 'Der proress fun der bundistisher zelbstshuts in Homel in 1904', *Naye Folksaytung*, 19 September 1937.

¹⁴ *PI*, 6 October 1903, vol. 3, no. 149.

¹⁵ *Statisticheskiiia danyia o B.O.* (Survey in the Bund Archives, 1906.)

¹⁶ A. Cahan, 'Tsu der geshikhte fun der bundistisher zelbstshuts', in *Unzer Tsayt*, New York, 1953, no. 12, p. 18, reports higher figures: Minsk, 230; Zhitomir, 400; Vitebsk, 200; Riga, 200; Vilno, 300; and Kishinev, 250. See also Tobias, op. cit., p. 315. Neither Cahan nor Tobias offers convincing data to support these estimates.

¹⁷ *Odesskii pogrom i samooborna*, Poale-Tsion, Paris, 1906, p. 77.

¹⁸ *Statisticheskiiia . . .*, op. cit.

¹⁹ *PI*, March 1904.

²⁰ S. Z. Shazar, 'Defenders of the City', in Lucy Dawidowicz, ed., *The Golden Tradition: Jewish Life and Thought in Eastern Europe*, New York, 1967, p. 388.

²¹ Kalman Likhtenstein, ed., *Pinkas Slonim*, vol. 1, Tel-Aviv 1960, no pagination.

²² Shazar in Dawidowicz, ed., op. cit., p. 387.

²³ *PI*, 22 August 1904. Reference is also made to the pogrom in Rovno in 'From Kishineff to Bialystok. A Table of Pogroms from 1903 to 1906', in *American Jewish Yearbook 5667 (September 20, 1906, to September 8, 1907)* (hereafter *AJYB*) Philadelphia, 1906, pp. 34-89; see pp. 38-39.

²⁴ *PI*, 22 August 1904, vol. 4, no. 193.

²⁵ See Leonard Rowe, 'Jewish Self-Defense: A Response to Violence', in Joshua Fishman, ed., *Studies on Polish Jewry 1919-1939*, YIVO, New York, 1974, p. 108.

²⁶ *Di Tsukunft*, vol. 12, no. 12, 1907.

²⁷ *Pogromen Blat*, 16 July 1905. See also AAIU, URSS, Dossier Zhitomir.

²⁸ *Der Fraynd*, 'Briv fun Chudnov', no. 105, 1905. See also Shazar in Dawidowicz, ed., op. cit., p. 385.

²⁹ AAIU, URSS, Dossier IC-1. Special report to the Alliance Israélite Universelle by Maxim Vinaver on *La Situation en Odessa depuis 1905*.

³⁰ *AJYB*, op. cit., p. 65.

³¹ *Der Bund*, May 1905, vol. 2, no. 7.

³² *Der Glock*, 3 October 1906, no. 3.

³³ L. Berman, *In loyf fun di yorn*, Warsaw, 1936, p. 361.

³⁴ AAIU, URSS, Dossier Taurida, no. 7/2000.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, Dossier Bessarabie, unnumbered.

³⁶ Simon Dubnow, *Nationalism and History. Essays on Old and New Judaism*, edited by Koppel S. Pinson, New York, 1970, p. 193.

³⁷ K. Likhtenstein, ed., op. cit., no pagination.

³⁸ Abramovitch, op. cit., pp. 189-90.

³⁹ L. Blekhman, *Bleter fun mayn yungt*, New York, 1959, pp. 279-80.

⁴⁰ Rowe, in Fishman, ed., op. cit., p. 108.

⁴¹ *Folksaytung*, 22 February 1906, no. 4.

⁴² *AJYB*, p. 71.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 73.

⁴⁵ *Materialy k istorii russkoy kontr-revolutsii; Tom I: Pogromy po ofitsialnym dokumentam*, St Petersburg, 1908, p. 173.

⁴⁶ See Shlomo Lambroza, *The Pogrom Movement in Tsarist Russia, 1903-06*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1980, pp. 255-56.

I should like to express my gratitude to Karen Rubenstein, who greatly assisted me in the research work for this article.

GERMAN JEWS AND ANTISEMITISM

Julius Carlebach

(Review Article)

NO SOONER had the Jews of Germany succeeded in their long and bitterly fought struggle for complete emancipation, than they were faced with an aggressive challenge by the emergence of a vicious, vociferous, and politically organized antisemitism, which sought to eliminate a Jewish presence in Germany or, at least, to reverse the benefits which the prevailing liberalism had bestowed upon them. It was a painful experience for an essentially religious minority which was passionately committed to German culture and German nationalism. It took some time before appropriate responses evolved and it is likely to remain an open question whether the German-Jewish community did as much as it could, and ought to have done, to counter the evil force which eventually destroyed it. It is a problem of more than academic interest in our own time, since it is difficult to read accounts of Jewish students being debarred from German student organizations and of synagogues being placed under special police supervision, without feeling that perhaps there are lessons to be learnt from the German-Jewish experience which might enable us to avoid some of the mistakes, if such they were, that had such disastrous consequences. At the same time, we probably feel, like the authors of the two books to be discussed here,* that the distance from the cataclysmic events of the Nazi era is now sufficient to allow us to look dispassionately at the past century and to evaluate the nature and effectiveness of Jewish reactions to organized antisemitism.

One of the most significant changes brought about by emancipation was the disappearance of the *Schutzjude*, the despised, tolerated Jew, who had no rights to which he could lay claim, but, precisely because of that, enjoyed the protection of those who exercised complete control over him and determined his destiny. For equal citizens, not only the constraints but also the privileges of special status are abolished and

*Sanford Ragins, *Jewish Responses to Anti-Semitism in Germany 1870-1914. A Study in the History of Ideas*, xiii+226 pp., Hebrew Union College Press, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1980, \$17.50.

*Donald L. Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, viii+229 pp., Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1980, £12.50.

JULIUS CARLEBACH

our two authors are agreed that in the periods 1870–1914 (covered by Ragins) and 1918–33 (covered by Niewyk), the Jews exchanged governmental dependencies for an unequivocal identification with liberalism, perceived by them as the political realization of the Enlightenment. Accordingly, both authors make only limited reference to alternative ideologies — neither the important left of the political spectrum and its involvement for and against the Jews, nor the more improbable right, receives much attention, though Niewyk offers a short and fascinating chapter on a German-Jewish nationalist faction. He certainly takes the view that, had the fascist elements been free of antisemitism, they would have found some support amongst the Jews, no less than the political left did. Both authors deal in a cursory (and Niewyk, at times in an ill-informed) way with Judaism, and particularly orthodox Judaism, as a meaningful factor in the period. On the other hand, they both devote a considerable amount of attention to the emergence of Zionism, without, however, demonstrating convincingly that it was really as important as the *Central-Verein*, the central organization of German Jews, which was established as the primary communal agency for defence against antisemitism. The result is that both writers tend to identify the histories of the *Central-Verein* and of the Zionist movement with the history of German Jewry, an approach which mitigates against the emergence of a proper historical perspective in that the roots of many key factors are obscured or neglected.

Both authors, for example, emphasize the initial lack of, and resistance to, a centralized institutional structure to represent the interests of the community as a whole. The point is well taken but ought to be related to the innate fear of centralization, which was already apparent in medieval ghetto communities, as J. R. Marcus has shown.¹ In the period under review, that fear was exacerbated, first, because the achievement of emancipated status proceeded at varying speeds according to the attitudes of the state authorities, which, in turn, generated Länder specific, lasting loyalties. Second, and more importantly, in the dominant state, Prussia, which hosted by far the largest proportion of Jews in Germany, centralization was historically and politically identified with controls and restrictions, more especially in the abortive attempt in 1842 to establish a central organization and special status for Jews in lieu of emancipation. Similarly, the determination of the Jews of Germany to treat 'their' antisemitism as a strictly national problem reflects, to some extent, the xenophobic content of German antisemitism, but also an attitude which was common amongst Jews throughout the century. Abraham Geiger's refusal to show more concern for the Jewish victims of the Damascus blood libel in 1840, than he felt for the debarment of Jews from becoming apothecaries in Prussia, matches precisely the preference for 'Pomeranian peasants' quoted by Niewyk.² The issue was debated following the

GERMAN JEWS AND ANTISEMITISM

conspicuous failure of Gabriel Riesser, then the most prestigious Jew in Germany, to join Moses Montefiore of England and Adolphe Crémieux of France in their mission to rescue the Jews of Damascus. It was argued then that while Montefiore was publicly rewarded by Queen Victoria for his efforts on behalf of his fellow-Jews in distant lands, German Jews were fearful lest an openly displayed concern for 'foreign' Jews would call in question their loyalty to the fatherland.

Again, in typical Jewish fashion, the *Central-Verein* defined its task of fighting antisemitism at two levels, *Abwehr*, the defence against verbal and physical attacks, and inner reform, 'Germanising' Jewish behaviour and occupational structures.³ This is typically Jewish in the sense that Jews tend to assume that all forms of antisemitism have an 'objective' basis (that is, a religiously based tradition which seeks to explain external hostility by reference to internal faults); but both authors err in suggesting that accusations of a distorted Jewish presence were initiated by late nineteenth-century antisemitic dogma. Complaints about Jewish behaviour accompanied the entire period of the struggle for emancipation, from Christian-Wilhelm Dohm's call for the 'civil improvement' of Jews in the early 1780s to the Nazi era, and were, in the main, socially defined objections to religious behaviour (though Martin Philippon wrote at the end of the century that, if Jews stopped talking with their hands, it might lessen German distaste for them). The determination of German Jews to alter their occupational structure (that is, to forego their 'strong Jewish proclivities for free enterprise'⁴) also goes back to the eighteenth century, but neither they nor, indeed, our two authors, recognized that changes in occupations have social consequences and involve changes in social class positions and allegiances. Throughout the periods under discussion, the willingness of state authorities and aspiring Jews to facilitate moves into new occupations failed to take into account the rigid hostility with which the German working and lower-middle classes, for instance, would block the integration of Jews. Hence, many Jewish artisans had no choice but to relinquish the crafts in which they were trained and revert to trading, or to emigrate.⁵

To the extent that hostility towards Jews was part of the social climate of Germany, it owed much to the resistance which both Protestant and Catholic Churches offered to the ethos of tolerance propagated by the advocates of the Enlightenment. Nevertheless, it is important to exercise caution in seeking the roots of *modern* German antisemitism in earlier religious and philosophical ideas and personalities. One ought to heed the warning of Peter Gay that to treat all German nineteenth-century ideas and institutions as 'clues of crimes to come' is to tear them 'from their living context'.⁶ Nowhere is this tendency more evident than in the case of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814), who was described by Heinrich Graetz as the 'father and

JULIUS CARLEBACH

apostle of national German hatred of the Jews',⁷ a view echoed more recently by Jacob Katz, who described Fichte as 'a kind of locus classicus in antisemitic literature'.⁸ Since Ragins has presented his book as 'A study in the History of Ideas', and since he, like the present reviewer on an earlier occasion,⁹ has joined the chorus of condemnation (using the same secondary source) against Fichte, we might usefully take a closer look at the case against this brilliant though eccentric philosopher who, encapsulated as he is by the overpowering Kant and Hegel, never succeeded in persuading those who supported or attacked his political ideas to take his philosophy seriously.

In 1793, at a time when Europe was debating the emancipation of Jews and of women, in the wake of the French revolution, Fichte published a politico-philosophical tract in which he discussed the relationship between the state and its variously privileged citizens.¹⁰ In the context of this famous essay he inserted a paragraph in which he rejected the then hotly topical demands for civil rights for Jews, on the grounds that Jews chose to isolate themselves from general society and could claim human but not civil rights — unless they themselves relinquished their special status. Like Bruno Bauer in his debate with Marx half a century later, Fichte argued that it would be unjust to offer tolerance to Jews who openly rejected Christianity, whilst no such tolerance was extended to Christian 'freethinkers'. He added a footnote to this paragraph, a fraction of which (6 out of 55 lines) has since become the foundation of the Jewish case against Fichte. The lines are quoted by Graetz and after him, more or less accurately, by a host of other Jewish historians, including Poliakov,¹¹ Lowenthal¹² (Ragin's mentor), and Sanford Ragins as follows: 'The only way I can see to give [the Jews] civil rights is to cut off their heads in a single night and equip them with new ones devoid of every Jewish idea . . . to protect ourselves against them, again I see no means except to conquer their Promised Land and pack them all off to it'.¹³ What is not made clear by those who use this quotation is, that the footnote begins thus: 'Let any poisonous whiff of intolerance be as far removed from these pages as it is from my heart . . . [the Jews] must be accorded human rights, whether they reciprocate them or not: for they are human . . . If you have eaten yesterday and are again hungry, but you have bread enough only for today, then give it to the Jew who starves beside you, if he had nothing yesterday . . . I am not saying that Jews should be persecuted for their beliefs, but that no one should be persecuted for what he believes.'¹⁴ In the same book Fichte attacked the 'cruel and hateful' regulation of Frederick II, which compelled Jews to buy a certain amount of porcelain when they married.¹⁵

Unlike Jewish historians, Jewish philosophers have generally been more sympathetic (and more accurate) about Fichte. Bergman has described him as 'an apt pupil of Solomon Maimon',¹⁶ Hans Kohn,

GERMAN JEWS AND ANTISEMITISM

who argued that Fichte had assigned to nationalism the earlier functions of religion, saw him as a significant influence on Martin Buber's formulations of Jewish nationalism.¹⁷ Even the extra-sensitive Emil Fackenheim took the view that 'Fichte's thought became rabid teutonic nationalism when his risky proposition became inverted'.¹⁸ Uriel Tal was undoubtedly right when he suggested that German antisemitic, anti-liberal groups took propaganda material indiscriminately from Fichte, Herder, Hegel, Marx, and Treitschke.¹⁹ That in itself would not exonerate any author of anti-Jewish sentiments, but it should impress on present-day writers of intellectual history the need to consult primary sources before reaching a verdict.

Sanford Ragins's book was first presented as a doctoral thesis almost ten years ago. He set himself the task of looking at the responses to antisemitism made by those Jews whose Jewish consciousness prevented them from seeking a haven in the Christian church or through intermarriage. The book consists mainly of two lively, well-written, and interesting essays. The first, on the origins and activities of the *Central-Verein*, was a more original project at the time it was written than it is at the time of publication. The second is a discussion of the first two generations of Zionists and their very different attitudes and ideologies. His material is chosen from a careful, if somewhat limited, reading of newspapers and archives, and relies, perhaps too much, on views and opinions of selected individuals, without adequate indication of just how representative such views might have been. The main and altogether puzzling weakness of this book is its publication in its original form. The past decade has been particularly fruitful and prolific in the field of German-Jewish history. A great deal has been published concerning the issues raised by Ragins, including discussions of his thesis (for example, by Arnold Paucker).²⁰ To issue a book in 1980 which makes no reference to the extensive literature published after 1970 is to reduce a useful academic exercise to the level of a curiosity.

Donald Niewyk's *The Jews in Weimar Germany* is, in many ways, a much more substantial and sophisticated undertaking. He posits three possible reasons for the intense loyalty with which German Jews embraced German liberalism to the bitter end. They may have been blind to the full extent of German antisemitism; they may have had no alternative, being excluded by the left's anti-capitalism and the right's antisemitism; or they may have chosen to remain in the liberal camp, fully understanding the consequences of what they were doing. In a lucid and elegant style, a mass of primary material is pulled together to make easy and at times exciting reading. It is probably inevitable that the attempt to present the entire spectrum of Jewish social, cultural, and political life in the Weimar period is unlikely to succeed in one slim volume. It is not surprising, therefore, that the chapters on economic

JULIUS CARLEBACH

performance, literature, and the social sciences are little more than recitals of names and bare facts. The best parts of the book deal with communal organizations and political responses, where the author shows considerable understanding and sound judgement. The weakest part lies in the indifferent carelessness with which Judaism and Jewish religious attitudes are presented. The discussion of Jewish schools is devoid of any conceptual basis, orthodox Jews are 'intransigent' (p. 112), observing an 'unreconstructed' (p. 117) Judaism, based on 'holy writ' (p. 121) and containing 'antiquated Jewish marriage and divorce laws' (p. 118). *Galuth* (Exile), one of the most ancient Jewish concepts, is explained as the Zionists' 'term for the Diaspora' (p. 142). One might also note that suicide statistics which do not differentiate between men and women (p. 20) do not lend themselves to support social explanations, and surely it cannot be right to describe Rosa Luxemburg as a 'Polish Jew' (p.27).

These criticisms notwithstanding, Niewyk has written an important book and one would like to commend it, especially to Jewish communal leaders, as compulsory reading and an invaluable guide for the challenges which lie ahead.

NOTES

- ¹ J. R. Marcus, *Communal Sick Care in the German Ghetto*, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1947, p. 3.
- ² Page 142; see also Ragins, p. 55.
- ³ Ragins, p. 67.
- ⁴ Niewyk, p. 11.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- ⁶ Peter Gay, *Freud, Jews and Other Germans*, New York, 1978, pp. 8-9.
- ⁷ Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews*, vol. 5, Philadelphia, 1967, p. 461.
- ⁸ Jacob Katz, *Out of the Ghetto*, Cambridge, Mass., 1973, p. 100.
- ⁹ Julius Carlebach, *Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Judaism*, London, 1978, pp. 57-58.
- ¹⁰ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Beitrag zur Berichtigung der Urteile des Publikums über die Französische Revolution*, Meiner edn., Hamburg, 1973.
- ¹¹ Léon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth. A History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe*, transl. by Edmund Howard, New York, 1974, pp. 238 and 263.
- ¹² M. Lowenthal, *The Jews of Germany*, London, 1939, p. 229.
- ¹³ Ragins, p. 11.
- ¹⁴ Fichte, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-16.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 140.
- ¹⁶ Samuel H. Bergman, *The Philosophy of Solomon Maimon*, Jerusalem, 1967, p. 230.
- ¹⁷ Hans Kohn, *Martin Buber. Sein Werk und Seine Zeit*, Wiesbaden, 1961, pp. 95, 148, 245.
- ¹⁸ Emil L. Fackenheim, *Encounters between Judaism and Modern Philosophy*, New York, 1973, p. 191.
- ¹⁹ Uriel Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics and Ideology in the Second Reich 1870-1914*, Ithaca, N.Y., and London, 1975, p.244.
- ²⁰ Arnold Paucker, 'Zur Problematik einer Jüdischen Abwehrstrategie in der Deutschen Gesellschaft', in W. E. Mosse and A. Paucker, eds., *Juden im Wilhelmischen Deutschland 1890-1914*, Tübingen, 1976.

A COMPOSITE PORTRAIT OF ISRAEL

Walter P. Zenner

(Review Article)

THIS compendium of competent anthropological studies* is more a collection of miniature pictures of various sectors of Israeli society than it is a 'composite portrait'. Like many collections of that sort, it does not give a sense of an anthropological representation of the whole. The volume does in its way show both the strengths and the weaknesses of a certain genre of social anthropology.

Most of the papers in this book are based on studies funded by the Bernstein Israel Research Project, whose main director was the late Max Gluckman. The present volume is the concluding publication of that Project, which provided for a wide range of studies of kinship and family, as well as of communities of different varieties, with regard to both ethnicity and principles of organization. Longitudinal research, where feasible, was also sponsored. In an article published in an earlier issue of this Journal,¹ Emanuel Marx described both the overall goals of the Project and its accomplishments, and paid tribute to Max Gluckman. His Introduction to this volume includes some sections based on that article (as he acknowledges in a Note).

Following his Introduction, Marx contributes a stimulating essay 'On the anthropological study of nations', in which he evaluates the various approaches of anthropologists who have carried out field-work in modern societies. He considers, for example, the strategy used by Lloyd Warner and his team in the *Yankee City* study, and that of Julian Steward and his assistants in Puerto Rico. His 'main conclusion is that the small social aggregates traditionally studied by anthropologists reveal a great part of the complex structures of composite societies' (p. 24).

Certainly, the nine papers which follow convey a broad panorama of Israeli society. Myron Aronoff deals with relationships in the Labour Party; Moshe Shokeid writes on the Arab electorate in an Israeli city, and is followed by Leonard Mars on Ashdod's port workers. Dafna

* Emanuel Marx, ed., *A Composite Portrait of Israel*, viii + 290 pp., Academic Press, London and New York, 1980, £12.80 (UK only), \$29.50.

Israeli reports on a television assembly department. There are two papers on the kibbutz: Israel Shepher on the social boundaries of the kibbutz, and Terence Evens on 'Stigma and Morality in a Kibbutz'. Ruwen Ogien is concerned with a slum area of Tel Aviv, Haim Hazan with 'Adjustment and Control in an Old Age Home', and the last contribution is that of Don Handelman on 'Bureaucratic Affiliation: the Moral Component in Welfare Cases'.

We therefore read about those at the bottom of the social pyramid (squatters, welfare recipients) as well as about the members of the political and the social élites — whether they are found in an old age home, a kibbutz, or on the Central Committee of the Labour Party. These anthropologists have 'studied down', as field-workers in their discipline have always done, and 'up' as the left-wing critics of anthropology say they should. In fact, the small scale of Israeli society and its residual egalitarianism make it possible for some studies to do both at the same time. For instance, Hazan's paper on the very dependent population of an old age home shows how those who have been members of the élite continue to maintain their status in that setting.

In his Introduction and in his essay, Marx highlights a number of themes. He goes over the familiar ground of how the microcosms show the richness of texture of the whole and how the way in which the larger society impinges on the small group and the little community is different in each case. At the end of the essay, he stresses that the studies which follow 'reveal the extent of centralized bureaucratic control in Israel' (p. 25). However, Israel's bureaucracy is far removed from Weber's ideal type. The contributions in this volume show how the various officials interact with their different clienteles, each of whom employs a different set of resources in coping with the agents of the State, the Labour Federation, etc.

With one exception, all the studies show the interaction between individual, small group, and community with the bureaucracies. The exception is that of the report by Terence Evens of the proceedings in a kibbutz concerning the unwelcome future wife of a member. All the other studies bear out in varying extents the importance of bureaucratic control, which Marx stresses. That is particularly interesting in the study by Hazan of an old age home and in Handelman's work on welfare recipients; both reveal how dependent individuals are perceived by those who are in charge and how bureaucratic control can sometimes be manipulated in the dependent's favour.

Shokeid's contribution on political parties and the Arab electorate is one of the very few published studies of urban Arabs in Israel. In 1972-74, he carried out field-work in a suburb with a population of about 10,000 Arabs; before the establishment of the State in 1948, more than 100,000 Arabs had lived in the area. It would be interesting to

A COMPOSITE PORTRAIT OF ISRAEL

learn about the larger numbers of Arabs in the Galilee and the Little Triangle, as well as about those workers who come from the occupied territories to find employment in Israel's cities.

Ruwen Ogien describes the squatting strategies of the inhabitants of a slum area in Tel Aviv, and the way they compete for the limited funds and services which social workers can provide. One of the benefits of being an 'illegal' occupier of a site is that tax cannot be claimed by the authorities. The objective of many of the squatters is to become self-employed, and some have indeed established small businesses.

Shepher deals with conflict between the kibbutz as a community and as the supplier of élite workers to the State and to some industries. His discussion of the social boundaries of the kibbutz is somewhat prolonged, but he very skilfully illustrates the openness of the kibbutz as a social system.

Dafna Izraeli's article on a television assembly department is reminiscent of early studies on human relations and productivity, notably the classic Hawthorne studies. She was a participant observer, working in the factory for a year and attending meetings of the management and of the union.

Leonard Mars's field-work in the port of Ashdod was carried out in 1970-71. He found that the leadership of the port workers was 'becoming more bureaucratic and its power more centralized' (p. 81). He gives a clear picture of the organization of the Workers' Committee and of the role of its Secretary, whose superior position was unquestioned by other Committee members and whose salary was paid by the Israel Ports Authority.

The Bernstein Project studies are representative of a genre; they are examples of case studies, frequently using event analysis. The investigator selects a limited field and examines some aspects in great detail. Don Handelman, for instance, appears to have spent most of his time in a sheltered workshop for elderly welfare recipients or in a Jerusalem welfare office.² Admittedly, some of the contributors to *A Composite Portrait of Israel* did not remain within such a circumscribed locality. Aronoff's orbit was far wider than that of the others when he analysed the relationships between the Central Committee of the Labour Party and the various local branches.

However, the authors generally did not go beyond what they had personally witnessed or what they had learnt directly from informants about recent events. Evens, for example, was not allowed to be present at some of the kibbutz meetings and had to rely on the reports of those who attended them. Documents are rarely used in this kind of study and it is assumed (with some justification) that testimonies about a more distant past are suspect. Little use is made of questionnaires, journalistic reports, or the content analysis of written accounts, folk-tales, and the like. This is part of a sound social anthropological

tradition, no doubt reflecting Radcliffe-Brown's disdain for conjectural history.

The way in which the Bernstein researchers have linked the microcosms with the larger structure of the State of Israel and the world economy shows the strength of the approach. Indeed, the links between the outside and the inside of the microcosm, as among élite residents of Hazan's old age home, can best be shown in this fashion.

An important weakness of this approach, however, is that some of its practitioners are reluctant to go outside the microcosms they describe. At the beginning of this review article, I noted that this volume was a collection of miniature pictures rather than a composite portrait. I would go further: most of the authors appear to have made little effort to look beyond their particular little groups or communities in order to see how what they describe fits into a picture of Israel as a whole. It is only recently that some of the anthropologists who participated in the Bernstein Project have broken out of this mould and have begun to paint with broader strokes. Shlomo Deshen's recent article on the major patterns of Israeli Judaism is an example;³ Marx's Introduction to the present volume is another. One of the reasons why we are shown only a set of miniatures may be due to the fact that several of the contributions are in effect versions of earlier papers rather than especially commissioned articles. However, it should have been possible to ask the authors to add short sections to their papers in which they suggest what their little world reveals about Israel as a whole.

At the end of his essay on the anthropological study of nations, Emanuel Marx states (p. 25):

There is evidence in the chapters of the book that Jewishness, Zionism and Socialism seem so self-evident, that even opponents may take them for granted; for instance, Arabs may vote for Zionist political parties, and factory-owners subscribe to socialist principles.

In this book, however, as in many other works stemming from the Bernstein Project, the Jewishness is taken for granted. (The works of Deshen and, to a lesser degree, of Shokeid and Hazan are exceptions.) Very little attention is paid to national symbols as such. Religion is dealt with cursorily, while nationalism as an ideology is ignored. Of course, socialist ideals are at the forefront of kibbutz and moshav studies, since they play a key role in those 'intentional communities'.

Marx's comment raises some interesting questions. For instance, if we consider the paradox of Arabs voting for Zionist parties, need we assume that they accept it as a given? Abner Cohen in his *Arab Border Villages in Israel* points to the exploitation of Arab nationalism by these Zionist parties in order to fight the Communists, their main opposition in the Arab sector.⁴ I have heard Arabs active in the Labour Party use

A COMPOSITE PORTRAIT OF ISRAEL

the term 'Zionism' negatively. The same could be true of the factory owners and managers with regard to socialism.

A disadvantage of the extended case method is the neglect of comparison. Again, this is part of the British social anthropological tradition, which has emphasized the intensive study of various societies but has been very wary of venturing into comparisons, except in carefully controlled cases. The Americans, on the other hand, have been often reckless, whether in using Murdock's correlational techniques or in writing survey textbooks and exhaustive comparative reviews.

Some of the papers in the present volume would have acquired greater significance if they had been set into a comparative framework. For instance, Mars's article on the Ashdod dockers and their union shows striking similarities between these men and port workers in other parts of the world;⁵ but the References at the end of his paper reflect his lack of interest in comparative studies. Similarly, Ogien (who is concerned with a slum area of Tel Aviv) only scratches the surface of the literature on squatters in other countries.

We know from their generous references to a fair number of authors, who have written in the field of general social science as well as of Israeli society, that the Bernstein Project scholars are not uninterested in the work of others; indeed, they believe that they have learned a great deal even from those with whom they disagree. We must therefore conclude that they do not give a very high priority to comparison, especially if to do so would require them to go far afield. In fact, in some cases even studies which are close to home do not appear to be taken into account. Sociologists as well as anthropologists have studied relations between the bureaucrats and their clients; but the References at the end of the papers omit some of these social scientists, most notably Brenda Danet. Her work is not cited by any of the authors. Danet has made some extremely imaginative studies of bureaucratic interaction, using socio-linguistic techniques which should be of interest to social anthropologists dealing with interaction and communication.⁶ Of course, she relied on content analysis as much as on observation.

Apart from Jewishness and its consequences, there are several features of Israeli nationhood which could be sharply contrasted with those of other societies. I noted earlier that the relatively small scale of the country and its egalitarianism makes it possible for élite individuals and disadvantaged persons to be fellow residents in the same old age home.

At the end of his Introduction, Emanuel Marx states: '... a village that uses imported grain and cattle-feed, and exports a considerable proportion of its produce to foreign countries, is surely part of a world-wide economy.' This is true of farming communities in many

WALTER P. ZENNER

countries; but it is only when comparisons are made that the peculiarities of the Israeli situation will be revealed, that what is unique will stand out.

NOTES

¹ Emanuel Marx, 'Anthropological Studies in a Centralized State', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 17, no. 2, December 1975, pp. 131-50.

² Don Handelman, 'Bureaucratic Transactions', in Bruce Kapferer, ed., *Transaction and Meaning*, Philadelphia, 1976, pp. 223-75; and D. Handelman, *Work and Play among the Aged*, Amsterdam, 1977.

³ Shlomo Doshen, 'Israeli Judaism: Introduction to the Major Patterns', *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 9 no. 2, April 1978, pp. 141-69.

⁴ Abner Cohen, *Arab Border Villages in Israel*, Manchester, 1965, pp. 146-73.

⁵ See Raymond Charles Miller, 'The Dockworker Subculture and Some Problems in Cross-cultural and Cross-time Generalizations', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 11, no. 3, June 1969, pp. 302-14.

⁶ Brenda Danet, 'The Language of Persuasion in Bureaucracy: "Modern" and "Traditional" Appeals to the Israel Customs Authority', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 36, no 5, 1971, pp. 847-59; and Danet, "'Giving the Underdog a Break": Latent Particularism among Customs Officials', in E. Katz and B. Danet, eds., *Bureaucracy and the Public*, New York, 1973, pp. 329-37.

BOOK REVIEWS

JAMES FAWCETT, *The International Protection of Minorities*, Report No. 41, 20 pp., Minority Rights Group, 36 Craven Street, London, 1979, 75p.

Dr Fawcett is Professor of International Law at King's College, London. In 1972, he was appointed President of the European Commission on Human Rights. The Minority Rights Group is an educational trust with English charitable registration. It aims to promote justice for groups who are discriminated against, and to foster a 'world conscience' concerning human rights. Towards such ends, the Group seeks to enhance by international research, and publication of the results, an 'international understanding of the factors which create prejudiced treatment and group tensions'.

No one who is responsive to the principles for which the Group stands will fail to treat with attention any assessment from the pen of Professor Fawcett, even if not every assumption or conclusion is free from controversy. He has packed into short compass a useful historical introduction on the international protection of minorities, a survey of many of the current problems, and suggestions for an approach and techniques towards their resolution.

The Report seems to be directed primarily at the concerned citizen, but it may also prove useful for those more immediately involved in the study and advocacy of policy.

ISRAEL FINESTEIN

SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, *New Reform Responsa*, x + 282 pp., Alumni Series of the Hebrew Union College Press, distributed by Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1980, \$12.50.

This is yet another of the volumes of *Responsa* published by the supreme Halakhic authority of the Reform movement. The very idea of consulting the Halakha would have been anathema to the early Reformers with their emphasis on prophetic Judaism and their marked indifference to the ceremonial law, or rather to its details as worked out in the classical sources. What has brought about the change in attitude? Why do contemporary Reform Jews wish to have guidance on the exact procedures to be adopted in connexion with some areas at least of Jewish observance? Freehof addresses himself to these matters

BOOK REVIEWS

in his Introduction, claiming that there has been a growing awareness in Reform circles that the Halakhic literature is the most continuous expression of Jewish religious thought so that the interest of Reform in the Halakha is not a reversion to Orthodoxy but a return to unity with Jewish history.

It follows from the author's analysis that the guidance sought is not for the totality of Jewish religious life but only for the active observances which Reform Jews still try to follow. Such an elevation of the *vox populi* leads to a definite imbalance: a quite disproportionate number of the questions discussed in the book deal with death and burial and yet Freehof (without appearing to realize the irony involved) describes these, together with the others he considers, as living observances! He appreciates this narrowing of scope, but claims that Orthodoxy has also virtually abandoned vast themes of Halakha, and he cites as one instance the neglect of Jewish civil law. He refers twice to the alleged fact that hardly any Responsa in the collections of present-day Orthodox Rabbis deal with the section of the *Shulchan Aruch* called *Choshen Mishpat*, the section which treats of lawsuits and allied matters. This is far too sweeping a generalization. He refers in a different context to the massive Responsa collection of Rabbi M. Klein, *Mishneh Halakhot*. That work contains many a Responsum on *Choshen Mishpat* and the same is true of the writings of such other Orthodox authorities as Eliezer Waldinberg, Isaac Weiss, and Moshe Feinstein.

Freehof is obviously familiar with the Halakhah, but occasionally misinterprets his sources. On Spiritualism, he quotes *Sanhedrin* 65a that the medium who summons the dead commits a capital offence and the 'inquirer of the medium should receive a warning not to repeat his sin'. The *azharah* ('warning') here is, in fact, a technical term for an offence which the Torah 'warns' against — that is, it is a negative precept but does not involve capital punishment. By no stretch of the imagination can it mean a warning not to repeat the sin. The famous statement about the learned *mamzer* and the ignorant High Priest is not that the former is 'superior' to the latter, but that he takes precedence over the latter in some instances — for example, in receiving financial assistance and the like from the community. It is a severely practical rule rather than a value judgement. The numerical value of the word Torah is 611, not 613; the relevant passage states that Moses 'commanded us' Torah = 611, the other two commandments being conveyed by God directly. And when the Rabbis say that Israel is immune from the influence of the *mazzal* this hardly means that, according to the Rabbis, it is forbidden for a Jew to believe in astrology. Maimonides alone among the giants of the Middle Ages rejected a belief in astrology, and in so doing he consciously departed from the opinions of the Talmudic Rabbis.

LOUIS JACOBS

BOOK REVIEWS

ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, *Jewish Justice and Conciliation. History of the Jewish Conciliation Board of America, 1930-1968 and a Review of Jewish Juridical Autonomy*, with a Preface by Dr Simon Agranat, xxiv + 252 pp., Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1981, \$17.50.

Since 1960 the author of this volume has lived in Jerusalem. He had long been prominent on the world Jewish scene by reason of his considerable influence in Jewish counsels in the United States. For many years he was President of the American Jewish Congress and of the Zionist Organization of America. He was at the same time the Rabbi of the Bnai Jeshurun Congregation, the oldest Ashkenazi congregation in New York. It had been an orthodox establishment, one of whose notable rabbis was Morris Raphall, formerly secretary to Solomon Hirschell in London and Minister of the Birmingham Hebrew Congregation. By Dr Goldstein's day, it had moved far towards advanced Conservatism and under his regime went further in a Reformist direction.

A distinctive feature of American Zionism in Dr Goldstein's generation was the leading role occupied in the movement by holders of rabbinical posts, especially those in the ranks of 'Progressive Judaism'. He was a vocal and energetic exemplar. These features of Jewish life across the Atlantic are connected with the particular American dimension to Jewish life in the United States — political messianism, pluralism, ethnicity, as well as the influence of men of the stamp of Stephen Wise. There were of course powerful cadres of anti-Zionist opinion in Reformist Judaism and elsewhere, but that circumstance does not detract from the historical interest of the phenomenon to which I have referred.

All these matters give added historical significance in several respects to Dr Goldstein's long Presidency of what came to be called the Jewish Conciliation Board of America. The major part of this volume, which has more than a touch of autobiography, is taken up with the inception of that Board in 1919 and the spirit which infused its development, together with summaries (without names) of many of the cases with which it dealt.

Dr Goldstein's headship of the Board illustrates the extensive versatility of the rabbinate in America. The notion of a 'Jewish clergy', though known there, does not appear to have taken root. The American rabbi was not a clerical official. The absence of an established church — and the style and vocabulary thereof — may in part account for this. The absence of a Chief Rabbinate, in the form in which it thrived in England in the second half of the nineteenth century, was another factor. Nor was there the old English erastianism, namely the control of the religious by the lay leadership, which became a habit of mind and of system in Anglo-Jewry. Lines of division between the roles of 'clerics'

BOOK REVIEWS

and laymen within American Jewish public life were more of a formal than of a substantive nature.

The Board began its life as a 'Jewish Arbitration Court'. It sought to apply between those disputants who resorted to it principles of *Halakha* and *Yosher*, the latter comprising the idea of fair compromise and the ideal of a return to friendship, where feasible. It was a New York institution, largely serving immigrant Jews who because of language, custom, and inhibition preferred not to air their quarrels to Gentile tribunals. In 1930, the year in which the author became President, the word 'Conciliation' replaced 'Arbitration' in its title. Later, 'Board' replaced 'Court'. 'Our role', comments the author, was 'primarily as voluntary conciliators' (p. 89). The arbitral status was retained. State law recognized the validity of an agreement between parties to abide by the arbitration award. But the Board sought an Aaronic rather than a Mosaic image, and proffered advice in preference to adjudication. Its proceedings were informal, without oath or representation.

No pretence was made to the status of a *Beth Din*. Dr Goldstein describes the authority of the institution as 'moral'. It was 'a secular court without any claim to ecclesiastical authority' (p. 98). This situation was not altered by the fact that rabbis were among the panel of 'judges'. The Board was not sectarian. Among the long list of the 'judges' appear Robert Gordis, Immanuel Jakobovits, Leo Jung, and Mordecai Kaplan.

Between the Board and those who came to it for whatever service, there was not that degree of psychological distance which often existed elsewhere between 'representatives' of the longer-standing Jewish community and 'greeners'. For the American rabbi of Bnai Jeshurun — which Dr Goldstein calls 'an upper middle class *kehillah*' — to be a fluent Yiddishist and to share the Zionist aspirations of many on the Lower East Side were striking facts.

The many glimpses of the Board's work given by this book fall short of affording that overall view of its impact on New York Jewry or upon the Lower East Side which would greatly have increased its value to scholars. The author's references to the Board's growing links with other agencies, its 'follow-up' of individual cases, and the interest its operation aroused in other Jewish communities in America, stimulate a curiosity which remains unsatisfied. He tells much, but the place of it all within the life of his metropolitan community, still less within the national Jewish scene, remains unassessed. That may have been the author's intention.

In the preceding issue of this Journal (vol. 23, no. 1, June 1981), Professor Lloyd Gartner, in a different but not wholly dissimilar context, observed (p. 51):

What generally distinguishes the Jews . . . is that on the one hand they participate extensively in the nation's economic, political, and cultural life

BOOK REVIEWS

while on the other they retain social separateness and maintain substantial independent, voluntary-supported institutions of their own.

It is not law but a feeling, a sense of relationship, that led to the foundation and continued maintenance of these institutions . . .

These comments are pertinent when considering the first part of Dr Goldstein's book, in which he offers a historical survey of what he calls 'Jewish juridical autonomy' in the Diaspora. They are a reminder of the distinction between institutions such as communal courts, as part and parcel of a separated Jewish community, and other institutions such as the Conciliation Board, which was established against a background of a developing integration. The latter kinds of body are bridges between the unacculturation and the integration of a community; they differ radically in character, purpose, and status from the general range of 'autonomous jurisdictions' of which Dr Goldstein provides a panoramic view. They are essentially temporary. If they survive beyond the generations which required them, they are transformed into social service agencies hardly recognizable from their original existence. It is doubtful whether 'autonomous' is an apt term to describe their jurisdiction at any stage of their history.

The Jewish courts in the *kehillot* of Muslim Spain, or at the various stages of the Venetian Republic, or in the German principalities, or under the Hapsburgs, or in the days of the Council of the Four Lands in eastern Europe, operated in contexts of great political and legal diversity. It is difficult to detect any common factors between such bodies and Dr Goldstein's Conciliation Board which would justify linking them all within a pattern of 'juridical autonomy'. There are Jewish enclaves and Jewish enclaves.

In his interesting Preface Dr Simon Agranat, formerly President of the Supreme Court of Israel, refers to the influence of Jewish juridical autonomy in preserving 'the separate existence and identity of the Jewish people as a religio-national entity'. That influence cannot be gainsaid. But in the interests of historical reality, care must be taken to avoid drawing inferences of continuity or parallelism. Dr Goldstein states that 'it is important to realize . . . that the . . . Board . . . was a continuation of the long history of juridical autonomy granted to Jews . . . during the two millennia when they were denied political autonomy in a state of their own' (p. 3). The differentiae belong to the pith of Jewish history during those ages.

The author's main references to England are on pages 43 to 46. A few points merit attention. Reliance upon the second edition of Cecil Roth's *A History of the Jews in England* (1941) for the medieval period is most unfortunate. Dr Roth extensively revised his medieval chapters in his third edition (1964), especially in the light of H. G. Richardson's important work on *The English Jewry under Angevin Kings* (1960), to

BOOK REVIEWS

which Dr Goldstein refers. He also seems to accord, perhaps understandably, a higher standing to Hermann Adler's outdated opinions on the Anglo-Jewish medieval presbyters than is warranted. Dr Roth's references to Menasseh ben Israel and the Resettlement in his second edition were also much revised in the third, and follow his paper on the subject in the volume of essays edited by V. D. Lipman, *Three Centuries of Anglo-Jewish History* (1961). Such decisions as that which allowed a Jew to swear on the Pentateuch in the Courts of the realm were not by way of royal decree but judicial orders in particular cases. Dr Goldstein post-dates the creation of the Board of Deputies of British Jews by thirty years, wrongly places Solomon Hirschell's Chief Rabbinate in the eighteenth century, and wrongly endows Nathan Adler with the distinction of being the first 'Chief Rabbi of the British Empire'. Adler was at least the third Chief Rabbi 'of England', and Hirschell has the best title as first 'Chief Rabbi of the British Empire', if only by reason of the mission to Australia by one of his *dayanim* in 1830 with his authority.

ISRAEL FINESTEIN

AARON LEVINE. *Free Enterprise and Jewish Law. Aspects of Jewish Business Ethics*, xii + 224 pp., The Library of Jewish Law and Ethics (General Editor, Norman Lamm), Ktav Publishing House and Yeshiva University Press, New York, 1980, \$17.50.

At a time when strikes, labour disputes, closed-shop legislation, nationalization versus private enterprise, unemployment, and similar problems dominate the economic scene, it is refreshing to obtain a Jewish slant on the subject of business ethics. The author is amply qualified to present both the secular and the Halakhic standpoints and to apply accepted economic terminology to Jewish legal principles. He is an ordained Rabbi and a professor of Economics at Yeshiva University.

What is manifest in the Halakhic approach to business dealings whether in the public or private sectors is that not only must justice be done, but that ethical behaviour is essential, and that the welfare of the individual as well as of the community must claim priority. Thus when dealing with the subject of monopoly, which involves business expansion, mergers, buying out of rivals, restraint on trade practices, and resale price maintenance, the Halakhah gives primary consideration to the harm that may accrue to third parties. Monopoly is held in check by communal legislation which would even approve of consumer boycott. The formation of cartels by which market prices could be distorted is forbidden. Protectionist tactics can be prevented by permitting external competition by out of town merchants, provided

BOOK REVIEWS

that they agree to pay local taxes or offer substitute products which are unobtainable locally.

Unbridled rivalry in the competitive market-place is also subject to Halakhic restraint. A clear distinction is drawn between competition which reduces the profit margin and that which deprives others of their livelihood. Whilst efficiency is encouraged, industrial justice must be observed especially in cases where larger and better equipped firms would oust smaller ones which are incapable of introducing highly specialized technology. Firms capable of cutting prices would be restrained from opening within the near vicinity of their competitors. Similarly, offering goods at lower prices in order to entice customers away from their local shops is included under the category of Tort, and this, too, is subject to restraint.

Within the framework of Contract Law, the Halakhah contains several unique aspects. The most ancient, referred to in the Bible (Ruth 4. 7), is known as *Kinyan*, a symbolic act in which an article is passed between the contracting parties thereby denoting the acquisition of legal right. This involves *Gemirat Da'at*, mental resolve to conclude a transaction, akin to 'good faith'. Distinction is however drawn between methods of acquiring movable as opposed to immovable goods. For the former, other methods of acquisition were devised, such as handling them by lifting (*Hagbahah*), pulling them (*Meshikkah*), or by exchange of money.

Contractual arrangements affecting labour relations occupy a prominent place in the Jewish legal system. Malfeasance on the part of the employee entitles the employer to dismiss him, especially if he is responsible for irretrievable loss to his employer. On the other hand, if the employer reneges on conditions of employment the employee has the right to claim adequate compensation, unless the dismissal is due to circumstances beyond the employer's control. Provisions exist for the worker to withdraw his labour, whether he be hired for a specific period of time (a day labourer) or for a specific task (piece worker), but much depends on whether such action would create an irretrievable loss to the employer. Strikes by Unions in order to settle employees' grievances are permitted provided that they do not present a health hazard to the public, but strike breakers who offer to work for reduced wages would come under communal restraint. Long-term labour contracts are deemed by some authorities as the equivalent of 'servitude' and therefore contrary to Biblical injunction. The efficiency of the worker is a pre-requisite of an employment agreement; it is therefore deemed morally indefensible for a day labourer to undertake outside jobs which would be detrimental to the quality of the work for which he is employed.

The Halakhah attaches much importance to the role of the communal authorities in relation to legislation. Within this category

BOOK REVIEWS

are included the power of enactment affecting amenity rights, the invasion of privacy, harm resulting from nuisance, environmental legislation affecting the quality of life, and inspection of weights and measures. These authorities are empowered to control profit margins for essential commodities on the ground of *Ona'ah* (price fraud) — the profit margins being fixed at a maximum of one sixth. Similarly, restraint is placed on 'unjust enrichment' resulting from the bestowal of unsolicited benefits which demand payment from the beneficiary. This differs from the case of communal projects which benefit every member of the community, since the levying of taxes is involved from which no one can claim exemption.

Deception in business representation on the part of the vendor as to true market value or quality of the goods offered for sale is clearly a case of *Ona'ah*. Credit purchase and deferred payments schemes which involve higher charges for commodities are Halakhically indefensible on the grounds of *Ribbit* (usury, excessive interest charges). Akin to *Ona'ah* is *Ona'at devarim* — fraudulent conduct causing mental anguish. This is applicable to the purchaser as well as to the vendor when, for example, the purchaser indulges in 'comparison shopping'.

One of the problems which has exercised the attention of leading Halakhic scholars is the method by which revenue may be raised to finance public sector projects which involve debt creation, the repayment of which would not contravene the interdict of *Ribbit*. A number of solutions have been offered, some of which are highly convoluted applications of the *Heter Iska* — a form of partnership agreement in which reservations are made regarding the sharing of profit and loss. Others propose the issuing of promissory notes which are sold to third parties on a discount in order to recoup by a cash advance. The most questionable is the suggestion that money bearing high interest rates be borrowed from non-Jews to whom the *Ribbit* prohibition does not apply.

Dr Levine has based his presentation on Talmudic sources, the later Codes, and the Responsa of mediæval and more modern Rabbinic authorities — a true mirror of his vast erudition. The reader, be he scholar or layman, will be greatly assisted by the excellent glossary of secular and Hebrew technical terms as well as by the superb index. But one question will remain uppermost in his mind. Is this an academic exercise or has it practical application? The Halakhah as presented emerged from a closely knit community which voluntarily submitted to the rulings of the Rabbinic authorities even in matters of civil law. Would all these regulations, superbly ethical as they are, prove viable in the Jewish State of Israel where the legal system is such an admixture of British, Ottoman, and Jewish law? As matters now stand, legal enactments are passed in a democratically elected Knesset which itself is subject to a party system in which Conservative, Liberal, and

BOOK REVIEWS

Socialist principles are constantly at variance. Would the application of Jewish law in its totality require a theocracy? That is the question.

ISAAC LEVY

HAROLD POLLINS, *A History of the Jewish Working Men's Club and Institute 1874-1912*, 41 pp., Occasional Publication no. 2 of Ruskin College Library, Oxford, 1981, £2.00 (including postage).

For this brief history of the Jewish Working Men's Club in the East End of London, Harold Pollins meticulously examined available records as well as relevant reports in the Anglo-Jewish press of the period; and he was also able to obtain information from two or three men who had been members of the Club in their younger days.

There was full membership for women; but before we can applaud such a lack of male chauvinism in 1874, we learn that the Club 'was really a refurbished version of the Jewish Association Reading Rooms', which had women members (p. 3). It was the first Jewish club to be affiliated to the Working Men's Club and Institute Union, whose *Annual Report* for 1874-75 welcomed its formation and praised its 'extensive library and handsome reading-room, the tables of which are covered with journals representing all the languages of Europe'. Ten years later, in 1884, it was reported that 72 journals were provided at the cost of 22 shillings a week (p. 19).

Pollins pays tribute to the short-lived (1869-79) Jewish Association for Providing Free Lectures to Jewish Working Men and Their Families, which indirectly helped to create the Club. The subjects of the lectures and debates were certainly wide-ranging. In 1877 Professor Ferrier, F.R.S., lectured on the psychology of sleep, Arthur Waley on landmarks in Italian painting, and Alfred Henriques on 'The Ocean'; while the previous year Professor Garrod, F.R.S., had spoken on 'Geography from a zoologist's point of view'. The debates held at the Club showed an interest in such matters as women's suffrage, the Irish question, vivisection, and direct versus indirect taxation. Somewhat surprisingly, in 1892, the motion that cremation was the best means of disposing of the dead was carried by a large majority. In 1906, a motion to adopt the metric system of weights and measures was 'Carried nem.con.'.

Sir Samuel Montagu, later Lord Swaythling, was a generous supporter of the Club and its President for more than two decades. He died in 1911, having bequeathed £200 to the Club; but the following year saw the closure of the institution which he had helped to establish and foster.

It had been hoped that the Club would attract the new immigrants and serve to anglicize them. That hope was not realized; and indeed,

BOOK REVIEWS

the closure of the Club was said to have occurred partly because of their lack of patronage. Lloyd Gartner, in his *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914* (London, 1960, p. 182), noted that the Club had a dramatic society, a glee club,

... and accommodated chess and draughts, athletics, swimming, and much debating. No other Jewish institution provided such opportunities for adults in the East End. . . . the immigrants . . . evidently preferred to take their pleasures in coffee shops and benevolent societies rather than in large premises, just as they turned aside all efforts to lure them away from their *hevrot* into large synagogues.

The Club also had several billiard tables, the game remaining popular to the end, and Harold Pollins tells us that it promoted such outdoor activities as rambling, cycling, football, and cricket, as well as indoor entertainments — concerts, dances, and whist drives. He adds that the Club 'acted as a marriage market, many members found their partners there' (p. 25). He finds it strange that the children of recent immigrants who had attended the Jews' Free School did not later join the Club. But one wonders whether the more anglicized Jews who were members would, in fact, have made them welcome. They had been urged in a lecture in 1876 to help their foreign brethren 'to become true Englishmen . . . and yet remain good Jews' (p. 17). But at the turn of the century there was still a great deal of animosity; some of the more assimilated Jews had appeared as witnesses before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration (1903), deploring the arrival of their foreign co-religionists. For their part, the newcomers might not have encouraged their children to join a Club whose members were anglicized to the extent that they played cricket, enjoyed whist drives, and put on performances of Gilbert and Sullivan operas. What if their son or daughter would wish to marry one of these assimilated English Jews? As Harry Pollins has commented (p. 32), 'Marriage between members of the two groups was often regarded with mutual horror.'

J. FREEDMAN

ALAN UNTERMAN, *Jews. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*, xiii + 272 pp., Library of Religious Beliefs and Practices (General Editor, John R. Hinnells), Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston, London, and Henley, 1981, £10.50 (paperback, £6.50).

This well-written book is more sociology than theology, an accurate description rather than an argument for any particular religious position. All three trends (a term the author prefers to 'denominations' which, he suggests, invites misleading comparison with Christianity) in religious Jewry — Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform — are treated quite objectively and with scrupulous fairness despite Dr

BOOK REVIEWS

Unterman's own evident Orthodox leanings. The work does not pretend to be a full account of Judaism, only of the religious beliefs and practices of contemporary Jews. The whole area of Jewish ethics is intentionally ignored not because it is held to be in any way unimportant but because in the ethical sphere, for all the differences in nuance, all members of Western society are in basic agreement. The book addresses itself to the specifics of Jewish life and faith; it aims to provide the intelligent reader, Jew or non-Jew, with information on what it is that makes religious Jews 'tick'. In this aim it succeeds admirably. The work is popular in the best sense; it is based both on wide reading and on the actual living of a committed Jewish life. Dr Unterman gives the lie to Renan's famous dictum that a religion can be understood properly only by a former adherent who is now an outsider.

The author's studious avoidance of anything that might be considered polemical, understandable enough given the nature of the book and of the series to which it belongs, is none the less irritating on occasion, as when he observes that Orthodoxy has elected to maintain a low profile on biblical criticism and its challenge to the doctrine of revelation. 'Even the mere entertainment of the ideas of modern biblical scholarship, particularly those denying Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, is anathema to most Orthodox thinkers' (p. 39). As a sociological observation this is no doubt correct, but it cries out for at least some slight indication of whether or not Dr Unterman thinks such a view is tenable; and if he does, how it can be defended.

One or two minor observations. 'Cholent' is defined in the Glossary as a 'Sabbath dish of meat, potatoes and beans eaten by Ashkenazi Jews'. I am told that Sephardi Jews also eat it but call it *hamin*, and that they usually add hard-boiled eggs. Not all Orthodox Rabbis demand that members of the Bet Din be actually present when a female proselyte undergoes immersion, her modesty being protected by her wearing a loose smock. In many Orthodox circles today, the members of the Bet Din stand outside the *mikveh* with the door open and this suffices. On the subject of conversion generally, it is stated that the required preparatory period of study and reflection is longest among Orthodox Jews 'and may be prolonged by the Bet Din for as much as five years' (p. 15). In fact, this practice of demanding a lengthy period of study before conversion is contrary to the Talmudic law and appears to have been adopted by some Orthodox Rabbis who copied here the Reform requirement!

LOUIS JACOBS

CHRONICLE

The Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel published last spring data on the country's book trade in the year 1979–80; 4,381 titles were issued, of which more than half (55 per cent) were first or new editions. There were, in addition, 511 Government publications.

The large majority of the 4,381 titles (3,707) were printed in Hebrew, 264 in English, 159 in Arabic, 108 in Hebrew and another language (mainly dictionaries), and the rest in various other languages. Of the 739 titles with English as their language of origin, 179 were printed in English and most of the remainder in Hebrew translation.

About a third of all titles were in the field of literature (including poetry); 13 per cent on Judaism (the Bible, the Talmud, Rabbinical works, prayer books); 12 per cent on the natural sciences, mathematics, and medicine; 10 per cent were in the humanities (including history); and nine per cent on the social sciences and law.

There were 213 publishers in 1979–80; 989 textbooks for elementary and secondary schools were issued, but only about 40 per cent were first or new editions.

*

The Ministry of Education of Israel has announced that the number of Jewish pupils studying Arabic is increasing steadily: 103,000 in 1977, 121,000 in 1978, 138,000 in 1979, and 150,000 in 1980. There has also been a corresponding rise in the number of teachers qualifying to teach Arabic: 280 in 1978, 350 in 1979, and 450 in 1980. The Ministry has encouraged the study of the language by granting special incentives to schools which have made Arabic part of their regular curriculum.

*

The Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) stated in its Annual Report for 1980 that it helped nearly 28,000 Jewish and non-Jewish refugees during that year. A total of 21,472 Soviet Jews arrived in Vienna in 1980, and about two-thirds of them (14,509) asked to settle in North America, Australia, and other countries rather than in Israel.

HIAS also helped more than 400 Iranian Jews to be reunited with close relatives in the United States; others came independently. It is estimated that between 40,000 and 50,000 Iranian Jews have left their country since 1979, and that about 30,000–35,000 still remain.

The non-Jewish refugees who were resettled by HIAS include 5,517 Indochinese and 2,781 Cubans.

CHRONICLE

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York has been helping Iranian immigrants through three of its agencies: the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services, the Jewish Community Services of Long Island, and the Federation Employment and Guidance Service. An Ad Hoc Committee on Iranian Jews was established to co-ordinate various programmes and to work closely with the federal Immigration Department, HIAS, and the Washington office of the Council of Jewish Federations.

The Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services has given assistance to about 2,000 Iranian Jews, and the Jewish Community Services of Long Island have helped more than 1,700; both agencies have Persian-speaking staff, who deal with problems of health care, employment, housing, language training, etc.

The Federation has also provided scholarships for hundreds of Iranian Jews at yeshivot and day schools.

*

A follow-up survey in the United States on the status of women in Jewish communal service was presented at the annual meeting of the Conference of Jewish Communal Service (CJCS) last June. It showed that there was some slight improvement in 1981 in the number of women in the two top executive categories: from five per cent in 1977 to eight per cent in 1981. On the other hand, nearly half the men (45 per cent) are in these two top categories.

Only 3.5 per cent of the women, but 38 per cent of the men, earn \$30,000 a year. Almost three-quarters of the women earn less than \$20,000, while only one-third of the men are in that category. Moreover, no woman is in the highest salary bracket.

The 1977 and 1981 surveys were based on personnel data of more than 2,000 professional workers in 273 agencies, including Federations, community centres, family and child care agencies, homes for the aged, and hospitals.

*

A chair of Judaeo-Christian studies has been established at the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati, Ohio, and its first incumbent has been appointed.

*

The International Jewish Committee on Inter-Religious Consultations and the Lutheran World Federation met in Copenhagen last summer and decided to establish an international committee to foster closer relations between Jews and Lutherans. Lutheran prayer-books and school texts will be examined for anti-Jewish references.

*

An Editorial in the April 1981 *Official Bulletin of The Central African Jewish Board of Deputies* states:

We now number only about 1,900 souls in the Jewish Community of Zimbabwe . . . a considerable fall from the 'all-time high' of 7,000 in 1961 and even the approximate figure of 5,000 as late as 1975. One direct consequence has been the increased burden

CHRONICLE

placed on the remnant — and on the present leadership — in maintaining the institutions we have built up over some four generations, and in preserving the Jewish way of life . . . In spite of the foregoing, it is nevertheless a matter for congratulation that all the institutions . . . are still in existence.

*

The Aviv-WIZO Ladies' Association of Greece have built and equipped a public kindergarten and children's playground in Athens, in memory of the 13,000 Greek Jewish children who were killed by the Nazis. The mayor of Athens performed the inauguration ceremony, in the presence of the Minister of Industry.

*

The Society for Danish Jewish History, which was established in 1980, sponsored its second Nordic Congress on Judaica in Copenhagen last June; the opening session was held in the Department of Hebraica and Judaica of the Royal Library.

Copenhagen is also the headquarters of the Scandinavian Jewish Youth Federation, which was founded in 1919; 23 member organizations are affiliated to the Federation.

*

The Institute of Jewish Affairs (11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX, England) regularly publishes Research Reports. The 1981 Reports include the following titles: *The Islamic Approach to International Law; Terrorism and International Law; The 'Jewish Vote' in the French Presidential Elections; Antisemitism in the Western World Today; and Jewish Themes in the Polish Crisis.*

*

The Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research was established in 1980 in the University of Cape Town. The Centre is multi-disciplinary in scope; it encourages the participation of scholars in history, political science, education, sociology, comparative literature, and the broad spectrum of Hebrew and Judaic studies.

The Centre has initiated an Oral History Project on the Jewish community of the Cape before 1930. A Research Fellow has been appointed to organize the Project and to train a team of interviewers. Other regions of South Africa may be included in 1982, as well as German Jewish immigrants of the 1930s.

The Centre awards a limited number of research grants and of graduate and undergraduate scholarships.

*

The International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization was established in Jerusalem in 1980.

The Center's August 1981 *Newsletter* states that 'the aim of the Jerusalem Center is to initiate, stimulate and coordinate institutional programs, but not itself to become a competing academic institution'. The Center is compiling a 'World Directory of colleges and universities with Jewish Studies Departments and/or accredited courses in general and inter-departmental programs'; an

CHRONICLE

'*Inventory* to gather existing syllabi and textbooks in Latin America; U.S.A. and Canada; Great Britain, South Africa and Australia; France and Western Europe'; and an '*Annotated Register of Research* in Jewish Civilization including published dissertations, work-in-progress in the different regions, and conference papers'.

Information for the *World Directory*, the *Inventory*, and the *Annotated Register of Research* should be sent to the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization, c/o Office of the President of the State of Israel, Jerusalem 92188, Israel.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Bardis, Panos D., *History of Thanatology: Philosophical, Religious, Psychological, and Sociological Ideas Concerning Death from Primitive Times to the Present*, x + 89 pp., University Press of America, Washington, D.C., 1981, \$15.75 (paperback, \$6.75).
- Frankel, Jonathan, *Prophecy and Politics. Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862-1917*, xxii + 686 pp., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1981, £30.00.
- Frisby, David, *Sociological Impressionism. A Reassessment of Georg Simmel's Social Theory*, xi + 190 pp.; Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1981, £16.00.
- Katz, Jacob, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700-1933*, viii + 392 pp., Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Ma., and London, 1980, £12.00.
- Kosmin, Barry A., and Caren Levy, *The Work and Employment of Suburban Jews. The Socio-Economic Findings of the 1978 Redbridge Jewish Survey*, 39 pp., Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place, London WC1H 0EP, 1981, £1.50.
- Lemert, Charles C., ed., *French Sociology: Rupture and Renewal Since 1968*, xi + 445 pp., Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1981, \$41.60 (paperback, \$16.25).
- Melnick, Ralph, *From Polemics to Apologetics. Jewish-Christian Rapprochement in 17th-century Amsterdam*, viii + 95 pp., Van Gorcum, Assen, 1981, Dutch Florins 17.50.
- Schmelz, U. O., *World Jewish Population. Regional Estimates and Projections*, 72 pp., Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1981, n.p.
- Steinberg, Stephen, *The Ethnic Myth. Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America*, x + 277 pp., Atheneum, New York, 1981, \$14.95.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

- CARLEBACH, Julius; D.Phil. Reader in Sociology, University of Sussex. Chief publications: *The Jews of Nairobi*, 1962; *Caring for Children in Trouble*, 1970; *Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Judaism*, 1978. Currently working on a sociological analysis of early modern Yiddish literature for women and on issues in the sociology of medical knowledge.
- CROMER, Gerald; Ph.D. Senior Lecturer, Department of Criminology, Bar-Ilan University. Chief publications: 'Intermarriage and Communal Survival in a London Suburb', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. xvi, no. 2, December 1974; 'Drama as Catharsis and Catalyst: Two Ways of Preventing Delinquency', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, vol. xxii, no. 1, 1978; 'Gamblers Anonymous in Israel: A Participant Observation Study of a Self-Help Group', *International Journal of the Addictions*, vol. xiii, no. 6, 1978; 'The Israeli Black Panthers: A Case Study in the Politicization of Delinquents', *Howard Journal of Penology and Crime Prevention*, vol. xxvii, no. 1, 1978. Currently engaged on a study of pro-Soviet treason since the end of the Second World War.
- LAMBROZA, Shlomo; Ph.D. Lecturer in the Department of History, Boston College.
- ROFÉ, Yacov; Ph.D. Lecturer, Interdisciplinary Department of Social Sciences and Department of Psychology, Bar-Ilan University. Chief publications: with I. Lewin and B. Padch, 'Affiliation before and after delivery as a function of repression-sensitization', *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, vol. xvi, 1977; with I. Lewin, 'Who adjusts better: repressors or sensitizers?', *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, vol. xxxiv, 1979; with L. Weller, 'Attitudes towards the enemy as a function of level of threat' in a forthcoming issue of *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*.
- WELLER, Leonard; Ph.D. Professor of Sociology, Bar-Ilan University. Chief publications: *Sociology in Israel*, 1974; co-author, 'Consanguinity Analysis in Israeli Mental Retardates', *American Journal of Human Genetics*, vol. xxix, 1977; with O. Jaffe, 'Social Class and Personality Factors: Acculturation of Young Samaritan Men' in R. P. Mahan and W. Wilke, eds., *Community Theory and Social Change*, 1981; 'Perception of Retardation and Parental Guilt Feelings' in A. Grahame, ed., *The Many Faces of Crime and Deviance*, 1981.
- ZENNER, Walter, P.; Ph.D. Associate Professor of Anthropology, State University of New York at Albany. Chief publications: 'Syrian Jews in Three Social Settings', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. x, no. 2, December 1968; 'Aqili Agha: The Strongman in the Traditional Ethnic Relations of the Ottoman Galilee', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. xiv, no. 2, 1972; co-editor, *Urban Life: Readings in Urban Anthropology*,

1980; 'Middleman Minority Theories: A Critical Review' in R. S. Bryce-Laporte, ed., *A Sourcebook on the New Immigration*, 1980; 'Censorship and Syncretism: Some Social Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Middle Eastern Jews' in Frank Talmage, ed., *Studies in Jewish Folklore*, 1980.

THE
JEWISH JOURNAL
OF
SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR Judith Freedman

VOLUME TWENTY-THREE 1981

Published by William Heinemann Ltd

CONTENTS

American Jewish Leaders from the Periphery by <i>Alan S. York</i>	25	Jewish Self-Defence During the Russian Programs of 1903-1906 by <i>Shlomo Lambroza</i>	123
Books Received	93, 163	Marx and Judaism (Review Article) by <i>Werner J. Dannhauser</i>	57
Chronicle	89, 159	Notes on Contributors	95, 165
Composite Portrait of Israel, A (Review Article) by <i>Walter P. Zenner</i>	141	Notice to Contributors	4, 100
Ethnic Group Prejudice and Class in Israel by <i>Yacov Rofé and Leonard Weller</i>	101	Repentant Delinquents. A Religious Approach to Rehabilitation by <i>Gerald Cromer</i>	113
German Jews and Antisemitism (Review Article) by <i>Julius Carlebach</i>	135	Urban History and the Pattern of Provincial Jewish Settlement in Victorian England by <i>Lloyd P. Gartner</i>	37
Integration of Ethnic Groups in Israel, The by <i>Judith Bernstein and Aaron Antonovsky</i>	5		

BOOKS REVIEWED

Carlebach, Julius, <i>Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Judaism</i>	57	Niewyk, Donald L., <i>The Jews in Weimar Germany</i>	135
Endelman, Todd M., <i>The Jews of Georgian England 1714-1830</i>	77	Pollins, Harold, <i>A History of the Jewish Working Men's Club and Institute 1874-1912</i>	155
Fawcett, James, <i>The International Protection of Minorities</i>	147	Ragins, Sanford, <i>Jewish Responses to Anti-Semitism in Germany 1870-1914</i>	135
Freehof, Solomon B., <i>New Reform Responsa</i>	147	Sidorsky, David, ed., <i>Essays on Human Rights. Contemporary Issues and Jewish Perspectives</i>	83
Goldstein, Israel, <i>Jewish Justice and Conciliation</i>	149	Stack, John F., <i>International Conflict in an American City: Boston's Irish, Italians, and Jews, 1935-1944</i>	86
Haberman, Jacob, <i>Maimonides and Aquinas</i>	79	Unterman, Alan, <i>Jews. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices</i>	156
Jackson, Bernard S., ed., <i>The Jewish Law Annual, Supplement One</i>	81		
Levine, Aaron, <i>Free Enterprise and Jewish Law</i>	152		
Marx, Emanuel, ed., <i>A Composite Portrait of Israel</i>	141		

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

Antonovsky, A.	5	Lambroza, S.	123
Bernstein, J.	5	Rofé, Y.	101
Carlebach, J.	135	Weller, L.	101
Cromer, G.	113	York, A. S.	25
Dannhauser, W. J.	57	Zenner, W. P.	141
Gartner, L. P.	37		

AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS

Finestein, I.	77, 147, 149	Levy, I.	152
Freedman, J.	155	Lipson, L.	83
Glazer, N.	86	Solomon, N.	81
Jacobs, L.	147, 156	Werblowsky, R. J. Z.	79

Competition and Control at Work

The New Industrial Sociology

STEPHEN HILL

'The central problem facing modern business is the impossibility of abolishing the conditions which create conflict in the workplace without destroying the present form of the economy.' With this controversial conclusion, Stephen Hill ends his wide-ranging study of competition and control at work.

The author has first hand research experience of British industry and considerable teaching experience; which make this book essential reading for undergraduate and graduate courses in industrial sociology and industrial relations.

cased £12.50 net
paper £4.95 net

The Inner City in Context

The Final Report of the Social Science Research Council Inner Cities Working Party

Edited by PETER HALL

This book defines Britain's 'inner city problem' in a year in which that problem has burst violently into public view. It sets out to identify the factors that helped to produce the decline of our cities, and outlines what kind of action is necessary to improve and change them.

Social Science Research Council

cased £12.50 net
paper £5.50 net

Beyond Welfare Capitalism

Issues, Actors and Forces in Societal Change

ULF HIMMELSTRAND, GORAN AHRNE, LEIF and LARS LUNDBERG

Faced with dead-locked capitalism, ossified state socialism and seemingly exhausted social democracy, this book examines labour's alternative proposals for economic democracy and the kind of 'welfare capitalism' of which Sweden was until recently the best known example.

cased £19.50 net

Diagnoses of Our Time

JOHN HALL

This book assesses the work of six recent social and political thinkers who offer us philosophies of history in both senses of the word: an analysis of our social condition and of the philosophy of social science. It considers Herbert Marcuse, Jürgen Habermas, Daniel Bell, Ralf Dahrendorf, Raymond Aron and Ernest Gellner.

cased £16.50 net

Sociological Impressionism

A Reassessment of Georg Simmel's Social Theory

DAVID FRISBY

Intended as a critical introduction to Georg Simmel's sociology, this study seeks to locate the rich diversity of his social theory within its historical context.

cased £14.95 net



Heinemann Educational Books

22 Bedford Square, London WC1B 3HH