THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published on behalf of Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd
by William Heinemann Ltd

VOLUME XXVI : NUMBER 2 : DECEMBER 1984

CONTENTS

Editor: Judith Freedman

ISSN 0021–6534

OBJECTS AND SPONSORSHIP OF THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

The Jewish Journal of Sociology was sponsored by the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress from its inception in 1959 until the end of 1980. Thereafter, from the first issue of 1981 (volume 23, no. 1), the Journal has been sponsored by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Limited, which is registered as an educational charity and has as its main purposes the encouragement of research in the sociology of the Jews and the publication of The Jewish Journal of Sociology. The objects of the Journal remain as stated in the Editorial of the first issue in 1959:

> '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.'

The founding Editor of the *JJS* was Morris Ginsberg, and the founding Managing Editor was Maurice Freedman. Morris Ginsberg, who had been Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics, died in 1970. Maurice Freedman, who had been Professor of Social Anthropology at the London School of Economics and later at the University of Oxford, succeeded to the title of Editor in 1971, when Dr Judith Freedman (who had been Assistant Editor since 1963) became Managing Editor. Maurice Freedman died in 1975; since then the Journal has been edited by Dr Judith Freedman.

William Heinemann Ltd have acted throughout as publishers on behalf of the sponsors.

Applications for subscriptions and enquiries regarding back numbers should be addressed to:

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

TELEPHONE: 01 262 8939

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Volume XXVI : Number 2 : December 1984

CONTENTS

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY, IN JUNE AND DECEMBER
on behalf of Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd
by William Heinemann Ltd

(Published by the World Jewish Congress 1959–80)

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

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

BOOKS REVIEWED

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. If there are two or more authors, the thirty offprints are shared between them.

THE PRESENT ERA IN JEWISH EDUCATION: A GLOBAL COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Bernard Steinberg

PREOCCUPATION with the future has become, especially since 1945, a recurring theme in the deliberations and the literature of Jewish communal leaders and academics both in Israel and in the Diaspora. It has long been accepted that the survival of any Jewish community as a viable entity is inextricably linked with the effectiveness and success of its Jewish educational system. Yet it remains an anomaly that only in recent years has there emerged an awareness of the need for a systematic and analytical understanding of all aspects of contemporary Jewish education, and in particular its problems and its shortcomings. The creation in 1964 of The World Council on Jewish Education, the subsequent establishment in Jerusalem of a Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, and a series of international conferences and colloquia represent some of the attempts to comprehend the entire issue within a global context.[1]

There is a need to produce a viable theoretical and conceptual framework and a systematic methodological scheme for the applied study of contemporary systems of Jewish education. Meanwhile, this exploratory paper presents an overview of the main related substantive material, of necessity selective in detail, and concentrating on the Diaspora, as a tentative introduction.

Bearing in mind the experience of comparative research in the wider field, such a task is not a mere academic exercise *in vacuo*. On the contrary, it takes account of the practical nature of existing studies, and of publications by such international agencies as UNESCO, the World Bank, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, as attempts to understand and alleviate various aspects of the acknowledged crises in world education as a whole.[2] Similarly, the emergence of the sociology of education as an applied discipline in its own right constitutes one of the most important developments in the social sciences since the beginning of the 1960s. The nexus between the social, political, and economic orders and the process of education,

with specific reference to Jewry, requires much systematic investigation.[3] The Jewish setting need not be considered as an isolated phenomenon, even if it does have its own distinctive characteristics. In fact, many valuable insights and perspectives can be derived from that wider field and applied to issues relating to Jewish education.

While group survival can be cited as one of the cardinal aims of all modern educational systems, the specific Jewish example provides details that are unique and unparalleled elsewhere, as indeed is the case of Jewish history as a whole. The presentation of data and examples through self-contained case studies could ideally also provide a base on which to construct global models in an attempt to confirm or refute certain assumptions and theories relating to Jewish education.

In contemporary Jewish studies, Jewish history has been depicted as a series of clearly defined eras, each with its own centres of greatness and each characterized by its own distinctive systems of education. In historical terms, these systems fulfilled two crucial functions: they ensured group survival, and they added to the spiritual and cultural heritage of future generations.[4] Against this background, post-1945 Jewry is manifestly at the threshold of a new era, correspondingly related to events within world history as a whole. In the past four decades there have been new centres of Jewish settlement, and tremendous changes in demographic patterns and Jewish identity which have in turn produced new problems, issues, and dimensions in Jewish education.

Throughout Jewish history, either of two sets of prevailing conditions has exerted its own special influence. On the one hand, there have been centuries in which Jewish communities developed in comparative isolation — intentionally as well as through the force of historical circumstances. Two such examples, far removed in every other respect, were to be found in Biblical times and in the situation of Jews in Christian Europe until the advent of emancipation and the Enlightenment. By contrast, there were those eras in which Jewish life and thought were significantly influenced by other cultures and civilizations — by Hellenism, Arab civilization, Renaissance Italy, and in the rise of German *Haskala* in the eighteenth century. In ancient Hellenic times Jewry differed radically from all other cultural, religious, and national groups, in its comparative resilience in the face of the dominant civilization. It was able to survive by effecting a compromise, by coming to terms through a form of acculturation. A similar resilience can be detected in the process of cultural symbiosis during the heyday of the encounter with Islam. On the other hand, in Renaissance Italy and in the eighteenth-century German States the general consequence for Jewry was that of erosion through cultural and structural assimilation.[5]

With the advantage of historical hindsight, some basic characteristics can be seen to distinguish the present era. First and foremost, there

is the Israel-Diaspora dichotomy. Second, there is the phenomenon of the open, plural societies in which virtually all Western Diaspora communities are located today. Third, there is the universal contemporary ideal of education as a human right.

Perhaps the crucial difference between previous eras and the contemporary situation is that one of the dominant realities in the Western World today is the plural society. Moreover, it is Western civilization which constitutes the most important extraneous influence upon Jewish life in both Israel and the Diaspora. As a result largely of mass migrations and the emergence of new attitudes towards minorities, Jewish Diaspora communities no longer find themselves, as they did in the past, as solitary alien elements within their respective host societies. In this post-1945 environment, Jewish education thus functions to an important degree under circumstances without historical precedent.

The situation is further compounded by recent and current developments in the general field of education. The advent of the education explosion in most countries of the world has brought in its wake a constantly changing plethora of educational theories and ideologies, as well as a preoccupation with futurology. Inevitably, Jewish educationists are influenced by these factors, if only by virtue of the fact that much of their own professional pedagogic preparation is largely based on non-Jewish texts. Hence conditions exist for the judicious and beneficial use of ideas and policies from other sources as a means towards attaining the goals of Jewish education, without compromising its own principles.[6]

With all these considerations in mind, and with due reference to literature in the Jewish as well as the wider field, three interlinked composite factors are considered here. These are, first, the condition of Jewish education since 1945 in historical perspective; second, socio-cultural and political characteristics of individual Jewish Diaspora communities within the context of their respective host societies; and third, the dichotomous structure of world Jewry today, with its interdependent Israel and Diaspora components.

The Present Era in Historical Perspective

The impact of the Enlightenment and of emancipation upon Jewish communal structure, socio-cultural patterns, and individual identity has by now become an established theme among social scientists and writers on contemporary Jewish history. The familiar emergent model is that of Jewish communities as sub-groups or religio-ethnic minorities within open host societies.[7]

Immediate pre-emancipation Diaspora history has been depicted —admittedly, with certain exceptions — largely within the context of Jewish communities as self-contained entities, as characterized by the

ghetto, the *mellah*, and the *shtetl*. Such communities functioned with great success as viable social and cultural entities, but they did so for the most part in virtual isolation from outside influences. Thus, the educational institutions of Diaspora Jewry until the modern era were characteristically those of comparatively self-contained and often even isolated social and cultural entities. The most familiar of these — the *Heder*, the *Talmud Torah*, and the Yeshiva of eastern Europe — were without dispute remarkably successful in attaining their primary educational goals in terms of group survival, high standards of corporate life, and character formation. The fact that they were in due course regarded as archaic can be attributed to processes of social and cultural change, in particular to the consequences of the post-1881 mass migrations from eastern Europe to the open societies of the West.[8]

Contemporary Diaspora Jewish life as a process of reconciling two cultures proceeded against the background of the emergence over the past century of national systems of education that are today free, compulsory, and in most cases secular.[9] In those countries to which Jews emigrated, particularly North and South America and Western Europe, they took advantage of the educational opportunities provided by the State. The educative function of the Jewish family milieu was drastically reduced. Inevitably, Jewish education was relegated to a part-time pursuit, and all too often it was totally discarded. The consequences are sufficiently manifest today.

In the history of modern Jewish education, the dominant preoccupation became that of the struggle to adapt to new conditions. Such episodes as the creation of the short-lived *Kehilla* in New York and its more durable by-product, the Bureau of Jewish Education, have provided valuable object lessons for policy-makers. From these beginnings there developed the first attempts to come to grips with the reality of modern conditions, by devising the new organizational structures, policies, and goals that have come to characterize Jewish education in the United States and elsewhere in the Western World.[10]

In the Jewish communities of Germany, Great Britain and France, educational policy until the Second World War was strongly influenced by a desire of the older-established and longer-settled leaders to integrate the outlandish newcomers as quickly as possible into the host society, as Germans, Englishmen, or Frenchmen of the Jewish persuasion. The *Philanthropin* School in Frankfurt and the Jews' Free School in London, both originating in the eighteenth century, perpetuated curricula dominated by secular studies and with a minimum of Jewish content. These prototypes were to be followed by a number of schools — often short-lived — established in Western Europe and North America during the last century. Here again, the account of the subsequent demise of most of these institutions, in that they sowed the seeds of their own destruction, provides a valuable object lesson.[11]

By the middle of this century, Jewish education in the Diaspora was predominantly a part-time pursuit, essentially voluntary in nature, and subordinated to the contingencies of full-time schooling and its associated activities. Largely sponsored by communal and congregational sources, the new systems reflected a further characteristic of modern Jewry, namely its own pluralistic ideological and organizational structure. In keeping with such subdivisions as Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism in the United States, for example, a corresponding fragmentation developed in the ideologies and allegiances of twentieth-century Jewish educational systems.

The pattern had already been established in the Jewish communities, now tragically defunct, of the successor States of eastern Europe during the interwar decades, with their Zionist, Yiddishist, and Orthodox school systems in an uneasy state of co-existence.[12] Such ideological divisions today cut across local Jewish communities, in complete contrast to the hitherto predominantly monolithic *Kehilla* tradition of pre-emancipation times.

The cumulative effects of the Second World War, the destruction of European Jewry, and the establishment of the State of Israel upon Jewish education are all crucially significant in any understanding of present-day systems. The subsequent upsurge of concern for Jewish education on the part of community leaders as well as education policy-makers is attributed to reactions to these momentous events. Notable among these reactions was the realization that the surviving Jewish communities could no longer turn to the spiritual and cultural resources of eastern European Jewry. Simultaneously, the advent of Jewish statehood provided a new impetus in every aspect of educational provision, from the organizational sphere to the day-to-day activities in the classroom.[13]

Another crucial factor is the nature of the host societies of Diaspora Jewish communities. The drastic social changes wrought in the post-1945 Western world, particularly in Europe and North America, resulted in part from a series of mass migrations involving national and ethnic groups. As a comparatively minor part of this phenomenon, the mass emigration of old-established Jewish communities from Islamic countries, and of many survivors of the Holocaust — mainly to Israel, and also to Western Europe and North America — was to exert its own influence on World Jewry. Ethnic minorities whose group identity is based on religious, national, or racial differences, with resultant distinctive social and cultural traits, have virtually everywhere been involved in educational issues and even controversies. Educational policy in all Western countries, and incidentally also in the USSR, is to an important degree concerned with plural societies over such questions as those of integrated schools and of separate amenities for minorities.[14]

Against this background it would be apposite to survey national education policies in respect to ethnic minorities, and to attempt an assessment of their implications and consequences for local Jewish communities. Most of the countries concerned have experienced an upsurge of ethnic consciousness on the part of their minority groups. Former policies of absorption by assimilation on the one hand, or of institutionalized separation on the other, are now largely replaced by acknowledging and respecting differences within an open society.[15] The extent to which this approach encourages the preservation of distinguishing traits, not least of all through the medium of education, has a bearing on Diaspora Jewry.

Within this context, three noteworthy features distinguish Jewish education during the post-1945 years from the earlier decades of this century. The first concerns a series of efforts to organize and co-ordinate Jewish education across national boundaries: a conference in Paris in October 1946 which set up the United Jewish Educational and Cultural Organisation (UJECO) and the extension of older-established activities of such organizations as the Alliance Israélite Universelle and the American Joint Distribution Committee represent the first steps towards a global approach to the goals of education for survival.[16] Of equal importance is the increasing interest, influence, and active participation of organizations ranging from the Jewish Agency to the Lubavitch Movement in the sphere of education and culture in the whole Diaspora.

Second, there is the emergence of the Jewish day school which, given modern contingencies, has become acknowledged by communal leaders and policy-makers as the most effective educational agency in the Diaspora. Empirical studies relating to the efficacy and shortcomings of day-school education have come to assume a special relevance in recent years, precisely because of their practical import.[17] Those for and those against Jewish day schools have considered the implications of a self-contained Jewish educational system within an open society for the Western Jew living in two cultures. In this way the debate has often assumed sociological, anthropological, and even psychological frames of reference. Day schools are also to be considered in relation to other comparable agencies — supplementary classes, youth movements, and summer camps; while in a number of countries there are special classes for Jewish pupils in state schools. Today, therefore, the day school is but one of several policy options for the provision of Jewish schooling.

As the third noteworthy feature, the influence of the State of Israel merits special attention. Admittedly, the many day schools and Yeshivot of the ultra-Orthodox (mainly Hassidic) communities of North America and Western Europe adopt a marked anti-Zionist attitude towards the State of Israel and its official institutions. Nevertheless, because of its centrality in contemporary Jewish history,

the Jewish State has a special place within the curricula of most systems of Jewish education today.[18] For example, the presentation of Hebrew as a living language lends an invaluable aura to what in many cases hitherto tended to be remote and even irrelevant. The same applies to the religious content, hitherto in so many of the new Diaspora communities the main problem area in the syllabus. In fact, the very reality of Israel is such that it has become the medium, the setting, and the resource centre of the educational process in the Diaspora.[19]

Socio-Cultural and Political Aspects of Contemporary Jewish Education

In the Diaspora, each community has an individual profile tempered by the historical interaction with the social, political, and economic forces of its nation-based host society, in addition to the more immediate distinctive features of the local community itself.[20] Therefore, any study of contemporary Jewish education must take account not only of the specifically Jewish historical and religio-cultural foundations, but also of the influence of the wider setting beyond the Jewish community. Thus, national education policy in various countries regarding two issues — religion and ethnic minorities — has become a significant factor in planning Jewish education.[21]

In Great Britain and the Netherlands, for example, the State has for many years provided generous financial support for denominational schools, while striving to avoid the imposition of its own rigid controls. Under such conditions Jewish day schools, alongside those of other religious denominations, have had since 1945 the potential to expand. In the case of Great Britain, where by the terms of the 1944 Education Act generous support was available, the Jewish community was comparatively tardy in taking advantage of this situation.[22] In Canada, where in various provinces legislation now provides for language instruction for various foreign immigrant groups, Hebrew and Yiddish have been accorded official recognition within the curricula of some public school systems. A number of school boards in the United States have granted similar recognition to Hebrew. In France, the mass immigration in the 1950s of North African Jews has resulted in a revival of communal activity and consciousness as well as in some expansion of existing educational amenities.[23] However, the Jewish educational provisions remain inadequate to this day, probably as a result of traditional French policy which until the 1960s maintained non-denominational, secular schooling as the basic form of education.

In the United States and France, with their tradition of separation between Church and State, the consequent establishment of secular public schooling has been complemented by the creation of independently supported (mainly Catholic) school systems. As for the vexed questions of State aid to denominational schools and of religious

instruction in the public school system, it is interesting to note the contrasting attitudes of the Catholic and Jewish communities. The Catholic Church in both countries has been generally uncompromising in advocating the allocation of public funds for denominational schools, while the Jewish leadership has at best been divided, with the general consensus against state subsidies. It is noteworthy that the Orthodox sector of American Jewry consistently refused to consider such subsidies and established and maintained its own day schools. That policy was to be subsequently followed, but to a lesser degree, by the Conservative and Reform Movements.[24]

Until recently, most Jewish communal leaders were in favour of a public education system in which children of all religious and cultural backgrounds are united under one common ideal. The reluctance of many Jews to find themselves exposed as the sole minority group, and the exception to the general norm, emanates from the painful recollection of pre-emancipation history. The common ideal is regarded as preferable to the conspicuous position of the Jew in a Gentile world.

A different situation exists in national states and provinces whose public education systems are influenced by Christian or Islamic ideologies, such as Argentina and other Latin American republics, Quebec Province in Canada, the Republic of South Africa, and Iran, Morocco, and Tunisia. In the local Jewish communities of Latin America, Quebec Province, and South Africa, the motivation for establishing and maintaining Jewish day schools — usually with the aid of minimal state funds, or none at all — stems from the perceived need to avoid exposing Jewish children to Christian doctrinal teachings; and a significant proportion of those Jewish day schools are not dominated by formal religious ideologies, but as a rule veer towards Zionist-secularist orientations. In addition, there tends to be a special stress on secular subjects, with the Jewish sector of the curriculum sometimes even constituting the problem area, both in the attention devoted to it and in the clarification and implementation of aims and objectives.[25]

Under Communist regimes, formal Jewish education, wherever it does exist, must at best function in an ideologically hostile environment or, more usually, as a clandestine activity. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to carry out appropriate investigations or gather data on contemporary conditions. Hungary and Romania exceptionally allow some Jewish educational institutions to function. As for Russia, with its substantial Jewish population, the information derived from personalized accounts, oral histories, and reports of participant observers indicate that the existence of underground Jewish tuition constitutes one of the most inspiring episodes in the entire history of Jewish education.[26]

Turning now to the typical local Diaspora community in Western countries, here again pluralism is a further complicating factor. In place of the erstwhile monolithic *Kehilla*, there is a choice of formal religious affiliation. In addition, there are significant numbers of unaffiliated Jews, and various cultural, charitable or service organizations through which many give expression to their identity. Indeed, within many geographically compact local urban communities, both in Israel and in the Diaspora, one can still observe a full spectrum of Jewish identity. This element of intra-communal variegation inevitably affects education in its organization and policies at the local level.[27]

Administrative structures are often based on allegiance to particular ideological strands within any one given community. Separate systems, each to a large extent self-contained and independent, function within most of the larger cities with sizeable Jewish populations, especially in North and South America and in Western Europe. For example, in many cities in the Diaspora, intensive Yeshiva-type institutions of the Orthodox and ultra-Orthodox sectors function side by side with supplementary afternoon schools and Sunday schools under the aegis of other bodies. This multifaceted structure reflects the variety of responses to the influence of the host society and its culture. It also perpetuates the existence of inherently similar structures of interwar eastern European Jewry and of the *Yishuv* during the British Mandate. One of the consequences of this situation of internal pluralism is the quest for a curriculum which, in addition to the usual pedagogic considerations, takes into account the element of response to the host society and its culture.[28] The options of how far to adapt to this situation, or how far to reject it, are likely to remain urgent priorities.

There is a tendency to over-emphasise the role of day schools in comparison with that of other agencies. The majority of children in the Diaspora who are actually receiving some form of Jewish education still do so through the medium of part-time supplementary schools. Indeed, as the foremost contemporary agency of Jewish education, the supplementary school remains at the centre of ongoing problems and crises. The most urgent among these are, first, the shortage of suitably qualified teachers and of available school time; and, second, the school ethos of educational institutions which are inherently voluntary and at the same time subordinated to the mainstream education of the average Jewish pupil in the Diaspora.[29]

This inadequacy of formal Jewish schooling, whether part-time or full-time, has led to a quest for viable alternatives. In some countries, youth movements, especially those with Zionist orientations, perform a valuable educational function. Similarly, there are sporting, social, and cultural clubs, mainly for adolescents.[30] Of special importance, in view of the disproportionately large number of Jewish students in higher

education, has been the spectacular expansion of Jewish Studies departments at universities throughout the world.[31] Another recent development is the effective use of non-formal teaching and of educational alternatives ranging from *Havurot* to the family unit.[32]

There is an additional medium of Jewish education for which data, particularly in the form of statistical material, are lacking. This concerns children in the state schools who are allowed to receive their denominational instruction during normal school hours. In a number of countries, in accordance with a formal 'conscience clause' in education regulations, Jewish (and other) pupils are permitted to absent themselves from Christian religious instruction, should their parents formally so request in writing. A number of Jewish communities have negotiated with the authorities to allow their teachers to provide in the schools religious instruction for groups of such pupils.

In several countries there is legislation for such denominational instruction. In England, by an arrangement known as 'withdrawal classes', Jewish pupils (in common with those of some other religious denominations) receive religious instruction as separate groups on the school premises during normal school hours, from special teachers appointed by Jewish educational or communal bodies. There is a similar provision in Sydney, in Australia, for 'right of entry classes'. In Cape Town, a group of part-time teachers regularly provides instruction to Jewish pupils in government schools, under a special agreement between the South African Jewish Board of Deputies and the Cape of Good Hope Education Department. By contrast, the Education Department of Transvaal Province does not permit this type of religious instruction in the classroom.[33]

In a number of American cities, the legal prohibition against religious instruction in the state schools is circumvented by an arrangement known variously as 'dismissed time' or 'released time'. Pupils are permitted to leave the school premises, usually by curtailing the school day, in order to receive religious instruction in their respective places of worship.[34] In several cities, Bureaux of Jewish Education and local congregations have availed themselves of this arrangement in order to provide tuition for Jewish pupils.

With the various settings for Jewish education described above, the emergent global profile is one of inherent diffusedness, without any regular consistent policy patterns. This complex profile is further bedevilled by other factors just as pervasive. For example, there are the various ideologies, as reflected in the ethos of individual schools and in the communal response to official state education policies. Within the wider context, in nation-based plural societies with an unpredictable rate of social change, the resultant effects upon Jewish communities and their educational systems remain all the more difficult to assess.

Israel and the Diaspora

The study of education in the State of Israel is undeniably a valid exercise in its own right, as the abundant literature confirms. However, within the setting of World Jewry as a single entity, some aspects of this national system merit closer, more detailed investigation and analysis. Ideally, such an applied exercise would lead to the integration of certain key aspects of education in Israel, notably those relating to goal attainment, with their equivalents in Diaspora communities. While basic inherent differences will inevitably prevail, some form of closer relation between State and Diaspora education is not altogether a futile quest. Global monolithic-type systems, as in the case of Catholic and Muslim education, provide noteworthy cases for comparison and contrast.[35] Two fields of study are of relevance here. The first concerns those facets of education within Israel which have some bearing, direct or indirect, on Diaspora Jewry. The second emanates from Israel's estabished function as a combined resource centre, a location of educational institutions, and a source of educators for Jewish communities in the Diaspora. Before 1948, within the *Yishuv* under the British Mandate in Palestine, four self-contained and often mutually antagonistic systems of Jewish education existed: the 'General' Schools, those of the Labour movement, the Zionist religious *Mizrahi* schools, and those of the ultra-orthodox congregations.[36] These ideological subdivisions retain their vestiges to this day in Israel's schools.

Until 1967, there was a small but insistent element within Israeli society that regarded Israeli identity and Diaspora Jewish identity as two separate incompatible elements. This 'Canaanite' philosophy, while it has now almost completely receded, nevertheless serves as a reminder of the need to create and preserve a spontaneous condition of Israel–Diaspora interdependence as the basis of corporate Jewish identity. The point is best illustrated by some fundamental differences between the school curricula of Israel and of Diaspora communities.[37]

Apart from the few exceptions, Diaspora Jewish education in its aims and its content is inherently Israel oriented, irrespective of whether or not overt Zionist doctrines are involved. In Israeli schools, while the Diaspora is not totally overlooked, there is no equivalent prominence devoted to present-day Diaspora communities. Nor is the Zionist component similar to that of Diaspora schools. In the 1960s, *Toda'ah Yehudit* (Jewish Consciousness) programmes, which among other details involved the presentation of Judaism in the syllabuses of Israeli secular schools, were introduced in an attempt to convey to pupils the inextricable links between State and Diaspora. Israel's wars of survival combined with recurrent causes held in common with the Diaspora — Soviet Jewry provides the main example — have also served to consolidate such links by creating a greater awareness of the crucial

function of Jewish education in fostering unity and solidarity within Jewry as a whole.[38]

A potential cause for Israel–Diaspora divisiveness emanates from the religious issue. In contrast to conditions before 1939, secular-orientated Jewish education, usually Yiddishist in its ideology, has now become a far less influential factor in most Diaspora communities — with the only notable exception of Latin American communities. However, even there, the Yiddishist movements are in decline and the impact of their educational and cultural institutions has diminished accordingly. Diaspora curricula generally contain a marked religious component, even if the actual application of the goals very often does not reach fulfilment. In this respect there is a direct contrast with Israel, where the formal differences between religious and secular education are more clearly defined. This is despite the undoubted religious content in Government 'General' syllabuses.[39] It should be added, however, that the emergence in the past decade of the *Bet Sefer M'sorati* within the Government school system may yet provide a viable alternative to the extremes of orthodoxy and secularism. With their stress on a traditional approach to Judaism, and with official support from the Ministry of Education, the small but increasing number of such schools provide for children of all shades of religious background. An integral part of their curricula is devoted to religious knowledge and prayer. These schools are also characterized by active parent involvement, although many if not most of the pupils do not come from an Orthodox background.

Given the fundamental differences in identity and in corporate life between Israel and the Diaspora, the task for curriculum and organizational planners is to effect some form of compatibility in their respective educational goals.[40] In the remaining years of this century, such goals will emanate from the priorities of survival and unity. Similarly, the inherent problem areas and crises in the Diaspora can be matched in terms of urgency with comparable issues in Israel. Basic among these is the absence of a universal educational ideology, as opposed to the currently entrenched traditions of polarization and a clash of doctrines. In effect, these respective issues within education relate to the problems as a whole — assimilation in the Diaspora and fragmentation in Israel.

On the other hand, the establishment of the State of Israel has also served to reinforce and support educational systems in the Diaspora in a number of other ways. The appointment of Israeli teachers in Diaspora schools and the presence of Israeli youth leaders have in a number of countries provided crucial support for flagging systems of Jewish education.[41] In a number of Latin American countries, where local communities were hitherto not particularly distinguished by their religious standards, group loyalty has been reinforced by a closer

emotional involvement with the Jewish State; and this has led to an expansion of Jewish day schools. Similarly, in South Africa the Jewish day school system is strongly inspired by a 'traditional-national' ideology, based firmly on the tenets of Zionism.[42]

Perhaps the most notable event in recent years has been the increasing number of Jewish pupils from a variety of institutions in various parts of the Diaspora who have been spending a substantial part of their formal education in Israel, at Yeshivot, at universities, and at summer schools or camps. In a number of communities more and more groups of Jewish pupils, often accompanied by their own teachers, spend a school term, a semester, or even a year in Israel as an integral stage of their schooling.[43]

Towards an Appropriate Frame of Reference

The applied study of Jewish education in its contemporary global context has now begun to be accepted as a practical exercise.[44] But, as with similar work relating to other systems — national as well as cross-cultural — comparative perspectives do not provide an easy panacea for urgent problems. Nevertheless, World Jewry could fully utilise its own global agencies for the promotion of ongoing investigations and research, the maintenance of clearing-house type amenities for relevant data, and the publication of a journal dealing with Jewish education in its international setting. On the other hand, there have been in recent years significant developments at the organizational level, involving such bodies as the Pincus Fund in Jerusalem, which sponsors local educational projects in the Diaspora.[45]

Contemporary issues, inherently local in nature, can be considered under two headings. The first comprises problems relating to the actual provision of Jewish education, and concerns such matters as finance, the availability of suitably qualified teachers, and enrolling and retaining pupils for a sufficient length of time to render Jewish schooling effective. Second, there are those issues relating to the actual process of schooling, such as teaching methods and curriculum material and content, which engender their own characteristic problems. Global perspectives and comparative studies — at the most simple level, placing two case studies in juxtaposition — provide a valuable practical dimension, as yet hardly utilised, for educationists and planners.

In the realm of research, official projects tend to be sponsored by local bodies with reference to local situations. A typical study would concern the provision for Jewish education in a large North American urban community. At the national level, the detailed statistical surveys carried out by the American Joint Distribution Committee in continental Western Europe provide valuable models for comparative

studies concerning such details as educational provision, financial policy, and the proportion of Jewish children receiving some form of Jewish education.[46] Research of this nature, extended to the entire Diaspora setting, can provide an authentic profile of the state of contemporary Jewish education. Thus, a number of recent statistical studies have not only charted profiles in terms of educational provision and proportions of children receiving Jewish education, but also set out projections for the future, with their policy implications.[47]

Within the wider context, beyond the specific Jewish concerns, it is noteworthy that Comparative Education as an applied academic discipline has for a number of years itself been undergoing its own form of identity crisis. The condition of contemporary Jewish education is inevitably influenced by changes and upheavals within the educational scene as a whole. This concerns not only the actual systems of education, but also educational ideas and philosophies. For example, the growing disenchantment with conventional schooling and teaching methods since the 1970s, and the corresponding expansion and development of non-formal education agencies both have clear implications for the Jewish case. Accordingly, the quest for alternatives, including (ironically enough) the synagogue and the family, has in recent years become a marked preoccupation among Jewish educationists.[48]

In sum, contemporary Jewish education presents a viable global frame of reference. The value of a comparative perspective lies in its attempt to utilise existing methodologies and data for the creation of more comprehensive models that can serve World Jewry as a whole.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture for a grant that enabled me to carry out the research for this paper, a version of which was presented at the International Research Conference on Jewish Education, held in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in June 1984.

NOTES

[1] 'For the first time in our long history it is now possible, nay it is becoming increasingly necessary, to apprehend the crises of Jewish education and to try to solve them': Azriel Eisenberg and Jacob Seeger, eds, *World Census on Jewish Education*, New York, 1968, p.5.

[2] See, for example, Philip G. Altbach *et al.*, *Comparative Education*, New York, 1982, pp. 453–468 and 505–33, for a cursory survey of the field and its related literature.

[3] For a perspective of the application of the social sciences to the study of educational systems in general, see Joseph Fischer, *The Social Sciences and the*

Comparative Study of Educational Systems, Scranton, Pennsylvania, 1970, pp. 3–51.

[4] This is, of course, a main theme in all modern histories of the Jews, beginning with Graetz's perception of the entire process as 'essentially the history of its culture, which has been kept alive by the whole people'. Quoted by B. Z. Dinur, *Israel and the Diaspora*, Philadelphia, 1969, p. 13.

[5] Again, these processes are described in detail in a number of standard Jewish histories. See, for example, Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vol. 13, chapter 57, New York, 1969.

[6] The influence of the ideas of John Dewey and other progressive theorists upon American Jewish educators already set the scene for this during the interwar years. See Walter Ackerman, 'The Americanization of Jewish Education', *Judaism*, vol. 24, no. 5, 1975, pp. 416–35.

[7] See Moshe Davis, ed., *World Jewry and the State of Israel*, New York, 1977.

[8] In the case of American Jewry, these pre-1914 institutions were described as 'a liability rather than an asset in an attempt to preserve Jewish life in this country': Alexander M. Dushkin, *Jewish Education in New York City*, New York, 1918, p. 103.

[9] Emanuel Gamoran, *Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education*, New York, 1924.

[10] Nathan Winter, *Jewish Education in a Pluralist Society*, New York, 1966.

[11] See P. L. S. Quinn, *The Jewish Schooling Systems of London, 1656–1956*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1958.

[12] Miriam Eisenstein, *Jewish Schools in Poland, 1919–1939*, New York, 1956.

[13] 'Pedagogically the introduction of Israel into the classroom offers a heaven-sent opportunity to bring a new approach to basic subjects and to enliven ideas whose presentation may have become dulled through frequent repetition': Bearice J. Barwell, *Zionist Yearbook, 1955–1956*, London, 1956, p. 402.

[14] Jacquetta Megarry, *et al.*, eds, *World Yearbook of Education — Education of Minorities*, London, 1981.

[15] See Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Ethnicity — Theory and Practice*, Cambridge, Mass, 1975.

[16] 'All of us have come to the conclusion that there is a pressing need for some kind of representative world body that can look at the problem of Jewish education in its totality. Today nobody is responsible for the co-ordination of Jewish education': *Report of Plenary Session of Conference of Jewish Organisations* (mimeographed), Geneva, 1971, p. 3.

[17] For example, Stuart Kelman, *Motivations and Goals: Why Parents Send their Children to non-Orthodox Jewish Day Schools*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1978; and Harold S. Himmelfarb, *The Impact of Religious Schooling: The Effects of Jewish Education upon Adult Religious Involvement*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1974.

[18] The entire issue of *Jewish Education*, vol. 42, nos. 2 and 3, 1973, is devoted to the place of Israel in American-Jewish education.

[19] For a presentation of the curricular issues, see Zvi Adar (trans. Barry Chazan), *Jewish Education in Israel and the United States*, Jerusalem, 1977.

[20] See Seymour Martin Lipset, 'The Study of Jewish Communities in a Comparative Context', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 5, no. 2, December 1963, pp. 157–66.

[21] See Alexander M. Dushkin, 'Analysis of Some recent Developments of Jewish Education in the Diaspora', *Scripta Hierosylimitana*, vol. XIII, Jerusalem, 1963, pp. 56–74.

[22] Despite the availability of trust funds, and also of government subsidies under the terms of the 1944 Act, it was not until 1958 that the Jews' Free School in London was re-established, after having ceased to function during the Second World War.

[23] See Elie Asseraf, *Les Talmudei Thora de Province — Enquête Socio-Educative*, Paris, 1978.

[24] See *The Pedagogic Reporter*, vol. XXIX, no. 1, 1977; the entire issue is devoted to the Jewish day school.

[25] See, for example, Chanoch Rinott, *Reflections on Change in a Jewish School*, Jerusalem, 1981, for a Mexican case study.

[26] The autobiography by Mark Azbel, *Refusenik*, London, 1982, contains some brief but illuminating references to this phenomenon.

[27] *Jewish Education in Toronto, 1979*, a series of reports issued by the Toronto Board of Jewish Education, is a comprehensive document illustrating this point in the case of one city with a large Jewish community.

[28] See Seymour Fox and Geraldine Rosenfield, eds, *From the Scholar to the Classroom — Translating Jewish Tradition into Curriculum*, New York, 1977.

[29] The problems of part-time education are of course an overriding concern throughout the Diaspora, and have occasioned a number of studies and reports. One such study is D. Belogrodsky de Shebar *et al.*, *Investigation: Causas de la Desercion en la Escuela Judia, 1975/76*, Buenos Aires, 1977.

[30] This is particularly important among South American communities. See, for example, the journal *Comunidad*, Buenos Aires, December 1980, for various articles on this topic.

[31] See Moshe Davis, *University Teaching of Jewish Civilization*, Jerusalem, 1979 (mimeographed).

[32] See Daniel J. Elazar and Rela Geffen Monson, 'The Synagogue Havurah: An Experiment in Restoring Adult Fellowship to the Jewish Community', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 21, no. 1, June 1979, pp. 67–80.

[33] In Great Britain, the annual Reports of the London Board of Jewish Religious Education and of the Jewish Memorial Council provide relevant information. For Australia, 'right of entry' arrangements are decribed in the annual *Reports* of the New South Wales Board of Jewish Education, and in *Report of Commission of Inquiry into Jewish Education in New South Wales*, Sydney, 1970. For South Africa, details are provided in *Reports* of the South African Board of Jewish Education and of the Religious Instruction Department of the Cape Council of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies.

[34] See A. P. Stokes and L. Pfeffer, *Church and State in the United States*, New York, 1964, pp. 363–66.

[35] James Michael Lee, ed., *Catholic Education in the Western World*, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1967, and S. M. al-Naguib al-Attas, ed., *Aims and Objectives of Islamic Education*, Sevenoaks, 1979.

[36] See Ruth Stanner, *The Legal Basis of Education in Israel*, Jerusalem, 1963.

[37] See Adar, op. cit.

[38] In July 1974, the whole issue of Israel–Diaspora links in education was the subject of a conference in Jerusalem, organized by the World Zionist

Organization Department for Education and Culture in the Diaspora, in co-operation with the COJO Commission on Education. See Issachar Katzir, ed., *A Selection of Articles on Jewish Education Prepared for the Conference of Educators from the Diaspora and Israel*, Jerusalem, 1974.

[39] A brief overview of the curricular issues is set out in Shevach Eden, 'Curriculum Development in Israel', in P. H. Taylor and M. Johnson, eds., *Curriculum Development: A Comparative Study*, Windsor, 1974. See also David Zisenwine, 'The Jewish Curriculum in Israeli Schools', *Jewish Education*, vol. 49, no. 4, 1981, pp. 30–33.

[40] See Norman Schanin, 'The Centrality of the Jewish People in Israeli and Diaspora Jewish Schools', *Jewish Education*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1979, pp. 6–13.

[41] A. M. Dushkin *et al.*, *Jewish Education in the Diaspora 5731–1971*, Jerusalem, 1971, pp. 41–83, is one of many sources providing information on the steady growth of these activities since 1948.

[42] See *Jewish Affairs*, vol. 37, no. 1, 1982, which contains a series of articles on Jewish education in South Africa, under the general heading 'Aspects of Jewish Education in South Africa'.

[43] A number of studies have confirmed the positive results of these courses in Israel. See, for example, Ronald G. Wolfson, *A Description and Analysis of an Innovative Living Experience in Israel . . . The Dream and the Reality*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1974.

[44] See, for example, *The Jerusalem Post Supplement*, 18 June 1984, for details of the World Leadership Conference for Jewish Education, being held at that time.

[45] *The L. A. Pincus Jewish Education Fund for the Diaspora — Report No. 3, June 1983*, Jerusalem.

[46] See the American Joint Distribution Committee's *Surveys of Jewish Day and Supplementary Schools in Western Continental Europe*, Geneva, 1959, 1962, 1966, 1970.

[47] For example, Harold S. Himmelfarb and Sergio Della Pergola, *Enrollment in Jewish Schools in the Diaspora: Late 1970s*, Jerusalem, 1982.

[48] Since 1976, annual Conferences on Alternatives in Jewish Education (CAJE) have been held at selected university campuses in the United States. Within the atmosphere of a 'total institution' there is an intensive programme of seminars, encounters, and exchanges of ideas for Jewish educators. See, for example, *Seventh Conference on Alternatives in Jewish Education*, Brandeis University, 13–19 August 1982.

FROM PARIAH TO PARVENU: THE ANTI-JEWISH STEREOTYPE IN SOUTH AFRICA, 1880–1910

Milton Shain

I

THE successful integration and emancipation of Jews within European society during the nineteenth century aroused an opposition and hostility referred to in Jewish historiography as the 'new' or modern antisemitism. A centuries-old medieval or Christian image of the 'evil Jew' was now transformed to fit a secular age and an industrial society.[1] Underpinning the literature and rhetoric of the 'new' antisemitism was an implicit, and at times explicit, rejection of modernity.[2] The Jews were blamed for those upheavals and disturbances which accompanied industrialization and modernization. Hostility towards them was a way of expressing antipathy to, and fear of, changing conditions that had indeed coincided with the emergence of the Jews from the ghetto. Having been on the periphery of society, they now moved to the centre — the apparent beneficiaries of the new order. In time the Jew came to symbolize, at least for the antisemite, all that was evil in the modern world, a world nostalgically contrasted with an idealized past age of order and harmony.

The rejection of modernity similarly underlay manifestations of antisemitism in South Africa during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In that country, however, it was not emancipation but large-scale immigration that led to an increased awareness of the Jewish presence.[3] The Jewish population, which had consisted of a mere sixty families in 1858,[4] totalled 49,926 persons (or 3.7 per cent of the total white population) by 1911.[5] The newcomers, mainly from eastern Europe, were attracted by the economic opportunities which followed the discovery of diamonds in the 1860s and of gold two decades later. Their influx therefore coincided with a 'mineral revolution' that radically transformed the social and economic fabric. As one historian recently observed: 'Old patterns of life were shattered, and men and women were hurled into new, foreign and threatening economic, social and political environments'.[6] A rinderpest epidemic in the early 1890s, sporadic plagues, and the devastating Anglo-Boer

War were additional sources of disruption. A post-war economic depression and a sustained drought further exacerbated distress and alienation.[7] It was within this context that the anti-Jewish stereotype evolved. While the Jew never became a political pawn in the European sense, his presence did serve, at least for some, as an 'explanation' for, and a psychological symbol of, dislocation and upheaval. This is most evident in the literary and social stereotype which developed before 1910.

The nature of the stereotype was inevitably influenced by the penetration of European ideas: this was an age of increasing literacy, improved communications, and large migrations which included a significant interchange between South Africa and Britain.[8] Moreover, 'a vaguely racial definition of Jewishness'[9] ensured that those traits traditionally associated with Jews would be ascribed to their co-religionists in South Africa.[10] And yet, notwithstanding this European influence, the negative image of the Jew that evolved in South Africa was firmly rooted in a historical context and a local milieu. It was, to be more precise, a product of the alien or exotic nature of the Jewish influx, the specific mode of Jewish–Gentile interaction, and the enormous upheavals in South African society in the four decades preceding Union in 1910. This paper examines the perceptions only of the white population. It would be almost impossible to gauge those of the black South Africans during that period since there is a lack of source material.

The arrival in the 1870s of eastern European immigrants following the discovery of minerals transformed the hitherto essentially Anglo-German Jewish community. Whereas the earlier settlers hardly penetrated the public consciousness — despite the formation of the Cape Town Hebrew Congregation — the new arrivals were conspicuous and could not be ignored. Their alien appearance and exotic manner made a marked impact on the popular mind. Within three or four decades, a vivid and unflattering stereotype of the Jew had evolved. This is most convincingly illustrated in the images presented in, and the responses to, *The Girl from Kay's*[11] and *Helena's Hope Ltd.*,[12] two stage productions performed in South Africa in 1903–04 and 1910 respectively. *The Girl from Kay's* was a musical and included one Max Hoggenheimer, a Jewish parvenu, while *Helena's Hope Ltd.* had three vulgar and unscrupulous Jewish characters.

The loud-mouthed Hoggenheimer was an instant favourite with South African theatre-goers and by all accounts the English comedian, W. W. Walton, delighted audiences with his portrayal of the wealthy Jewish financier of London's Park Lane.[13] Within five years, Hoggenheimer had become a household term, a symbol recognized nationally. Walton's performances alone, however, cannot have led to the stage character's rapid rise to fame and indeed notoriety. A fuller

explanation must be found in the social, economic, and political upheavals of the period and more specifically in the proliferation of D. C. Boonzaier's 'Hoggenheimer' cartoons. His cartoons, depicting a quintessential capitalist, had appeared since at least 1902 in *The Owl* and in the *South African News*, a Cape Town weekly and daily respectively.[14] It was, however, only ten days after *The Girl from Kay's* had opened in Cape Town that Boonzaier appended the name Hoggenheimer to his hitherto anonymous capitalist. Thereafter, the cartoon figure became a regular feature, symbolizing all that was evil in the world of mining and finance, a dominant issue in South African politics.[15] It was in this way that Hoggenheimer entered the lexicon of South African mythology, assured of an immortality quite unbefitting a character in a London theatre musical. Although the Jewish characters in *Helena's Hope Ltd.* failed to gain quite such a degree of eminence, they were nevertheless instantly recognized by South African audiences and it seems that the play's billing — 'A Mirror of Rand Life' — was fully believed. Certainly, both Jewish and Gentile reviewers agreed that the portrayal of Jews was not exaggerated.[16]

Quite clearly, the two productions struck a responsive chord in the popular consciousness. Only in this way can we explain the overwhelming critical acclaim of *Helena's Hope Ltd.*, the enduring popularity of Boonzaier's 'Hoggenheimer' cartoons, and the delight expressed by the audiences at W. W. Walton's portrayal of the Park Lane millionaire. The only apparent indication of opposition came from a group of Ferreirastown[17] Jews who threatened to disrupt the opening night of *Helena's Hope Ltd.* in Johannesburg.[18] It is possible that they had been forewarned by kinsmen who had seen the production in Cape Town, where it had been shown without incident some three months earlier.

The threatened attack did not go unchallenged. Stephen Black, the play's author, denied accusations of antisemitism in a lengthy letter published in the front page of the *Rand Daily Mail*, arguing that the play contained no villain and no Jew 'of the accepted stage type'. After all, he pointed out, the Polish Jew, Abraham Goldenstein, 'invariably came out on top', in spite of having to compete with people 'of a more cultured class'; and this was 'due to his shrewdness and wit'.[19] The play centres around the dishonest dealings of two Jews, Abraham Goldenstein and Samuel Shearer, who persuade a naïve Afrikaans girl, Helena Joubert, to part with her inherited farm. Unknown to her, but known to them, the farm contains deposits of gold. The plot revolves around attempts at retribution and it is ultimately only Shearer who manages to outwit Goldenstein — hence the playwright's comment that 'the one time Goldenstein is overmatched in business is when a Hebrew does it'.[20]

One wonders how the author could have denied the presence of villains in his production. In fact, Goldenstein owed his ascent from

bearded *smous* (itinerant pedlar) in the opening scene to opulent Parktown financier at the close to sharp and dishonest dealings. Shearer, too, is an unsavoury character. To add gloss to those already virulent anti-Jewish characterizations, the play includes Goldenstein's wife, an ostentatious and vulgar woman who had, according to *The South African Jewish Chronicle*, 'peregrinated from Petticoat Lane to Parktown'.[21]

Significantly, Goldenstein's accent is thick and guttural, an indication of the impact made by eastern European Jews upon the author. Indeed, these exotic newcomers made an impression upon South African society as a whole and contributed in no small way to the formation and nature of the anti-Jewish stereotype. Their presence obviated the need to invent or create (in Sartre's sense[22]) the Jew as an explanation for both social and economic distress. They were certainly a visible addition to a society in transformation.

II

In 1860, the aristocratic Cape socialite, Lady Duff Gordon, noted that the local Jews had abandoned 'the peculiarities of their tradition', if not 'the features of their race'.[23] But she spoke too soon, only a few years before the advent of those fortune-seekers who joined in the rush for diamonds. Indeed it was in the diamond fields — present-day Kimberley — that the foundations of an unflattering and invidious stereotype were laid. The motley assemblage of diggers included, according to a contemporary observer, the historian J. A. Froude, 'a hundred or so keen-eyed Jewish merchants . . . gathering like eagles over their prey'.[24] By 1880 Jews had become prominent in the commercial life of the 'diamond city', a role in which they attracted the type of opprobrium evident in the comments of Lewis Michell,[25] General Manager of the Standard Bank:[26]

> The departure of hordes of hook-nosed Polish and Lithuanian Jews whose evil countenances now peer from every little shanty and cigar divan would be a distinct gain to the community. Under cover of keeping a 'winkel' [shop] they at present flock to Kimberley from afar, like as-vogels [vultures] to a dead ox, and their villainous faces enable one easily to understand the depth of hatred borne to them in Russia and elsewhere.

These sentiments were echoed in a *Uitenhage Times* editorial following a complaint by 'Afrikander' to the *Tarka Herald*, a rural eastern Cape newspaper. 'Afrikander' had deplored the imprisonment of an English clergyman, the Reverend B. B. Keet, for a debt owed to a firm of Kimberley auctioneers, Rothschild Brothers:[27]

> We don't know the Rev. Keet, nor have we the least idea who 'Afrikander' may be, but we have met many Shylocks in our time of the tribe of

> Benjamin, and we can fully sympathise with the English clergyman and his Afrikander defender. These are the kind of Afrikanders we want in the Colony; if we had more like the Tarkastad 'Afrikander' and few Hebrews of the Rothschild type, the Colony would be better off than it is. It is a fact which few will be found to state publicly — but none the less true for that — that the Jewish race has been one of the greatest curses of South Africa. Of course we know that there are Jews and Jews, and that some of the Yeddin are honest and straightforward, and far more generous than most Christians, but they are the very infinitissmal [*sic*] minority. . . . If a few of those slightly bloodthirsty peasants could be imported . . . from South Russia, they would have gay times in Kimberley and the neighbouring villages — and the Jews wouldn't. All Houndsditch, Petticoat Lane — Pilomet as the people called it — and Seven Dials rolled into one could not produce such an aggregate of knavery and vice as the Hebrew fraternity of the Fields exhibit. The Afrikander Bond[28] should, as the old Kimberley song has it — 'Bar the Jews'.

Besides reflecting an obvious knowledge of conditions in London and Russia, the diatribe openly reflected a growing antagonism towards Jews in the rural areas where, as will be seen later, they were believed to cause distress and disruption. The comments in the *Uitenhage Times* also indicate the ease of transmission of ideas, in this case between London, the diamond fields, and the South African hinterland. One specific dimension of the stereotype which evolved in Kimberley, and which would persist for decades, was the association of Jews with illicit diamond dealing. In his study of early Kimberley, Turrel notes: 'If Africans were labelled diamond thieves by mineowners, "Cape Boys" and Jews were most commonly associated with illicit dealing'.[29] These generalizations are corroborated in contemporary fiction as well as in memoirs.[30] One writer noted:[31]

> . . . the IDBs [Illicit Diamond Buyers] were mostly low-class Europeans, many of them old Fagin types, who with the predatory instincts of their race and a precocious fondness for 'klippies' [stones] established a new Jerusalem on the Fields from the very first and continued to 'cock the wealth' and 'rule the roost' in certain corners of the Diamond City, even to the present day with a brilliancy fitting their origin.

In the view of many, the Jew, illicit diamond buying, and the seedy side of Kimberley became inseparable.

The diamond industry, and more particularly the formation of De Beers Consolidated Mines in 1886, introduced the reality of international finance and its alleged pernicious power. A contemporary observer warned:[32]

> This intrusion of the millionaire, of the living incarnation of the spirit of Mammon, into South African politics is a factor of the situation the importance of which cannot be overestimated. It represents the accession of a strenuous and persistent desire to make use, by every possible means, of

> disproportionate wealth for purely selfish ends, utterly regardless of the moral principles that may be violated and the lives that may be sacrificed in the pursuance of this desire. There is no kind of machinery which the incarnation of Mammon is ashamed to employ in furthering its aims.

The penetration of finance capital placed the Jews, the so-called pioneers of capitalism, in a potentially vulnerable position. Significantly, the De Beers group was by 1901 personified in cartoon caricatures by a vulgar and semitic-looking figure. The eminence of the legendary Jew, Barney Barnato, in the affairs of the company falls short as an explanation, since he had committed suicide in 1897. A more probable explanation is that once the Witwatersrand Randlords began wielding power in the 1890s, both domestically and internationally, all symbols of capital were depicted as semitic. The involvement of some English and German Jews in the gold industry and in the world of international finance merely confirmed and reinforced the current European image of the cosmopolitan Jewish financier. Before examining this dimension of the stereotype, it is necessary to look at the position of the Jewish pedlars and shopkeepers in rural communities.[33]

Objections to the 'Israelitish boereverneukers' (Jewish Dutch-swindlers) were raised as early as 1875[34] and farmers were warned, albeit jocularly, in a *Cape Punch* article of 1888 to avoid the 'boereverneukers' who were 'a stiff-necked and perverse generation'.[35] Jewish and English shopkeepers were even accused of influencing the election of candidates for local office through their hold on country commerce.[36] Moreover, in the South African Republic's presidential contest of 1892, Paul Kruger (the incumbent) was alleged to be under the influence of 'Israelites and Hollanders'.[37] This image of the manipulative and dishonest Jew must be seen in the context of late nineteenth-century urbanization and modernization. For the alienated and the landless — those constituting the incipient poor white problem — the Jewish shop was a symbol of greed and of dishonesty. Instead of being appreciated for their services, the itinerant trader and the small shopkeeper were held responsible for corrupting a rustic world of innocence and harmony. While the pedlar was a figure of fun,[38] the Jewish shopkeeper was derided for his competitive manner, his persistence, and his alleged dishonest dealings.

The most virulent of such views was expressed by Martin James Boon, an expatriate Englishman, who placed Jews together with Germans and Hollanders in his pantheon of hate. His writing displays notions of social Darwinism and Saxon superiority but little is known of Boon, apart from his arrival in 1874. The eastern European Jews, whom he accused of having driven the Dutch (Boers) from their land 'by craft', obviously made a marked impression upon this inveterate racist.[39] He did note, however, that the Dutch were beginning to recognize 'that under the sneaking 'ferneaking' [swindling] Jew,

German and Hollander, they are in the hands of Shylock, and that in having their pound of flesh, they lose their farms and that the Hebrews are their masters . . .'.[40] A similar view was expressed in the *Volksbode*, a Cape newspaper, which identified the Jew as the cause of Afrikaner poverty in the Oudtshoorn district, an area which was, significantly, heavily populated by Jews.[41] Also significant was the evidence to a Commission of Inquiry into Labour in 1893, which frequently indicated concern about the 'set in' or influx of Polish and Russian Jews.[42] With his predilection for commerce rather than manual labour, the alien Jew certainly was unwelcome in some circles.

The coincidence of Jewish penetration into the rural economy with the disruption of traditional agrarian life explains, to a large extent, the crystallization of an anti-Jewish stereotype in the rural areas by the 1890s. The identifiably alien Jew was, after all, the creditor or supplier of the struggling farmer,[43] and the image of an avaricious shopkeeper, living by his wits and bent on exploiting the Boer, is understandable. Most farmers did not realise that social changes of a structural nature were undermining their former well-being and security. Disturbing feelings of alienation and displacement were instead simply projected onto a readily available symbol of change.

III

Those Jews who came to South Africa after 1880 were less fortunate than their predecessors who had enjoyed the benefits of a rapidly expanding economy. Many of the newer arrivals were, as van Onselen notes, 'pushed into the life of the lumpenproletariat'.[44] Their conspicuous presence and geographical concentration, especially in Cape Town and Johannesburg, attracted a vicious brand of abuse. Their detractors focused essentially on the newcomers' predilection for commerce and their role as middlemen, which made them an unfortunate social acquisition. For example, at the very beginning of the eastern European influx in 1893, a Cape Town German newspaper, the *Zud Afrikanische Zeitung*, advocated banning 'tradesmen, brokers and canteen owners', the 'dirty proletariat from the Polish and Russian borders'.[45] The newspaper did, however, welcome educated and middle-class Jews, an indication that it was perhaps class prejudice and not racist social Darwinism which informed the anti-alien lobby.[46]

The influx of 'undesirables' — a euphemism for eastern European Jews — was a topic regularly aired in the Cape Legislative Assembly.[47] Antipathy towards them was perhaps predictable, given the unkempt appearance of these hapless migrants who disembarked in Cape Town after a lengthy voyage. 'The lowest class of Russian, Polish and German Jews, filthy and evil smelling, pass in succession through the dock gates' wrote H. S. Smith to the *Cape Times*.[48] Indeed, the Medical

Officer of Health for Cape Town, Dr A. J. Gregory, looked askance at these foreign arrivals and in 1904 described them as '. . . ill provided, indifferently educated, unable to speak or understand any language but Yiddish, of inferior physique, often dirty in their habits, persons and clothing, and most unreliable in their statements . . .'.[49]

Despite their impoverished appearance, the immigrants posed a challenge to the established mercantile class and their trading patterns in particular proved most repugnant:[50]

> Saturday by Saturday the 'Grand' — Heaven save the word — parade gets worse. The rotten trash that is put upon the sales there would be a disgrace to Petticoat Lane. Not only this, but the trade is now largely carried out by Polish Jews, who import — no doubt from other Polish Jews in London — the commonest off-scourings of Houndsditch goods. Then these greasy frowzy gentry stand around and sum up the things until whoever purchases is sure to be heartlessly swindled.

> The fact is Cape Town at the present time is full of those Polish Jew hawkers, who live in dirtier style than kafirs [*sic*] and existing on about half a crown a week rob the tradesman of his due. They don't pay rent, rates or taxes, yet they are allowed to sell goods just the same as if they kept a store. Respectable Europeans should order these people from their doors. That is the only way to put them down. Let these people do manual work.

Similar sentiments were voiced in Johannesburg where, by 1890, eastern Europeans accounted for about half of the Jewish population.[51] Residing mainly within a three-mile radius of the market square, they formed a conspicuous segment of the much maligned 'Uitlander' (foreigner) community. Soon, these struggling victims of Tsarist oppression were given the pejorative label of 'Peruvian' — a term of obscure origin.[52] The *Johannesburg Times*[53] deprecated

> . . . the apparition of a slovenly, unkempt and generally unwashed edition in various numbers of the Wandering Jew. As a sort of commercial shield he carries a basket of eggs on his right arm, while holding his money tightly clenched in his sinister hand. He wears no socks. He is a pariah among his own people and among the Gentiles . . . in tatterdemalion garments, until he has made his pile, . . . and he blows forth on the Stock Exchange . . . And presently he may rise a stage higher, he buys unto himself houses and lands which he will market to himself with great advantage . . . If some restraint is not imposed upon the operations of these unwashed peregrinators, it will be necessary to consider some legislative means for the isolation of the species, and for the protection of those who, either English or Dutch, have to earn their bread by that most wholesome of all exertions — the earning of one's bread by the sweat of one's brow.

The 'Peruvian', a classic pariah or outsider, was carefully distinguished from his acculturated and wealthier English or German co-religionists, the latter group achieving particular prominence on 'the

Bourse and in trade . . .'.[54] Many of these Jews had played a significant role in the economic development of the diamond fields and had now expanded the scope of their activities to the Witwatersrand. Some, however, had achieved financial success through the liquor trade and it was that group which found its interests seriously harmed by the South African Republic's prohibition of liquor sales to blacks from 1897 onwards. Faced with possible ruin, the merchants began trading illegally, exploiting their impoverished and desperate fellow Jews in these operations.

Even before that prohibition, eastern European liquor merchants had been assailed by the anti-alien lobby. For example, the government Inspector of Mines, J. H. Munnik, publicly referred to them as a 'depraved race', and 'without the slightest sense of decency and morality'.[55] Once the public became aware that Jews dominated the illicit liquor trade, these views were reinforced. In a series of sensationalist exposés, *The Transvaal Leader* definitively linked the Peruvian Jew with the liquor underworld.[56] Glaring publicity resulted from the gang murder of a Mrs Appelbe, supposedly for supplying information about the liquor gangs. 'How long', ran an editorial, 'is the community to be ridden by these monsters, by these NATHANSONS, the KATZENS and LEDIKERS and SCHLOSSBERGS and the rest of the off-scourings from a degraded European race whom they employ?'[57] The degree of contempt for the 'Peruvian' was reaffirmed at a public meeting in Boksburg when the Reverend Fagan warned that the 'Peruvians made the name of the white man stink'. They were, in his view 'moral Pariahs'. 'A Peruvian', he argued, was 'too acute and sharp in his liquor dealings to be a good citizen'.[58]

By the turn of the century, the term 'Peruvian' had become commonplace throughout South Africa. This was certainly so by the end of the Anglo-Boer War in 1902. In fact, that war had contributed to the diffusion of the term because many of Johannesburg's eastern European Jews had arrived in Cape Town as refugees at the outbreak of hostilities. Their presence exacerbated the nascent anti-alienism of the 1890s. Antagonism was sharpest, however, during the post-war economic depression when cartoon caricatures and some newspapers regularly besmirched the Jews in general and the eastern European Jews in particular.[59] The latter were, the *Cape Times* wrote, 'a MOST UNDESIRABLE CLASS', monopolizing the trade of Cape Town.[60] Some writers ignored even the most simple euphemisms and instead heaped abuse upon the immigrant Jewish community:[61]

> A disreputable-looking coterie of the parasites of the social fabric, standing a little apart, conversing in a gibberish of mid-Europe, bare-legged, frowsy-headed, shifty-eyed, and nervously sharp, ready to pounce upon the rough-handed sons of the sea as they come to land . . . The keen-witted specimen of the lowest species of the immigrant Hebrew race in unvarnished guise and

> unreserved demeanour . . . Rapacious foreign Hebrew who never risks his own life or safety . . . indignantly asks in pig English, 'Call that a fish? Vy, I will haf to give it away'. The Peruvian soon pockets his profit, and so he prospers from day to day.

Although unusually flagrant and provocative, such comments were not unique. In conditions of extreme austerity, the Jew was portrayed as the economic exploiter, the socially corrupt perverter of morality, the conveyor of filth, the unpatriotic parasite and, in some cases, the disloyal guest of the British Empire.[62]

The intensity and frequency of anti-Jewish acrimony waned once the economy had revived, but the 'Peruvian' or pariah image nevertheless survived. These people were, noted the *Transvaal Critic* in 1908, 'a class of degraded Europeans who plot in the dark, encourage crime by providing a refuge for the criminal and a depot for his plunder'.[63] The image of the 'verneuking' (swindling) Jew, so popular in the rural culture, also endured. The Jew had, as it were, risen on the back of the impoverished farmer — the so-called poor white. This was certainly the contention of one irate correspondent who, in a lengthy epistle to the *Cape Times*, complained that the Jew exploited the farmer, 'traded on his charity' and eventually planned 'the expropriation of his poor Dutch neighbours and customers'. Dutch girls, he warned, were not to marry into the 'Semitic strain'.[64] As if to sanction such views formally, an official of the Cape Government, P. J. Hannon, condemned the role of the 'Jewish speculator' and money-lender in the eastern Cape.[65] By 1910, the *Northern Post and Border News* could state with impunity that the Jews committed most of the frauds.[66] Clearly, the Jew was a readily accessible target for those who had been the victims of fraudulent dealings,[67] even when there was no proof for such allegations.

IV

A constant theme, expressed in the European tradition of antisemitism, was the apparent ability of the Jew to rise from a condition of pauperism to opulence; this was perhaps best exemplified in the writings of the notorious French antisemite, Edouard Drumont. For South Africans, it was the pariah or 'Peruvian' who underwent such a startling metamorphosis and gave rise to the anti-Jewish stereotype. It explains the juxtaposition of the pauper 'Peruvian' image with the image of the cosmopolitan financier. The notion of metamorphosis was apparent in the *Johannesburg Times*'s description of the 'Peruvian' (quoted above), as indeed it was on many other occasions. For instance, Councillor van Zyl, of Graaf-Reinet, when considering a Jewish immigrant's application for a hawker's licence in 1907, commented that such applicants 'started today with a bundle behind

their backs' and 'drove around a few months later with a cart and a flashy pair of horses such as . . . he and his fellow farmers could not afford'.[68] Similarly, J. Carver, a Cape Town labour leader, complained soon after the Anglo-Boer War that the alien Jew was a pariah who became a usurer and then a capitalist.[69]

The capitalist or the end-product of the metamorphosis from pauper to financier was exemplified in the Randlord or 'Goldbug' — the wealthy mining magnate who supposedly dominated the social and economic life of the Witwatersrand. J. A. Hobson, the *Manchester Guardian*'s correspondent in Johannesburg and later the doyen of the British liberal-left, certainly held this view. It was, he argued, a ring of Jewish international financiers who controlled the most valuable economic resources of the South African Republic.[70] Allegedly dominating the stockmarket,[71] the Jew had, as Claire Hirshfield states, 'come to personify an encroaching industrial civilization rapidly eroding spiritual values and the fancied virtues of a lost utopia'.[72] He was, in other words, the architect of modernity, a symbol of the city. If the De Beers group in Kimberley had introduced the spirit of Mammon to South Africa, the mining magnates consummated the relationship. They embodied everything the socially aggrieved had come to detest.

The nefarious role of international finance was revealed in the abortive British attempt to overthrow the Kruger regime in 1895. The so-called Jameson Raid awakened the liberal-left in England to the machinations of capitalism, confirming in the minds of the radical left 'the existence of a crucial nexus joining Jewish finance with British imperialism'.[73] Although these views were not systematically articulated in South Africa, their penetration can be assumed, if only because of the circulation in South Africa of British labour-oriented newspapers such as *The Clarion*.[74]

Even if the specifically Jewish dimension of the Raid remained dormant in South Africa, the same cannot be said about the role of international finance. From the time of the Jameson Raid, an economic interpretation of political events was inescapable.[75] The outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War merely confirmed that suspicion, especially for the pro-Boers in England.[76] Their argument that the British unionists were 'the tools of financiers, mainly Jewish',[77] gained adherents in South Africa. A Cape Town daily, for example, quoted with approbation one of Hobson's most vicious anti-Jewish diatribes in *The Speaker*.[78] The infiltration of Hobsonian and pro-Boer sentiment is evident in letters to the press — one correspondent, for example, warning against the Orange Free State and Transvaal gaining 'responsible', or self-government, because 'the Jewish gang of capitalists would have too much power'.[79] Cartoon caricatures of corpulent and semitic-looking financiers adorned the pages of Cape weeklies such as *The Owl* and the *South African Review*, revealing the inroads made by English pro-Boer ideology.[80]

The notion of a Jewish–capitalist conspiracy was revived after the war, this time in connection with the controversial importation of Chinese labour to replace the dwindling reserves of African labour in the mines. Henceforth, 'Hebrew Goldbugs' were frequently portrayed as responsible for the scheme,[81] while poems and satirical compositions alluded to a Jewish–Chinese take-over of Johannesburg — the 'Golden City'.[82] In Cape Town, some of those opposed to recruiting Chinese labour blamed the Jews,[83] while the British High Commissioner, Alfred Milner, was accused of siding with the mine owners to enable 'an alien plutocracy to crush a much larger section of the British people'.[84] The regularity of such charges provoked one 'Israel' to state in a letter to the *South African News* that it was 'time the current nonsense indulged in by thoughtless, ill-informed people about Jews being responsible for the coming of Chinese [to work the mines] have its quietness [*sic*]'.[85]

It was in that climate that Hoggenheimer, the Jewish parvenu, appeared upon the South African stage. Given the ostensible power of the Randlords, the imperialist nature of the Anglo-Boer conflict, and the impact of Britain's pro-Boer ideology, his transition from stage to popular culture is understandable. It is no wonder that within two years he became, in the words of South Africa's elder statesman, John X. Merriman, 'a classical character'.[86] Although Hoggenheimer's notoriety waned once the Chinese controversy was over, allegations of Jewish underhand activities were revived in debates concerning the Draft Act for Union in 1909, particularly by those who believed that the Afrikaner leaders, Botha and Smuts, were being manipulated by the mining magnates.[87]

By 1910, the cosmopolitan Jewish financier had become a visible component of the anti-Jewish stereotype, complementing the pariah or 'Peruvian' image. In the eyes of the antisemite, it was indeed the dishonesty of the pariah which had enabled him to achieve plutocratic eminence. Hoggenheimer, allegedly the *éminence grise* of South Africa, merely symbolized on a higher plane the machinations of the Jewish pedlar and of the illicit diamond and liquor dealers. Similarly, the upstart in *Helena's Hope Ltd.*, Abraham Goldenstein, embodied all the dimensions of the stereotype: in the opening scene of the play, he straddles the stage as an unkempt, bearded pedlar, only to become transformed, through his cunning intrigues, into a wealthy financier. His metamorphosis is that of the classic parvenu.

Conclusion

The anti-Jewish stereotype which had emerged in South Africa by 1910 was intimately bound up with the local stresses and upheavals engendered by the 'mineral revolution'. Although it confirmed and, in a way, reinforced the widely accepted European anti-Jewish

stereotype, the South African image was not simply its reflection. The caricatures of both Hoggenheimer and Goldenstein became deeply embedded in South African ethnic mythology. They were the products of an encounter between Jew and Gentile, specific in time and place. This encounter was determined by the role, or rather the perceived role, of the Jew as the creditor, the competitor, or the financier — perceptions facilitated by the European anti-Jewish image. For many categories of the social spectrum — the impoverished farmer, the unemployed worker, the competing merchant, and the frustrated businessman — the stereotype served as a psychological cushion. It was the universal scapegoat in an age of turmoil.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the Human Sciences Research Council, the Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research, the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, and the South African Jewish Board of Deputies for their financial assistance towards research for this study. I am also grateful to Edna Bradlow, Sally Frankental, Lloyd P. Gartner, and Charles Liebman for their helpful criticism and suggestions.

NOTES

[1] See Jacob Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Antisemitism 1700–1933*, Cambridge, Ma., 1980.

[2] See, for example, George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*, New York, 1964; Jacob L. Talmon, *The Myth of the Nation and the Vision of Revolution*, London, 1981; and Stephen Wilson, *Ideology and Experience. Antisemitism in France at the Time of the Dreyfus Affair*, London, 1982.

[3] There were, in fact, no professing Jews to emancipate. Non-Protestants had been denied the right to settle at the Cape during the rule of the Dutch East India Company (1652–1795). This practice was abrogated under the enlightened Batavian Administration (1803–06) and maintained thereafter by their administrative heirs, the British, from 1806 onwards. For the early history and genesis of the Jewish community, see Louis Herrman, *History of the Jews in South Africa: From the Earliest Times to 1895*, Johannesburg, 1935 and *The Cape Town Hebrew Congregation. A Centenary History, 1841–1941*. See also Israel Abrahams, *Birth of a Community. A History of Western Province Jewry From Earliest Times to the End of the South African War, 1902*, Cape Town, 1955.

[4] Abrahams, op. cit., p. 14.

[5] See Gideon Shimoni, *Jews and Zionism: The South African Experience 1910–1967*, Cape Town, 1980, p. 5.

[6] Dan O'Meara, *Volkskapitalisme. Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism 1934–1948*, Johannesburg, 1983, p. 67.

[7] David Welsh, 'The Growth of Towns', in Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson, eds., *The Oxford History of South Africa*, vol. II, London, 1971.

[8] D. Ticktin, *The Origins of the South African Labour Party*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cape Town, 1973, p. 2.

[9] See Michael R. Marrus, *The Politics of Assimilation: A Study of the French Jewish Community at the Time of the Dreyfus Affair*, London, 1971, p. 3.

[10] A Jewish presence has been shown to be unnecessary for perpetuating the stereotype. See Bernard Glassman, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes Without Jews. Images of the Jew in England 1290–1700*, Detroit, 1975. W. J. Cahnman's comments are also pertinent: 'Moreover, if a patterned arrangement of social forces repeats itself generation after generation, an image is formed in the minds of men which in continued cultural transmission becomes itself a factor of structural potency. The image of the Jew in the minds of occidental peoples has served to justify his position in the social structure and his position, in turn, has served to illuminate the image'. W. J. Cahnman, 'Socio-Economic Causes of Anti-semitism', *Social Problems*, vol. 5, no. 1, July 1957, p. 21.

[11] *The Girl from Kay's*, by Owen Hall, was first performed at the Apollo Theatre, London, in 1902; and in South Africa in 1903.

[12] *Helena's Hope Ltd.*, by Stephen Black, was first performed in Cape Town in 1910.

[13] See Milton Shain, 'Hoggenheimer — The Making of a Myth', *Jewish Affairs*, vol. 36, no. 9, September 1981.

[14] See, for example, *The Owl*, 31 January 1902.

[15] Boonzaier used Hoggenheimer in his cartoons for a number of newspapers. It was, however, through *Die Burger*, an Afrikaans daily, that Hoggenheimer became a household name — a symbol ultimately copied by cartoonists throughout the country.

[16] See, for example, *Cape Times*, 2 March 1910; *The Cape*, 4 March 1910; and *The South African Jewish Chronicle*, 3 June 1910, which even suggested that the author had omitted other pertinent features of the negative stereotype. The playwright, Stephen Black, stated that a prominent Jewish member of the South African parliament, Col David Harris, thoroughly appreciated the Jewish portrayals: *Rand Daily Mail*, 30 May 1910.

[17] A suburb in Johannesburg.

[18] *Rand Daily Mail*, 30 May 1910.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] *The South African Jewish Chronicle*, 3 June 1910.

[22] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Anti-Semite and Jew*, translated by George J. Becker, New York, 1965, p. 13.

[23] See Cornelis Pama, *Bowler's Cape Town. Life at the Cape Colony in Early Victorian Times, 1834–1868*, Cape Town, 1977, p. 95.

[24] James A. Froude, 'Visit to the Diamond Fields', in *Short Stories on Great Subjects*, London, 1970, p. 273.

[25] In 1905, Michell was appointed Minister without Portfolio in the Cape Colony's Government under L. S. Jameson.

[26] Standard Bank Archives, Diamond Volume, Michell to General Manager, 17 April 1882 (Henry Files). Quoted in R. V. Turrel, *Capital, Class and Monopoly, the Kimberley Diamond Fields 1871–1889*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1981, p. 315.

[27] *Uitenhage Times*, 13 September 1883.

[28] A political party in the Cape Colony.

[29] Turrel, op. cit., p. 314.

[30] See, for example, J. R. Couper, *Mixed Humanity*, London, 1892; D. Blackburn and W. W. Caddel, *Secret Service in South Africa*, London, 1911; Martin J. Boon, *The History of the Orange Free State*, London, 1885; 'Josh', 'Stories of Strange People', no. 5, and 'Mr. Sam Saulinski' in *The Owl*, 6 November 1897; 'Outlook' and 'Old Diamond Field Days. The Pioneer Talks' in *The Owl*, 8 June 1900. See also the cartoon in *The Knobkerrie*, 22 October 1884.

[31] Oliver Osborne, *In the Land of the Boers, or the Other Man and Myself*, London, 1900, p. 296.

[32] Francis R. Statham, *South Africa As It Is*, London, 1897, p. 197.

[33] The nature of the interaction between Jew and Gentile is important for an understanding of the evolution of an anti-Jewish stereotype. Indeed, the interactional approach to ethnic conflict is increasingly used. See, for example, E. Bonacich, 'A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism. The Split Labour Market', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 37, no. 5, October 1972, pp. 547–59; and E. Bonacich, 'A Theory of Middlemen Minorities', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 38, no. 5, October 1973, pp. 583–94. See also Colin Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society 1876–1939*, London, 1979, pp. 231–34.

[34] See Milton Shain, *Jewry and Cape Society. The Origins and Activities of the Jewish Board of Deputies for the Cape Colony*, Cape Town, 1983, p. 5.

[35] *Cape Punch*, 4 July 1888.

[36] Shain, *Jewry and Cape Society*, op. cit., p. 5.

[37] *Land en Volk*, 5 May 1891. See also C. T. Gordon, *The Growth of Boer Opposition to Kruger 1890–1895*, Cape Town, 1970.

[38] See, for example, Osborne, op. cit., pp. 82 ff. Osborne also commented: 'The Jew was always on the make and ready to turn his hand to anything (except of course hard work) . . .'.

[39] Martin J. Boon, *Jottings by the Way: or Boon's Madness on the Road, Being a Philosophical View of Life, Past, Present and to Come, in the Orange Free State, Natal and the Cape Colony*, London, 1884, p. 163.

[40] Boon, *The History of the Orange Free State*, op. cit., p. 54.

[41] *Volksbode*, 23 February 1893.

[42] *Commission of Enquiry into Labour in the Cape Colony, 1893*, G39–93 Labour Commission 1893, Cape Archives.

[43] Cahnman contends that the consumer always had to be on his guard with the merchant. What 'the neighbour, as a kinsman, would have to offer free of charge, if only he had it, can indeed be had from the merchant, but he does not offer it free of charge, he sells, and since he sells, he stands under the assumption that he takes his advantage'. Cahnman, op. cit., p. 23.

[44] Charles van Onselen, *Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Witwatersrand 1886–1914, Vol. I, New Babylon*, Johannesburg, 1982, p. 74.

[45] *Zud Afrikanische Zeitung*, 4 March 1893.

[46] On the other hand, there were clear instances of virulent racism, as in the following extract from *The Owl*, 12 February 1904: 'Never forget the Jew is not a white man. He is the Semite, the Asiatic. He is brown of skin, black of hair, dark of eye. Herbert, when he painted the greatest picture of Moses receiving the tablets of the law at Mount Sinai, depicted the Jew as brown as the sunburned Sinaitic rocks. His skull is different. A physiologist could no more

confound the Semitic skull with the Celtic or Teutonic than he could the Darmstadt skull with Cuvier's'.

[47] See Shain, *Jewry and Cape Society*, op. cit., chapter I, passim.

[48] *Cape Times*, 5 February 1904.

[49] *Report of the Working of the Immigration Act 1902–1904*, G63–04, vol. IX. Annexures to the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly, Cape Colony, Cape Archives.

[50] *The Owl*, 23 January 1897.

[51] See Dora L. Sowden, 'In the Transvaal Till 1899', in Gustav Saron and Louis Hotz, eds, *The Jews in South Africa. A History*, Cape Town, 1955, p. 150.

[52] Edna Bradlow of the University of Cape Town has suggested to me that the term was an acronym for Polish and Russian Union — a Jewish club established in Kimberley in the early days. This accords with an explanation given by Max Sonnenberg, one-time member of the Cape Legislative Assembly, in his autobiography, *The Way I Saw It*, Cape Town, 1957, p. 52. According to Eric Partridge, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, Peruvian was a Transvaal colloquialism for Polish and Russian Jews. It has also been suggested that the term refers to those Jewish immigrants who had sojourned in Argentina under Baron de Hirsh's settlement scheme before coming to South Africa. If that is the origin of the term, the lack of a geographical distinction between Argentina and Peru needs to be explained. It is interesting to note that in a short story in *The Owl* by J. E. Corbett, the author refers to the English Jews struggling to compete against 'Hebrews from Peru and Argentina . . .' (*The Owl*, 8 February 1901). Another theory is that the term is derived from 'Peruvia' — a mistaken reference to the ancient Latin term for Poland: see M. P. Grossman, *A Study in the Trends and Tendencies of Hebrew and Yiddish Writings in South Africa Since the Beginning of the Early Nineties of the Last Century to 1930*, 3 vols., unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1973, p. 162.

[53] *Johannesburg Times*, 1 April 1896.

[54] See Stuart C. Cumberland, *What I Think of South Africa*, London, 1896, p. 12. James Bryce observed that the most cultivated section of Johannesburg society consisted of men 'of English or Anglo-Jewish race — including . . . a few Germans, most of Jewish origin': James Bryce, *From Impressions of South Africa*, London, 1895, p. 318.

[55] See *Standard and Diggers News*, 5 November 1894.

[56] See van Onselen, op. cit., pp. 74 ff.

[57] *The Transvaal Leader*, 2 May 1899.

[58] Ibid., 15 May 1899.

[59] See Shain, *Jewry and Cape Society*, op. cit., chapter III, passim.

[60] *Cape Times*, 28 January 1903.

[61] Ibid., 20 May 1902.

[62] See Shain, *Jewry and Cape Society*, op. cit., chapter III, passim.

[63] *Transvaal Critic*, 24 August 1908.

[64] *Cape Times*, 18 March 1904.

[65] *Middelburg Echo*, 27 October 1905.

[66] Quoted in *South African News*, 25 June 1910.

[67] These perceptions survived well into the 1930s and were, in fact, given credibility in an official report of the Carnegie investigation into white poverty.

See J. F. W. Grosskopf, *Economic Report. Rural Impoverishment and Rural Exodus, Part I, The Poor White Problem in South Africa*, pp. 115–16.

[68] *Graaf-Reinet Advertiser*, 30 October 1907.

[69] *Cape Times*, 5 January 1904.

[70] John A. Hobson, *The War in South Africa. Its Causes and Effects*, London, 1900, pp. 190–91.

[71] See, for example, Francis E. Younghusband, *South Africa of Today*, London, 1898, p. 66. Significantly, the Stock Exchange was personified as a Semitic figure in *The Sunday Times* (Johannesburg), 10 December 1902.

[72] Claire Hirshfield, 'The British Left and the Jewish Conspiracy. A Case Study of Modern Antisemitism', *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 43, Spring 1981, p. 104.

[73] Ibid., p. 96.

[74] See Ticktin, op. cit., p. 10.

[75] See, for example, the view of Dr P. V. Engelenburg, editor of the *Pretoria Volkstem*, in *North American Review*, October 1899, quoted in John C. Ridpath and Edward S. Ellis, *The Story of South Africa*, London, 1900, p. 288. See also E. B. Rose, *The Truth About the Transvaal*, London, 1902, p. 113; and Statham, *South Africa As It Is*, op. cit., pp. 265 ff.

[76] For details, see Arthur M. Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877–1902*, Cape Town, 1978; and H. J. Ogden, ed., *The War against the Dutch Republic in South Africa*, Manchester, 1901.

[77] See John S. Galbraith, 'The Pamphlet Campaign on the Boer War', *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 24, no. 2, June 1952.

[78] Quoted in London's *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 January 1900.

[79] Quoted in London's *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 May 1900.

[80] See, for example, *The Owl*, 20 December 1901.

[81] See, for example, *The Owl*, 29 May 1903 and 18 March 1904.

[82] See 'The Jews Lament' in *The Owl*, 9 June 1903 and 'Ye Goldbug Dirge' in *The Owl*, 18 September 1903.

[83] *Cape Times*, 29 December 1903.

[84] *South African News*, 26 February 1904.

[85] Ibid.

[86] See Boonzaier Papers, MSC 4, II: letters from J. X. Merriman 1905–17, Merriman to Boonzaier, 22 August 1905, South African Library, Cape Town.

[87] See L. M. Thompson, *The Unification of South Africa, 1902–1910*, London, 1960, p. 315.

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH ON THE ANGLO-JEWISH COMMUNITY, 1983–84

Marlena Schmool

Introduction

IN 1968[1] and 1971,[2] the Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews compiled Registers of the Social Research which was being carried out on Anglo-Jewry. There were then 18 and 22 projects, respectively. A 1975 study,[3] with a far wider field of reference, pinpointed seven projects which fall within the brief of this paper.

The present study was undertaken with a view to establishing the extent of research on Anglo-Jewish topics at a time of financial stringency.[4] It is therefore encouraging to find that the number of projects currently in hand or recently completed (21) is near the 1971 level (22) although there has been a shift in the emphasis of studies. Two factors may be held to account for this maintained level. The first is the emerging interest in Jewish local history, with groups in Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, and London enquiring into various aspects of Jewish life over the past century. The second factor is the ever-growing realization on the part of some communal institutions (as witnessed by the entries from the Central Council for Jewish Social Service[5] and local co-operation in the Redbridge Study[6]) that research is a necessary tool in establishing community needs. This Register has been drawn up on the basis of information collected between October 1983 and February 1984. It includes details of current social research together with information about recently completed projects (including recent publications). The information presented is modelled on volume 3, Social Science, of *Research in British Universities, Polytechnics and Colleges.*[7]

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

a. title of the project;

b. short description;

c. the name of the person or committee responsible for the research;

d. the name(s) of the principal research worker(s);
e. the actual or proposed starting date;
f. the actual or proposed completion date;
g. date and details of publication of interim results; and
h. the actual or probable date and place of publication of final results.

As in earlier surveys, the Register is divided into two parts. Part A includes research undertaken or sponsored by Jewish communal organizations; Part B covers research undertaken under university or other academic auspices (as a research thesis or otherwise). Within each part, the entries have been listed in alphabetical order of the names of the institutions sponsoring the research (where appropriate, the words 'University of' are omitted). Research projects have been numbered serially throughout the Register; those undertaken by provincial communities, where such projects involve more than the routine collection of communal statistics, are included in Part A. Enquiries regarding a particular entry should be addressed to the person or organization undertaking the research.

PART A. Research undertaken by Jewish communal organizations

BIRMINGHAM JEWISH HISTORY GROUP

10, Lenwade Road, Oldbury, Waley, West Midlands.

1. a. *Birmingham Jewry: Further Aspects 1730–1950*
   b. Sociological study of occupations within the community and a history of the Birmingham Hebrew Congregation. Study of the Hebrew National School and Birmingham Hebrew Philanthropic Society.
   c. Z. Josephs, E. Lesser, P. Hale, R. E. Levy, and S. Eden.
   d. Z. Josephs.
   e. September 1980.
   f. September 1983.
   g. *Birmingham Jewry, vol. 1, 1749–1914*, 1980.
   h. Birmingham, September 1984.

BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS, RESEARCH UNIT

Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place, London WC1H 0EP.

The Research Unit was established in 1965. Compiles statistical data on various aspects of the community; sets up and advises on local surveys, prepares interpretative studies of trends, etc. c. Functions under a Special Committee of the Board (chairman of special

committee: Mr Hyman Diamond), d. Research Director: Dr B. A. Kosmin; Research Officer Ms C. Levy.

2. a. *Synagogue Membership 1983*
   b. The collection of synagogue membership figures throughout the United Kingdom. Ordering and listing them according to local government administrative units and to their affiliation by synagogue grouping. Analysis of trends since 1970.
   c. d. As above.
   e. November 1982.
   f. December 1983.
   h. B. A. Kosmin and C. Levy, *Synagogue Membership in the United Kingdom, 1983*, London, 1983.

3. a. *Synagogue Marriages 1973–1982*
   b. An analysis of synagogue marriage patterns and trends, using communal data and special Office of Population Censuses and Surveys tables for 1975, 1978, and 1979.
   c. d. As above.
   e. November 1983.
   f. November 1984.
   h. *Population Trends*, 1985.

4. a. *Replication Mortality Study for the Size and Structure of British Jewry*
   b. Collection and analysis of Jewish death statistics by age and sex for the years 1975–79 from burial societies, etc. A replication, with some modifications and separate coverage of provincial communities, of the method of Rosenbaum (1905)[8] and the early study by Prais and Schmool (1968).[9]
   c. As above.
   d. B. A. Kosmin, S. Haberman, and C. Levy.
   e. October 1980.
   f. October 1983.
   g. 'New facts on British Jewry', *On Board* (Board of Deputies Newsletter), March and April 1983.
   h. S. Haberman, B. A. Kosmin, and C. Levy, 'Mortality Patterns of British Jews 1975–79: Insights and Applications for the Size and Structure of British Jewry', *The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A (General), vol. 146, 1983, Part 3, pp. 294–310.

5. a. *Survey of Jews in Leeds Inner City*
   b. A project financed by the Social Science Research Council. Questionnaire-based interviews with a sample of Jewish households to examine the life-style of these inner-city Jews and their level of integration into the wider Leeds Jewish Community.

c. B. A. Kosmin.
d. N. Grizzard and P. Raisman.
e. January 1979.
f. July 1979.
h. N. Grizzard and P. Raisman, 'Inner City Jews in Leeds', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 22, no. 1, June 1980, pp. 21–33. Reprinted in Research Unit Reprint series.

6. a. *Redbridge Jewish Survey*
b. A stratified proportionate random sample of 500 households in the London Borough of Redbridge. Data collected on 1350 individuals. This was a multi-purpose community survey carried out from November 1977 to January 1978 on behalf of, and in co-operation with, a wide variety of communal, welfare, religious, political, and social organizations.
c. As above.
e. 1977.
f. 1983.
g. B. A. Kosmin, 'The face of Jewish Suburbia', *Jewish Chronicle*, 14 and 21 July 1978.
h. D. J. de Lange and B. A. Kosmin, *Community Resources for a Community Survey*, London, 1979.
B. A. Kosmin, C. Levy, and P. Wigodsky, *The Social Demography of Redbridge Jewry*, London, 1979.
B. A. Kosmin and C. Levy, *The Work and Employment of Suburban Jews*, London, 1981.
B. A. Kosmin and C. Levy, *Jewish Identity in an Anglo-Jewish Community*, London, 1983.
All available from the Research Unit.

CENTRAL COUNCIL FOR JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE
315–317 Ballards Lane, Finchley, London N12 8LP.

7. a. *The Jewish Mentally Handicapped at home*
b. Interview-based study of the needs of mildly and severely handicapped children and adults living with their families in North London, assessing the extent to which needs are being met by various agencies.
c. d. M. Jimack.
e. January 1982.
f. September 1982.
h. Report available from the Central Council for Jewish Social Service.

8. a. *Jewish Senior Citizens in South London*
   b. Study of the geographical distribution and of the social and community needs of retired Jews in South London by means of key-person interviews and local sample surveys.
   c. d. M. Jimack.
   e. November 1982.
   f. August 1983.
   h. Report available from the Central Council for Jewish Social Service.

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH AFFAIRS

11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX.

9. a. *Anglo-Jewish Leadership*
   b. Survey and interviews designed to build up a profile of Anglo-Jewish Leadership.
   c. S. J. Gould with Policy Planning Group of the Institute.

LEEDS JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

Bransby Lodge, 98 Chapeltown Road, Leeds, LS7 4BH.

10. a. *Jews of Leeds during The Great War: 1914–1918*
    b. Military, economic, and social aspects of Jewish Life in Leeds, 1914–18.
    c. Leeds Branch, Jewish Historical Society of England.
    d. S. Freeman and Research Committee.
    f. 1981.
    h. N. Grizzard, *Leeds Jewry and the Great War: 1914–1918*; J. S. Walsh, *Mrs Sheinblum's Kitchen*; and E. C. Sterne, *Leeds Jewry and the Great War: The Home Front*. All published by Jewish Historical Society of England, Leeds Branch, 1981–82.

11. a. *The Story of the Grimsby Jewish Community*
    b. Study of the statistical, social, and institutional development of the Grimsby Jewish community.
    c. L. and D. Gerlis.
    e. 1981.
    h. 1984.

NEWCASTLE AND DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

37 Eskdale Terrace, Jesmond, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4DN.

12. a. *The Size and Structure of the Jewish Community of Newcastle upon Tyne*
    b. Census of the local Jewish population.
    c. d. W. Sharmah and W. Blakey.
    e. May 1983.
    f. 1984.
    g. 31 May 1983.

SWANSEA HEBREW CONGREGATION

The Synagogue, Ffynone, Swansea.

13. *History of the Jews in South Wales*
    b. Analysis of archives and related material up to 1918 concerning Swansea, Cardiff, and small communities from Llanelly to Newport.
    c. Swansea Hebrew Congregation with financial assistance from Manpower Services Commission (Community Enterprise programme).
    d. N. H. Saunders, L. Mars, and U. Henriques.
    e. March 1983.
    f. March 1984.

WEST CENTRAL

3 Gower Street, Bloomsbury, London, WC1.

14. a. *Anglo-Jewish Divorce Project*
    b. Part of West Central's community research programme. Qualitative and quantitative research formed the basis for a working conference and subsequent community programme.
    c. B. Kosmin.
    d. B. Kosmin, P. Hill, S. Treisman, L. Firsht, and M. Cohen.
    e. September 1981.
    g. B. A. Kosmin, *Divorce in Anglo-Jewry 1970–80: An Investigation*, London, 1982; and B. A. Kosmin, ed., *The Anglo-Jewish Divorce Project: Papers for the 1983 Working Conference*, London, 1983.

PART B: Research undertaken under university or other academic auspices

THE CITY UNIVERSITY, PSYCHOLOGY UNIT

Department of Social Science and Humanities, St John Street, London ECIV 4PB.

15. a. *Attitudes and Religious behaviour of Jewish Secondary School Pupils*

b. Sample survey by questionnaire of pupils attending Jewish and non-Jewish secondary schools, measuring attitudes to Judaism and patterns of religious behaviour and relating them to parental and educational background.
d. S. H. Miller, M. Bar Lev, M. Levin, and E. Krausz.
e. September 1982.
f. May 1984.

LIVERPOOL, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

P.O. Box 147, Liverpool L68 3BS.

16. a. *Ethnic Identity and Religion: Tradition and Change in Liverpool Jewry.*
b. Explores the interaction between Jewish ethnic identity and Judaism as a religion in modern society, using the Liverpool Jewish community as a case study.
c. d. N. Kokosalakis.
h. *Ethnic Identity and Religion: Tradition and Change in Liverpool Jewry*, Washington, D.C., 1982.

MANCHESTER POLYTECHNIC

Cavendish House, Cavendish Street, Manchester M15 6BG.

17. a. *Jewish History Unit*
b. Various research projects on the historical and social development of Manchester Jewry.
d. B. Williams, R. Livshin, R. Burman, and S. Frais.
e. 1974.
h. R. Burman, 'The Jewish Woman as Breadwinner; the changing value of woman's work in a Manchester immigrant community', in *Oral History: The Journal of the Oral History Society*, vol. 10, 1982, pp. 27–39; R. Burman, 'Growing up in Manchester Jewry: the Story of Clara Weingard', in *Oral History: The Journal of the Oral History Society*, forthcoming; R. Burman 'The role of Jewish Women in Religious Life c. 1880–1930', in *Proceedings of the International History Workshop Conference on Religion and Society*, 1983; R. Livshin, *Aspects of the Acculturation of the Children of Immigrant Jews in Manchester, 1890–1930*, M.Ed. thesis, Manchester University, 1983; B. Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740–1875*, Manchester, 1976; B. Williams, 'The Jewish immigrant in Manchester: The contribution of Oral History', in *Oral History: The Journal of the Oral History Society*, vol. 7, 1979, pp. 43–53; B. Williams, 'The Beginnings of Jewish Trade Unionism in Manchester, 1889–91', in K. Lunn

and C. Holmes, eds., *Hosts, Immigrants, and Minorities in British Society*, London, 1980; and B. Williams, 'Processes of Jewish Migration 1780–1880', in L. P. Gartner, ed., *Anglo-Jewry in Modern Times* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1981.

READING, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Whiteknights, Reading, Berkshire RG6 2AA.

18. a. *Comparative Study of Jewish Dietary Rules and Sexual Taboos*
    b. Comparative and historical study based on written British and American sources.
    c. J. C. H. Davies.
    e. 1972.
    h. 1986, Cambridge.

19. a. *Sociology of Jewish Jokes and Humour*
    b. See previous entry.
    c. J. C. H. Davies.
    e. 1979.
    h. 1985, Bloomington, Indiana, USA.

STIRLING, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Stirling FK9 4LA.

20. a. *The Jews in Scotland*
    b. Ethnographic and oral-historical study of Jews in Glasgow and Edinburgh.
    d. A. M. Bowes.
    e. January 1984.
    f. 1988.
    g. Spring 1985.

SWANSEA, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

University College, Swansea SA2 8PP.

21. a. *Changing Structure and Organisation of a Small South Wales Jewish Community*
    b. Anthropological study examining demography, economic structure, family, leadership and organization, ethnicity, and relationship with the non-Jewish society.
    d. L. Mars.
    e. October 1983.
    f. April 1985.
    g. 1985–86.

NOTES

[1] M. Schmool, 'Register of Social Research on the Anglo Jewish Community', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 10, no. 2, December 1968, pp. 281–86.
[2] M. Schmool, 'Register of Social Research on Anglo-Jewry, 1968–1971', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 13, no. 2, December 1971, pp. 189–96.
[3] N. Marsden, *Register of Research in Jewish Studies in Great Britain*, Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1975.
[4] I am grateful to Professor S. J. Prais and to Dr Judith Freedman for suggesting that the exercise be repeated and also to the Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews for help in collecting the data.
[5] Entries Nos 7 and 8.
[6] Entry No. 6.
[7] *Research in British Universities, Polytechnics and Colleges, Government Departments and Other Institutions*, vol. 3, Social Sciences, The British Library, London 1982.
[8] S. Rosenbaum, 'A contribution to the study of vital and other statistics of the Jews in the United Kingdom', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, vol. 68, 1905.
[9] S. J. Prais and Marlena Schmool, 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population', 1960–65, *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 10, no. 1, June 1968, pp. 5–34.

A RESEARCH NOTE ON THE EMOTIONAL HEALTH OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING IMMIGRANTS IN ISRAEL

Michael Roskin and Jeffrey L. Edleson

RESEARCH has shown that the number and frequency of major life changes usually have a direct effect on a person's emotional and physical health. Moreover, the greater the number and the more frequent the changes, the greater is the likelihood of emotional and physical illness.[1] Leaving one's own country with the intention of settling permanently in another land is certainly a major life change which may affect the migrant's emotional, and perhaps also physical, health. The migrant's emotional health may also have an impact on his or her ability to cope successfully with the stresses of resettlement. Many new immigrants who are unable to make the necessary adjustments and who have the possibility of returning to their native land may then decide to leave the country they had wished to adopt and which had welcomed them. A somewhat large proportion of immigrants to Israel in fact did leave within five years of their arrival: at least 21 per cent did so between 1969 and 1980.[2]

Our own study in 1981 of 131 recent English-speaking Jewish immigrants in Israel reported that those who showed less flexibility in adapting overtly and cognitively to the new society and who had few supportive persons (such as relatives and close friends) in the country were, as a group, not as emotionally healthy as were their counterparts. We also found that, with the exception of Orthodox Jews, those from North America had lower levels of emotional health.[3]

The enquiry

In the spring of 1981, we approached all English-speaking adult immigrants in all the government-operated absorption centres in the Jerusalem area: 151 persons living in 97 households. We wrote to them to ask for their 'participation in a short interview that will hopefully aid in the development of new social services for olim in their first year of aliyah'. However, by the time the interviewers came to the centres, 16 immigrants in 9 households had already left. All the remaining 135

were interviewed: 76 females and 59 males. There were 49 couples (interviewed singly), 8 married women, 4 married men, 19 unmarried or divorced women, and 6 unmarried or divorced men; they ranged in age from 21 to 64 years, with an average age of 33 years. Two of the couples refused to participate in the full enquiry, so that we administered questionnaires to 131 individuals in 86 households. There were 83 from the United States, 33 from the United Kingdom, 8 from South Africa, and 7 from Canada.

The majority (70 per cent) said they were Orthodox Jews, while the others stated that they were 'Traditional Conservative', 'Progressive Reform', or 'secular' Jews. Half of them claimed to be either highly advanced or fluent in the Hebrew language, a third were beginners, and the remainder at an intermediate level. About half (45 per cent) had been trained for a profession, 17 per cent said they were engaged in teaching or research, another 16 per cent had been gainfully occupied 'in the public service', while the remaining 22 per cent had a wide range of other occupations.

The majority (78 per cent) had kinsmen or close friends residing in Israel when they arrived; and 62 per cent had paid from two to four visits to Israel before deciding to emigrate. Most of them had been in the country for a period of 10 months when we interviewed them in 1981.

We gave each of them a Symptom Checklist (SCL-90) devised by Leonard R. Derogatis;[4] it is a list of 90 problems and complaints and the respondents were required to state whether 'in the past seven days including today' they had been distressed by any of them; and if they had, to what extent — 'a little bit, moderately, quite a bit, or extremely'. The items to be checked incuded headaches, trembling, nausea or upset stomach, poor appetite, crying easily, faintness or dizziness, spell of terror or panic, feeling that most people cannot be trusted, difficulty in making decisions, feelings of being trapped or caught, feelings of guilt, etc. This checklist is designed to measure depression, anxiety, somatic equivalents of anxiety, obsessive-compulsiveness, and interpersonal sensitivity. These dimensions of emotional health as measured by the SCL-90 have been empirically validated in a series of clinical investigations.[5] Additional sub-scales include paranoia, psychotic symptoms, phobic reactions and hostility, as well as three overall scales.

Each respondent also agreed to reply to a questionnaire administered by an interviewer; there were questions about country of origin; age; marital status; number of children, if any; religious affiliation; occupation; ability in Hebrew; and details of previous visits to Israel. The immigrants were also asked whether they had 'close family or friends' on arrival in Israel. Other questions dealt specifically with difficulties a new immigrant might have encountered — whether

financial, or in finding employment or housing, or in dealing with bureaucracy, or in adjusting to a new culture or to new surroundings. The respondents were further asked whether in the past year a family member or close friend had died, whether they had been divorced or separated, and whether they themselves or a close relative had suffered from an incapacitating illness or an accident. Finally, they were requested to give brief details of one or two of the most difficult interpersonal relationships they had faced in Israel and of their reactions — such as arranging loans, seeking employment, or making new acquaintances. They were assured that all the information would be kept strictly confidential and would not be released without their prior written consent.

Results of the 1981 enquiry

We found that the emotional health of the Orthodox respondents was generally better than that of the others; this did not surprise us, since these immigrants had an almost automatic natural support group through their religious activities. It is also likely that they felt more at ease in a country where they could easily observe strict kashrut and keep the Sabbath holy.

We also found, as mentioned above, that the North Americans (apart from the Orthodox) had levels of emotional health which were lower than those of the British or of the South African immigrants; there were significant differences on the depression, hostility, and psychotic symptoms sub-scales of the SCL-90. We found no significant differences in emotional health scores between those whose knowledge of Hebrew was at beginner's, intermediate, or advanced levels; this may be due to the fact that they were still living in absorption centres at the time. Those with close family members or friends in Israel were consistently emotionally healthier than those who did not have that advantage (25 individuals).

We did not find it easy to explain why North Americans had lower levels of emotional health. Was it because they were less adaptable, or because the contrast between their American style of living and that of Israel was greater in their case than in that of other English-speaking immigrants from Great Britain and South Africa whom we intervewed?

The 1983 follow-up

In 1981, we had asked all our respondents to give us the name, address, and telephone number of a close family member or friend or other contact in Israel, in case we wished to get in touch with them at a later date. Two years later, in 1983, we wrote to these persons, searched extensively the files of the Ministry of Absorption and of the Ministry of the Interior, and eventually were able to trace half the total: 66, of

whom 54 were still in Israel. The other 12 who had left the country were all Americans and Canadians.

On looking through our 1981 records, we discovered that those 66 individuals were comparable in all respects to the entire original sample: they contained the identical proportions of males and females; 80 per cent of them were married (in the full sample, 81.5 per cent were married); their ages were approximately similar and they averaged the same number of children; and 82.8 per cent of them had a close friend or relative in Israel when they immigrated while the comparable proportion for the entire sample had been quite close at 78.2 per cent. Moreover, the 66 and the full sample had very similar proportions of countries of origin, range of occupations, and degree of proficiency in the Hebrew language.

We then examined our 1981 records to note the characteristics of those whom we had not been able to trace, the 'non-contacts', in order to compare them with those 66 whom we had traced. We found that there was a smaller proportion of Orthodox Jews and of persons with an advanced level of Hebrew knowledge among the non-contacts. The latter also had fewer close friends or relatives in Israel when they came to settle in the country and their average age was older — 36 years in contrast with an average of 30 years for those we traced.

When we examined the records of the 66 immigrants whom we did trace, we found that whereas 27 per cent of those who had left had indicated in our 1981 interviews that cultural factors were their most difficult area of adjustment, this was so in the case of only five per cent of those who had remained in Israel. As for religious affiliation, 23 per cent of those who remained but 42 per cent of those who left were not Orthodox. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups in the matter of the number of visits to Israel before the decision to emigrate, but there was such a difference in command of Hebrew in 1981: 42 per cent of those who left had stated then that their knowledge of Hebrew was at beginner's level, whereas this had been so in the case of 17 per cent of those who were still in Israel; and 17 per cent of those who left but 33 per cent of those who stayed had been fluent in the language. This difference was statistically significant: $x^2 = 4.61$, $p = .032$.

The presence of a relative or of a close friend upon arrival in Israel was, understandably enough, a differentiating factor: 89 per cent of those who had had such a supportive person were still in Israel in 1983, while 45 per cent of those who had left had not had such an advantage.

The immigrants who remained in Israel had shown in 1981 a consistently better state of emotional health than that of those who subsequently returned to their countries of origin. The emotional health of the non-contacts had been worse than that of the 54 who stayed on in Israel but better than the health of the 12 who had later

returned to their native lands. On over half of the sub-scales of the SCL-90, these differences were statistically significant at the .05 level.

It seems unlikely that many of the North Americans had come to Israel without a serious intention of settling permanently in the country. They were all in absorption centres because they had applied for admission and been accepted; and it was clear from conversations with the interviewers that they had given up their employment and sold their homes in their native countries. However, all but one of the 12 North Americans whom we know to have returned to their native lands did so within less than a year of their arrival: six left within five months and a further five within 10 months. Their emotional health in 1981 was consistently poorer than that of those who remained in Israel and the differences were statistically significant in the majority of cases.

Conclusion

Our study of English-speaking new immigrants in Israel revealed that North American Jews, with the exception of the Orthodox, had SCL-90 scores indicating that they were less emotionally healthy than were the British and the South African Jews, but we do not know whether they had such a state of emotional health *before* they decided to emigrate to Israel or whether it was the experience of immigration which affected their emotional health.

It may also be that American and Canadian Jews had arrived in Israel with higher expectations, which were not fulfilled, or that they were more easily discouraged by the exigencies of everyday life in Israel. One avenue for future research in this field might be an enquiry about the aspirations, expectations, and emotional health of immigrants as soon as possible after their arrival and a follow-up study one or two years later to determine how far those aspirations were realized, what obstacles had been encountered, and the impact of such difficulties on the emotional health of the newcomers. Such knowledge would help to devise intervention programmes for the successful adjustment of immigrants.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Phillip Heller and Robert Mednick for their assistance in funding the research on which this paper is based. We also wish to thank Shula Levi, Chana Pesach, Pamela Deutsch, Evie Wiedenbaum, and the staff of the Jerusalem Regional Office of the Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel for their help.

NOTES

[1] B. S. Dohrenwend and B. P. Dohrenwend, *Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects*, New York, 1974; V. L. Habif and Benjamin B. Lahey, 'Assessment of the Life Stress–Depression relationship: The use of Social Support as a Moderator Variable', *Journal of Behavioral Assessment*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1980, pp. 167–73; T. H. Holmes and R. H. Rahe, 'The social Readjustment Rating Scale', *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1967, pp. 213–18; J. H. Johnson and I. G. Sarason, 'Life Stress, Depression, and Anxiety: Internal–External Controls as a Moderator Variable', *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, vol. 22, no. 3, 1978, pp. 205–08; J. G. Rabkin and E. L. Struening, 'Life Events, Stress, and Illness', *Science*, vol. 194, 1976, pp. 1013–20; A. Vinokur and M. C. Selzer, 'Desirable Versus Undesirable Life Events: Their Relationship to Stress and Mental Illness', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1975, pp. 329–37.

[2] The Central Bureau of Statistics of the Israel Government reports that 21 per cent of immigrants to Israel left the country within 5-year periods between 1969–80. See 'Immigrants Who Left Israel Within 1–5 Years After Immigration'. Reprinted in Hebrew from Supplement to the *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, no. 4, 1982.

[3] Michael Roskin and Jeffrey L. Edleson, 'The Emotional Health of English-Speaking Immigrants to Israel', *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, vol. 60, no. 2, Winter 1983–84, pp. 155–61.

[4] Leonard R. Derogatis, R. S. Lipman, and L. Covi, 'SCL-90: An out-patient psychiatric rating scale', *Psychopharmacology Bulletin*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1973, pp. 13–27.

[5] See Derogatis *et al.*, op. cit., and Leonard R. Derogatis, K. Rickels, and A. F. Rock, 'The SCL-90 and the MMPI: A step in the validation of a new self-report scale', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 128, no. 3, March 1976, pp. 280–89.

BOOK REVIEWS

MARC D. ANGEL, *La América: The Sephardic Experience in America*, x + 220 pp., The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1982, $15.95.

The Jewish immigration into the United States between 1880 and 1925 is associated almost automatically with eastern Europe. The typical Jewish immigrant in the historical image speaks Yiddish, works in a sweat shop, lives on the Lower East Side, eats *gefilte fish*, and has only one burning ambition: to see his children succeed. Much has been done in recent years to rectify this romantic picture. Historians have studied the immigrant ghettoes as well as the institutions which enabled the migrants to adapt to their new surroundings while maintaining their socio-cultural values.

Very little attention has been paid to the other Jewish immigrants: those who spoke Judeo-Spanish, Greek, or Arabic, ate *pescado con tomate*, but also lived on the Lower East Side — the Sephardim. Angel's book is the study of a man, Moise Gadol, his weekly newspaper, *La América*, and his community, the Sephardim of New York in the first decades of the twentieth century. This triple character of the book (biography, the history of a Judeo-Spanish weekly, and a community study) is at one and the same time its strength and its weakness. It presents a vivid, impressionistic, and colourful insight into the 'other' community. The immigrant experience, so familiar from the Ashkenazi model, is described in detail and shows in fact little difference in its institutional dynamics. The social tensions, the poverty, the struggle for education, and the attempts to achieve unity among those from different geographical backgrounds are common to all Jewish newcomers, be they Sephardi or Ashkenazi.

Angel breaks new ground when he analyses the tensions between the Jewish establishment and the Sephardi immigrants. The relationship with Shearith Israel was highly ambivalent and is ably summarized by Angel: 'Many expected Shearith Israel to be their salvation and raise them from their misery; when Shearith Israel was unable to perform to their expectations, they became disillusioned and hostile to the synagogue' (p. 90). This process of hope and trust turning into antagonism is very clear in the case of Gadol himself, who expected help for his fellow immigrants but when it was offered was too proud to take what he perceived as charity. The same ambivalence existed in relations with Ashkenazim: on the one hand, Gadol advocated integration into Ashkenazi society, while on the other hand he stressed

the need for a distinctive Sephardi identity. When the Ashkenazi leader, A. Kretchmer, claimed in 1912 that Ashkenazim were superior to Sephardim, Gadol attacked him violently in *La América*. In that same year, however, he declared: 'We must convince ourselves that we Oriental Jews have the same aptitudes as our Yiddish brothers, and in consequence, like them, we are also able to achieve things' (p. 140). A proper biographical study would probably have explained this apparently contradictory mixture of ethnic pride and inferiority.

The second component of the book — the history of a Jewish weekly — is also disappointing. Throughout the years, Gadol repeatedly stated that the function of his newspaper was to defend the interests and dignity of the Sephardi people, to achieve centralization of the community's leadership and organizations, to help the Sephardi immigrants, and to advise them on 'the American way of life'. *La América* also propagandized Zionism. However, despite its lofty ideals, it never became as influential among Sephardim as the Yiddish newspapers were in the Ashkenazi community. Angel suggests some possible reasons for this lack of success: the degree of literacy and the linguistic diversity of Sephardim and Gadol's failure to obtain financial support. There was also very lively competition from other Sephardi newspapers.

Angel hardly deals with the social composition of the community, of which linguistic diversity was only one aspect. The use of a weekly newspaper as a single source does not automatically exclude such topics as economic and geographical mobility, demography, social structure, voting patterns, trade unionism, etc. A newspaper can also be helpful in determining the place of the community in the larger framework. What 'news' did it report? To what extent did its interests change over time? With one exception (Zionism), Angel fails to enlighten us on these matters. Even if Gadol's newspaper was concerned solely with Jewish issues, that very fact should be enlarged upon. The Ashkenazi press played an active part in the formation of political opinion on non-Jewish issues. *La América*, at least in Angel's analysis, hardly ever did.

Finally, a newspaper can be extremely helpful for the study of the social pathology of a community. Recent research has dealt with such topics as wife desertion, prostitution, gangsterism, and delinquency. These phenomena were not unknown among Sephardi immigrants in the United States, but from Angel's account it seems that *La América* ignored the seamier side of the society it served. If it did ignore it, we should be told why that was so. The author states at the outset that his book 'is primarily a study of the Judeo-Spanish speaking Sephardim of New York from 1910 to 1925 as seen through the eyes of Moise Gadol and his newspaper *La América*' (pp. 7–8); but for historians that prism may be too narrow to reflect a historically accurate picture.

ROBERT COHEN

STEVEN E. ASCHHEIM, *Brothers and Strangers: The East European Jew in German and German-Jewish Consciousness 1800–1923*, xiv + 331 pp., University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1982, £20.00.

Throughout the nineteenth century, almost 90 per cent of the world's Jewish population lived in a large area of eastern Europe – from Riga in the north to Odessa in the south, from Kolesh in the west to Poltave in the east. If there was a feature of eastern European Jewish life which affected all of them, it was the steady deterioration of their social and economic position which was accelerated by the partitions of Poland in 1792–95 and which culminated in their total destruction, but not before many of them had migrated and established themselves in Britain, the United States, Canada, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa, and Palestine. The Jews of Germany, meanwhile, although often subjected to hostility and discrimination, moved steadily towards equality and freedom, not uniformly, not evenly, but broadly successfully. To ensure their acceptance in Germany society, many of them went a long way to meet the demands of, and identified with, the dominant social values in Germany. One of these was a seeming contempt for the Jews of eastern Europe. It affected mainly the upper and more assimilated strata of German Jewry. It did not prevent them from rendering substantial and consistent material support to their eastern brethren, but it did constitute a curious response, which Steven Aschheim has made the subject of his book. It is handsomely produced, well written, and full of interesting material. There are nevertheless two levels at which one must take issue with the author. The first must be his interpretation of the issues he raises, and the second level concerns the way in which supporting literature is used.

Aschheim states that his aim is to 'delineate the fateful and complex role of "the ghetto"' and to write a 'cultural and intellectual history' (p. xiii) of eastern European Jews in German and German-Jewish consciousness from 1800 to 1923. It would have been surprising if he had succeeded in doing justice to such a vast and complex project in 250 pages of text. The book attempts to deal with so much that it rarely achieves any depth, yet it also leaves out a great deal, because the broad sweep of its inquiry is cast too wide. It must also be questioned whether a 'cultural and intellectual history' can be adequately presented within the parameters of literary criticism — arguments are built on comments drawn from various novels by both Jewish and non-Jewish authors. The choice of such an approach appears to have reduced Aschheim's awareness of social and geo-political forces, which are often paramount. It tends to weaken a disciplined approach to conceptual issues, a constantly recurring problem in this book. Emancipation and assimilation, ghetto and shtetl, caftan Jews and orthodox Jews, Hassidim and Polish Jews are used interchangeably, because there are no basic definitions.

The most fascinating problem must surely be the intense and persistent prejudice against the *Ostjude* (eastern Jew) which was prominent among Germans and which was adopted by many German Jews. Though closely and inextricably intertwined with antisemitism, it was also separate from and independent of it. This is most clearly revealed in the deliberate way in which this prejudice was reversed during the First World War — a process discussed at length by Aschheim in the best chapter of the book. He describes the positive attitudes of the German military authorities and the 'romanticisation' of the ghetto by German Jews, but what is at issue here is a geo-political, not an intellectual problem. The German desire for expansion to the East goes back at least to the mid-eighteenth century and to Prussian ambitions for more territory. When Prussia incorporated the Polish province of Posen, with its large Jewish population, Frederick the Great's first impulse was to expel the Jews. He was restrained from doing so by his bureaucrats, who advocated a rational approach. They persuaded the King that Jews should not be expelled abruptly, because that would damage Prussia's reputation as a 'civilised' state, and that the expulsion of skilled Jewish craftsmen should be delayed until Christian artisans could be found to replace them, in order to protect the economy of the province.

Such a calculated regulation of antisemitic attitudes became the hallmark of the Prussian and, subsequently, German approach to the Jews. It led Frederick William IV in 1840 to persuade the Jews of Western Prussia to agree that, while they were ready for full emancipation, the more 'primitive' Posen Jews needed more time and education to achieve 'civilised standards'. (This was the more remarkable since there was a steady drift of Posen Jews — the so-called *Berlin Hinterländer* — to Berlin where they settled very successfully.) It manifested itself again in the First World War, when the German authorities sought to control eastern European Jews by 'Germanising' them with the help of German Jews. The result, quite unexpectedly, was to forge a new bond between Polish and Orthodox German Jews — ably depicted by Aschheim.

The final manifestation was during the Second World War when the Germans' *Drang nach Osten* again encountered the barrier of eastern European Jewry, whom they now brutally exterminated. This final act lies outside the range of Aschheim's study, but belongs to that geo-political pattern of expulsion–integration-extermination, which for more than a century persuaded German Jewry (or, rather, its most assimilated and articulate social strata) to accept the negative conception of *Ostjuden* which was always derived from antisemitism and sometimes tempered by political considerations. The persuasiveness of that 'rational' antisemitism has even entrapped our author. There are frequent references in the book to the 'filth, dirt, degeneration and

overcrowding' in the ghettoes (for example, on pp. 11, 36, 60, 86, 148). Instead of rejecting these accusations outright, when they were applied to what was then the great majority of the world's Jews, he assures us that within his literary myth-reality continuum, these ascriptions must be accepted because 'all myths possess a core of reality' (pp. 11 and 231).

Perhaps, though, it is gullibility which leads Aschheim to accept antisemitic abuse at face value. Apart from the 'dirty' Jew, there is much reference to the 'caftan' Jew, a notion he introduces with a quotation from Hitler who, we are told, 'was appealing to an established cultural tradition' (p. 58). In fact, Hitler's real objection was not to the caftan on the Jew but to the Jew in the caftan. The caftan worn by the Hassidim was an outer garment only a few inches longer and not all that different from the then popular and widely worn *Gehrock* (a three-quarter-length jacket). Underlying this somewhat petty consideration is the more fundamental point that no matter what charges and complaints were levelled at the *Ostjuden*, they were never qualitatively inferior to either Germans or German Jews, except in German racialist theory. Aschheim recognizes this, but still insists that the *Ostjude* '*was* [his italics] in many ways radically different from West Europeans' (p. 77).

This leads us to the core of the book, the search for an explanation of why the Jews of Germany (or their spokesmen) accepted and internalized the prejudice against eastern European Jews. Aschheim argues that embourgeoisement and *Bildung* among German Jews created a barrier against their eastern European brothers which made them strangers. Such an interpretation ignores the reality of the dynamism and vitality which enabled eastern European Jews to achieve stunning successes when they migrated to open societies. It also assumes a homogeneity for German Jewry which did not exist: p. 15 — 'German Jews were infuriated'; p. 16 — 'patronising German Jewish attitudes'; p. 38 — 'widely regarded by German Jews'. It is more likely that the fear of eastern European Jews was based, as Franz Rosenzweig had argued (quoted on p. 79), on their ability to be like the German Jews. The fear of being swamped and overwhelmed by millions of Jews from across the border was the fear which united Germans and German Jews, which beguiled them into believing that hostility and prejudice would stem the feared invasion.

In taking issue with Aschheim's interpretations of events and attitudes, I am not necessarily criticizing his conclusions, which he is entitled to put forward, although I believe that my interpretations are closer to the facts of history. The situation is different when we look at the use of sources, for there we find errors and misapprehensions, especially in the earlier and least satisfactory chapters of the book. Here are a few examples. On p. 6, there is a 'quotation' from Goethe 'in his

discussion of the traditional rabbi'; it is taken from I. E. Barzilay's article, 'The Jew in the Literature of the Enlightenment', in which Barzilay explained how 'Goethe greatly enjoyed the *caricature* [my italics] of a rabbi presented by Wilhelm Meister'. Not only is the introduction to the quotation misleading, the quotation itself from Barzilay is also inaccurate. On p. 14, we are told that Leopold Zunz toured Leipzig in 1820 and 'the aesthetic dimension of the city was marred for him when he came across some Hassidim who "screamed and raved and sang like the savages of New Zealand"'. The quotation is taken from a letter Zunz wrote to S. M. Ehrenberg on 3 October 1820 in which he reported that one of the sights (*Merkwürdigkeiten*) he went to see was the Simchat Torah of the Hassidim (the Rejoicing of the Law, traditionally celebrated with much noise and revelry, especially by Hassidim). This makes Aschheim's introduction to the quotation erroneous and misleading — Zunz said nothing about an 'aesthetic dimension'.

On pp. 16–17, there is a long quotation from Abraham Geiger. In August 1840, Geiger wrote a letter to Joseph N. Dernburg about the Damascus Affair (Jews had been accused of abducting a Franciscan monk to use his blood for Passover), which must rank as one of the most arrogant, brutal, and callous documents in modern Jewish history. In introducing a part of this letter, Aschheim first makes an unwarranted assumption that Geiger's views on 'oriental Jews' were equally applicable to east European Jews. The quotation itself is carefully pruned, in part without indication that this has been done. The full text of Geiger's letter shows him to have been an arrogant chauvinist, utterly out of touch with the realities of Jews and Judaism of his time, but Aschheim's pruning enables him to present Geiger's letter as an expression of the 'spiritualisation' of Judaism and a radical challenge to 'traditional notions of Jewish solidarity'.

On p. 60, the author states that Karl Marx described Polish Jews as the 'dirtiest of all races . . . they multiply like lice'. His source for this quotation is a Ph.D. thesis by Jack Wertheimer who in turn refers to Joseph Nedava's book, *Trotsky and the Jews*. Nedava mentions 'the numerous and most offensive epithets used by Marx' (p. 69), which he supports with a note (n. 44, p. 245) about two separate quotations — 'dirtiest of all races' and 'they multiply like lice' — concerning Polish Jews. Nedava does not give a source for these quotations, which he may have taken from Edmund Silberner's *Sozialisten zur Judenfrage*. There we find (p. 128) that the assertion that Polish Jews breed like lice was reported to have been made by Marx during a conversation with Schlosser. Silberner adds a note (n. 103, p. 321) that an article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of 29 April 1849, written by either Marx or Engels, refers to Polish Jews as 'the dirtiest of all races'. Aschheim's quotation from Marx simply does not seem to exist.

Aschheim raises a large number of topics for discussion and injects some interesting comments on many of them. But I must confess that the slipshod use of sources, especially in the early chapters, undermined my trust in the much more closely researched second half of the book, which deals at length with the changing image of the eastern Jew as a result of the First World War and the development of antisemitism. That is unfortunate because this volume represents a rare attempt to deal with a very important subject.

JULIUS CARLEBACH

EDWARD J. BRISTOW, *Prostitution and Prejudice: The Jewish Fight Against White Slavery, 1870–1939*, xvi + 340 pp., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1982, £15.00.

One of the by-products of the great Jewish migrations during the second half of the nineteenth century was a substantial increase in Jewish participation in commercial prostitution, 'white slavery'. There were Jewish prostitutes procured by Jewish pimps housed in brothels owned by Jewish 'madams' operating not only in the areas of teeming Jewish populations in the old and new worlds but also in South America, southern Africa, and the Far East. The collapse of traditional standards of morality amongst Jewish communities and groups previously renowned for sexual purity demands investigation, as does, too, an account of the ways in which attempts were made to combat this new phenomenon and the ways in which it had wider implications. It would be wrong certainly to ignore the existence at earlier times of some Jewish prostitution, but its extent was minimal; tight social and religious bonds in effect prevented its growth. London was perhaps an exception to this; there were certainly a number of Jewish prostitutes, procurers, and brothel-keepers in the early nineteenth century, but even that was on a comparatively small scale, and by the middle of the century the problem had virtually disappeared there as well.

It was during the second half of the last century that the problem suddenly reappeared on a very much greater scale, becoming an issue capable of a much wider series of reactions. By the end of the century, the 'white slave traffic' was a common feature of the popular press, and the attack on commercial prostitution had become widespread. In many western countries, organizations were set up to lead action against those involved, and a number of international Conferences not merely gave publicity to the need to prevent the traffic but also took steps which were to prove very effective in bringing it to an end. At the same time, however, Jewish participation in that traffic provoked very bitter antisemitism and racial fantasies; world-wide hysteria on the subject, a sort of sexualist blood-libel, could quite easily be fanned by

those who had an interest in stirring up public agitations and the consequences were often tragic.

Edward Bristow has turned his attention from a general study of prostitution to this particular field and has trawled widely for information. The result is a work of the greatest importance which sets the story into the general background of Jewish history within the period of the great migrations. Closely linked with his study is one by Professor Lloyd P. Gartner, 'Anglo-Jewry and the Jewish International Traffic in Prostitution, 1885–1914' (published by the Association for Jewish Studies in its *Review*, vol. 7–8 for 1982–83, Cambridge, Ma., 1983). Gartner concentrated more closely on the London records and also pointed most specifically to the demographic imbalance in Russia between males and females in the age group 10 to 20 years, as evidenced in the census of 1897. He showed in a striking introduction to his paper that the shortage of marriageable young men in eastern Europe was one of the factors opening a path for the Jewish pimps and 'alphonses' who went there on 'recruiting' trips. London acquired special significance if only because it was through London that the international 'market' could be supplied. As a consequence, the attack on the trade was to a very large extent channelled through London, and various associations and societies were set up to protect young girls in transit from eastern Europe. At the same time, it must be emphasized, a great deal of the trade was aimed at the eastern Mediterranean, so that Salonika and Constantinople were as much destinations as were Buenos Aires and Bulawayo.

The story as shown by both studies is one of sordidness and greed. Girls were enticed by promise of marriage to leave their homes; the marriage either never took place or was illegal, the so-called *stille chassne*. Once away from home and protection, the girl could be forced into prostitution. At the same time, it must be admitted that a significant number of girls entered the trade well knowing what was involved. As one of them wrote, 'I just cannot be moral enough to see where drudgery is better than a life of lazy vice'. She was perhaps lucky in that the life of an inmate of many establishments could hardly be described as attractive and leisurely, and there were few girls able to set themselves up eventually as 'madams'. Those who made money were the pimps, and it was against them that most public campaigns were directed. It was to be ironic that the heat and sexual fantasy engendered by campaigns against 'white slavery' was often to culminate in outbursts of antisemitism. Many of the girls they procured were themselves Jewish, and many of the rioters attacking the brothels were themselves Jewish. At the end of the day, lurid stories of girls from good Christian backgrounds being kidnapped by evil Jewish procurers made good press, but were far from the truth.

The truth was bad enough, however, for the major Jewish organizations to lead an onslaught; and a combination of Jewish self-defence,

feminism, and shame concentrated less upon the women than upon the men involved. Both Bristow and Gartner illustrate the attack and the manner by which Jewish communities tried to deal with the problem. One of the traditional ways in which they reacted was to expel the wrongdoer from the synagogue and community, even denying him burial in a Jewish cemetery; in Buenos Aires the pimps responded by forming their own synagogue, Zwi Migdal. And since girls were induced to leave eastern Europe through illegal marriages, the various western communities insisted on the regularization under civil law of religious marriage processes; this was as much to protect the girls as to force new immigrants into a set social pattern.

Both Bristow and Gartner, in illustrating the causes of large-scale Jewish prostitution, point to the factors which brought it to an end. The closing of the frontiers to migration, the correction of unbalanced sex ratios in populations, normal access to economic and social advancement — these factors almost by themselves were instrumental in ending the traffic. It is not a pleasant story which they tell, but it is one which brings credit to all those (and they were many) who saw the problem and were prepared to face obloquy and even danger in order to find a solution. If the criminals and the victims were Jewish, let it be added that so too were the prosecutors.

AUBREY NEWMAN

ARNOLD M. EISEN, *The Chosen People in America: A Study in Jewish Religious Ideology*, xi + 237 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1983, $17.50.

The vocabulary of an established religion — the words in which it prays and with which it names its beliefs — changes slowly, if at all. The way the vocabulary is used, however, is modified in response to changing social and historical circumstances. The theologian preserves the sense of continuity of the society of the faithful by expressing the required modifications in a form which allows people to use the same keywords as before, though their beliefs are in fact subtly modified in relation to the changing circumstances.

The immigration of Jews from the culturally isolated communities of eastern Europe to the open society of the United States of America called into question their traditional self-understanding as 'a nation apart' and led them to reinterpret the concept of 'the chosen people'. Arnold M. Eisen is well aware of the gulf between the thought of the ordinary American Jew and that of his official spokesmen, be they rabbis, theologians, politicians, or philosophers. He prudently restricts himself to the still demanding task of explaining how the major spokesmen of American Jewry faced up to the problem of harmonizing their Jewish and American commitments. He concentrates on what are

termed, despite the long history of Jews in America, the second and third generations.

The 'second generation' Jews — those active between 1930 and 1955 — were kept apart from other Americans neither externally, by widespread discrimination, nor internally, by staunch adherence to halakhic norms. Yet antisemitism was still strong enough to make many of them feel 'different' in some way. Were they a nation, a people, or a religion? Many supported Horace Meyer Kallen's synthesis of democracy with religious pluralism; the Orthodox rabbi, Leo Jung, was one of many others who argued the compatibility of Judaism with democracy. To the Reform rabbis of the Columbus Platform (1937), 'chosenness' was the historical Jewish mission of bearing a spiritual heritage to all mankind, though Morgenstern's total rejection of particularism did not command general acceptance. Eisen skilfully presents the theology of the founder of the Reconstructionist movement, E. E. Kaplan, so placing in its context Kaplan's insistence on substituting the non-exclusive concept 'vocation' for 'chosenness'.

The 'third generation', from about 1955 to the present, is the one in which theology comes alive and Jewish intellectuals, of the type who would earlier have drifted out of the community, discover their identity and enter the debate. There is less antisemitism, though perhaps more of a sense of alienation, and the *Shoa* (Holocaust) and the establishment of the State of Israel are dominant influences on Jewish thought. Herberg, Hertzberg, Soloveitchik, Borowitz, and Fackenheim are names that come into focus here. Jewish ethnicity is widely assumed, though it is conceived in many different ways. The Orthodox Soloveitchik sees it in terms of 'halakhic man' while the Reform Borowitz, stressing the distinctiveness of Jewish ethics, proposed 'a renewal of the covenant that would necessarily involve a "creative alienation" from America'.

This is a thoughtful, well-written, and carefully documented book. It clearly raises several issues which some frightened Jews would rather evade. For many, it will be a useful introduction to seminal aspects of modern Jewish thought. Some, like the present reviewer, will be confirmed in their view that Jews spend too much time worrying about their identity instead of getting on with the job.

NORMAN SOLOMON

SAMUEL C. HEILMAN, *The People of the Book: Drama, Fellowship and Religion*, x + 337 pp., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1983, $22.50.

Using the tools and with the aims of the social anthropologist, Samuel C. Heilman examines a unique institution, the nightly or weekly gathering of men, not necessarily scholars, to study the Talmud under

the guidance of a skilled Talmudist. They are engaged in *lernen*, as it is called in Yiddish to denote a religious exercise that is beyond mere intellectualism, though the minds of the participants are kept constantly on the alert and the texts are analysed with a keen intellectual thrust. Those who pursue this activity are the eponymous people of the book (in this context the Talmud) seeking something more than the satisfaction of their curiosity and the sheer need to know.

Why do these men (with very few exceptions women do not participate) make their way, often after a hard day's work and in inclement weather, to spend an hour or more on the elucidation of a peculiarly difficult text, perhaps covering, at each session, no more than a few lines? That is the question the author seeks to answer through the examination of six such groups (five in Jerusalem, one in the USA) which he joined with tape-recorder at the ready. He detects three kinds of motivation: the dramatic, in which various roles are worked out; the enjoyment of fellowship of a kind nobler than that provided by social drinking or card playing; and the religious need to obey the divine command to the Jew to study the Torah.

One is inclined to wonder a little whether the author's fly-on-the-wall technique always allows those he observes to be as free in their attitudes as they would have been if they had not known that their words were eventually to be recorded in print. He is aware of the problem but claims that in all six groups he was accepted as a truly involved member, his role as detached observer quickly forgotten.

According to Heilman, *lernen* in this sense is only found among Ashkenazi Jews (hence the Yiddishisms frequently used in the lessons even when the language is Hebrew or English). Sephardi Jews, when they gather for a similar purpose, prefer books other than the Talmud, especially the Zohar, and even here the emphasis is more on recitation of the sacred words than applied understanding of their meaning. He may be right but more detailed investigation seems to be required before it can be stated as a definite fact of Jewish life.

As a student of the Talmud himself, Heilman is generally well-informed but there are occasional inaccuracies. Rigid standards of transliteration should not be expected from a work of this nature but it is a solecism to render throughout the letter *ḥet* as *kh*, particularly since this is also used for *khaf*, sometimes in the same word as in *khakhamim*. The Rabbinic expression *devarim she-be-lev eynam devarim* ('words in the heart are not words') refers to mental reservations in business contracts and the like. They do not mean that devotion alone is not enough, that prayers must be spoken, and the lips must move (p. 161). For this there is a different Rabbinic term: *hirhur lav ke-dibbur* ('thinking is not treated as if it were verbal expression'). Heilman remarks (p. 246): 'As holy activity Jewish study need not always lead to intellectual comprehension'. He quotes in support the sayings of Rabbah (actually our texts

have Rava, Rabbah's disciple) in tractate Avodah Zarah 19a: 'A man should always study Torah and [only] afterwards meditate upon it' and 'A man should always study even though he forgets [what he has reviewed] and even though he knows not [that is, fails to understand) what he says'. These translations are Heilman's own. But the word *ligros*, which he renders as 'study the Torah', really means 'rehearse the texts'. In an age in which all the texts were known only by heart, the student's prior obligation was to be familiar with the texts, otherwise he would have nothing on which to meditate. Rava was certainly not suggesting that the mere mechanical repetition of the words can qualify as *study* of the Torah.

The book has a number of (not very inspiring) photographs taken by the author. It is attractively written and easy to read with more than one really apposite anecdote.

LOUIS JACOBS

N. KOKOSALAKIS, *Ethnic Identity and Religion: Tradition and Change in Liverpool Jewry*, xiv + 262 pp., University Press of America, Washington, D.C., 1982, $23.50 (paperback, $11.50).

A heightened concern about the current problems of immigrants has, consciously or unconsciously, increased an interest in the history of earlier immigrant communities, and thus fostered a number of studies of various Jewish communities in Great Britain. Dr Kokosalakis's book therefore would seem to have a place among a series of such studies were it not that he is consciously striving to produce something different. He writes as a sociologist and not as an historian, but he also writes for the layman and therefore has 'toned down' some of 'the technical sociological language' (p. ix). There is thus a question about the extent to which he has fallen between the two stools.

One of his problems from the outset is that none of his classical or modern theoretical models of religion are of much help. Turning away from Marx, various members of the Harvard School, Weber, and even Durkheim, he came to the conclusion that Judaism is a special kind of religion closely tied up with the history, the on-going life, and the social experience of the Jewish people. There are tensions of course, and it is the existence of these tensions which are of particular interest. A growing secularization does not prevent many Jews from clinging somehow to traditional if attenuated religious and ritual symbols. 'Acculturation' appears over and over again in various comments about Jewish communities, but as Dr Kokosalakis points out very perceptively, acculturation 'may tell us something about how immigrant Jews become English or American Jews, but it tells us next to nothing about how American and English Jews remain Jews' (p. 8).

What he therefore attempts to do is to explore his themes within an historical context, the history of the Liverpool Jewish community.

The historical pattern of that community is not very different in many ways from that of others in the country. Early itinerant pedlars become shopkeepers; and increased industrial activity leads to the appearance of merchants on the grand scale. A fairly close-knit group of wealthy Jews control the institutions of the community, and it is this group which then takes the strain of the late nineteenth-century immigration from eastern Europe. Dr. Kokosalakis shows that here too there are conflicts between the various social and religious organizations founded for the immigrant poor and those they themselves founded. What makes Liverpool very different is its place at the European end of the transatlantic shipping and migrant routes and the consequent problems for the various charitable organizations which tried to help the transmigrants. There are unfortunately no statistics to show the numbers passing through Liverpool, but figures are quoted, for example, for the period May to mid-July 1882 when the local Board of Guardians had to deal with 6,274 transit refugees; 521 of them went to Canada (where regulations were easier) and the rest to the United States (p. 99). Much more research remains to be done on this subject, and of course it would be of interest to be able to compare the experience of Liverpool with that of the other towns on the Hull–Liverpool trans-Pennine railway line.

The chief aim of the author is to establish the bases for Jewish ethnicity and the extent to which it can be recognized through historical examples. If it is a long-standing, rather wry, Jewish comment that it is hard to be a Jew, Dr Kokosalakis shows how hard it is to define 'What is a Jew', let alone what constitutes his Jewishness. It is not at all clear that he has succeeded in his aim. He states that 'the central point of this book has been to highlight the fact that the decline of the authority of tradition in contemporary Jewish life is accompanied by a tension precisely because . . . Jewish identity cannot be expressed but through religious symbols' (p. 230). Even the growth of a secular Zionism to replace the religion of eastern Europe has failed to resolve that tension.

There are points on which historians would not altogether agree with him. It would be surprising, for example, if indeed the elite and the midde-class Jews were found to be 'far more numerous than their poor downtrodden brethren' (p. 51). On the whole, however, he has made an important contribution for which the historians of Provincial Jewry must be grateful It is a pity that Dr Kokosalikis's book has been produced in a manner unworthy of him. It is typewriter set, but not very well done and the proof-readers have missed several misprints: it was not Morgoliouth but Margoliouth who discussed Anglo-Jewry in 1851, while A. F. Rubens would be hard pressed to recognize himself as

either Rüeberns or Reubens. And was it perhaps a delightful Freudian slip rather than a misprint to comment on the speed with which in the nineteenth century many of the Jewish families became established in the 'supper class of Liverpool society' (p. 48)?

AUBREY NEWMAN

HARRY RABINOWICZ, *Hasidism and the State of Israel*, 346 pp., The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, Associated University Presses, London and East New Brunswick, N.J., 1983, £12.00.

In the midst of conflict between the affluent and the poor, between the Talmudic scholars and the unlearned Jewish masses, and in the midst of far-reaching superstition in Poland, the Hassidic religious movement emerged in the eighteenth century. Its masters stressed joy and faith in the performance of the commandments; intention; and intensity in prayers. The movement appealed to the ordinary Jew because, according to the author, the focus 'was on the soul rather than on intellect, on the service of the heart. It raised the unlettered Jew to the spiritual level of scholar. Everyone was a co-worker with the Almighty in the work of redemption, for every act could be redemptive. God was to be served not only through the study of the Torah, but through prayer, through song, through dance, through deeds of loving kindness' (p. 27).

Hassidism produced righteous masters, *Tsaddikim*, and rabbis to whom followers came for blessing, comfort, and advice; they achieved spirituality simply by being in their holy proximity. Rabbi Israel ben Eliezer — Baal Shem Tov (1700–1760) — was the founder of Hassidism. He aimed not only to bring man closer to God but to bring God closer to man — not through asceticism and self-affliction, as was the custom among many pietists and mystics of the day, but through simple faith and joy. The Hassidic masters were idolized by their disciples and by the common people who believed that only through the *Tsaddik* who performed miracles could they reach godliness. Rabbi Nachman of Breclow stated: 'Happy is he who knows nothing of [the philosopher's] books, but who walks uprightly and fears retribution. . . . There are some who pass today for great thinkers . . . but in the World to Come, it will be revealed that they were in reality nothing more than heretics and unbelievers . . . Acquisition of wealth [leads] to idolatry . . . the wealthy [are] slaves to their own desires and ambitions, and slaves to others' (p. 48).

Hassidic Jews, like religious Jews throughout history, firmly believed in the coming of a living Messiah who would redeem them from Exile and lead them back to the Holy Land. According to Hassidic masters, the Presence of God accompanied the Jews into Exile after the destruction of the Temple and God was therefore also in Exile. Rabbi

Dov Baer commented: 'We are concerned mainly with our own sufferings, but we should also remember that the Presence of God, too, yearns for Redemption. The role of the Zaddik is to help to restore the Presence of God to its original glory' (p. 55).

Many Hassidic masters longed to migrate to the Holy Land; some went to live there permanently while others came for periodic visits and still others wished to be buried in its holy ground. The Baal Shem Tov set out three times on the journey but he was forced to turn back and some believed that 'higher forces' frustrated his plans. However, a number of his associates and disciples did succeed in reaching the Holy Land. In 1777, some three hundred Hassidim under the leadership of Rabbi Menachem Mandel of Vitebsk embarked, but many perished at sea and only a small number of those rescued reached Acre and settled in Safed.

Although there were comparatively few Hassidim in the Land of Israel before the Second World War, strong ties were maintained. The Hassidic relationship to the Land was romanticized. Rabbi Simcha Bunam of Przysucha compared the love of the Jews for the Holy Land to the love of a bride for her bridegroom while Rabbi Abraham of Kalisk hoped that the love of that Land would live forever in the Jewish heart. Religious Jews were urged to make weekly or monthly contributions to sustain the Jewish inhabitants of the Holy Land because those who resided there had precedence over those who resided elsewhere. Rabbi Pinchas Shapira of Koretz believed that anyone who was in a position to settle in the Holy Land should do so and explained that the Tsaddikim who remained in Europe did so because the Diaspora needed them.

However, many Hassidic masters were vehemently hostile to secular Zionism for according to them Jews must not anticipate the Redemption by pursuing the dangerous paths of Zionism. 'To the Polish Hasidim, Herzl was not "a King in Jerusalem" . . . Herzl had been brought up in an assimilationist milieu . . . he was kindling the lights of a Christmas tree . . . In 1890 it had even occurred to him that baptism might be the ideal solution of the Jewish problem. He told . . . Rabbi Hermann Adler in 1895 that the creation of a Jewish state was not the result of a religious impulse' (p. 87).

Agudat Yisrael ('Union of Israel'), a world organization of orthodox Jews, was founded in 1912 and attracted large numbers of Hassidim. It was anti-Zionist at first because it feared a weakening of messianic fervour and the secularization of the Jewish people. But its constitution now states: 'It shall be the purpose of Agudat Yisrael to resolve all Jewish problems in the spirit of the Torah, both in Galut and Eretz Yisrael' (p. 91). In 1921, the Jewish National Council elected Rabbi Kook as the Chief Rabbi of the Ashkenazi community; but Agudat Yisrael did not recognize the Chief Rabbinate and established a

separate rabbinate for the ultra-orthodox Ashkenazi community under the leadership of Rabbi Yoseph Hayyim Sonnenfeld.

During the Nazi persecutions in Europe and after the Holocaust, many famous Hassidic masters were saved from death by the great efforts of the underground Jewish organizations and by 'miraculous' means. They came to the Holy Land, where they established their world-renowned dynasties. Among the more famous masters were the rabbis of Ger, Belz, Vishnitz, Zalov, Klausenburg, and Satmar, each leading a community with a distinct pattern of behaviour. They built synagogues, houses of worship and study, schools for boys and for girls, ritual baths, dormitories, and provided many other communal and social amenities. Some even established entire villages and private estates for their followers in order to facilitate their Hassidic life-styles.

Despite these many settlements and their outstanding philanthropic activities, the Hassidim in Israel do not all equally subscribe to secular Zionism; some quietly acquiesce, others are eagerly involved in the political affairs of the state, while still others actively oppose modern Zionism and the State of Israel. Rabbi Joel Teitelbaum was, and his followers still are, among the most hostile antagonists of the State. He believed the Jewish State to be an abomination: 'Zionism was an evil creed and to cooperate with the Zionists was a major sin. Nationalism was an imitation of the Gentiles' (p. 236). Once, before Kol Nidre, with a scroll of the Law in his arms, he declared solemnly: 'If there is any Jew here who believes that the Land of Israel is the beginning of Redemption, let him leave the synagogue. Even if I had to remain here alone, I still would not worship with him.' According to him, even if the people and the leaders of the State were to observe faithfully the principles of Jewish law, 'they would have forfeited everything by establishing a state before the advent of the Messiah' (p. 237).

Rabinowicz has organized the book into two parts. The first covers the early Hassidic masters from the eighteenth century until the Second World War. He provides a comprehensive description of the Hassidic rabbis' deep religious attachment to the Holy Land. He also shows how the Hassidim's fear of secularization and of the Enlightenment intensified their religious zeal and their attachment to a mystical charismatic leader. He stresses their ambivalence: on the one hand, they love and revere the 'Land of Israel' while on the other hand, they express grave apprehension and deep concern about a 'State of Israel', a secular national state not centred around traditional religious piety.

The second part of the book deals with the Hassidic rabbis and their followers now living in Israel. The author documents the Hassidim's accomplishments, their various settlements, their economic successes, their style of living, and their integration (or lack of it) into the life of modern Israel. The Hassidic masters were successful not only in transferring Hassidism from Europe to Israel, but they also elaborated

and stylized it. Rabinowicz demonstrates that in a comparatively small country such as Israel there is room for various religious sub-cultural differences to exist and to flourish side by side. With great skill, he shows that in the Holy Land, where it was believed that there was no need for Hassidic masters because 'the land itself was the Rebbe', in that very land *all* the Hassidic rabbis have succeeded in attracting many followers, have maintained their courts, and built Hassidism into the land and incorporated the land into Hassidism.

I think that he should have made a clearer distinction between the ultra-orthodox, non-Hassidic Jews and those who are clearly Hassidic, the followers of the particular teachings and life-styles of their rabbis.

The book is encyclopedic in character and highly informative. It provides an excellent *Who's Who* of the Hassidic world (but on p. 239, 'R. Abraham Blau' should read 'R. Moshe Blau'). It is a praiseworthy achievement which will be of great value to the English-reading public. What is now needed is a comprehensive sociological analysis of the contemporary growth of the Hassidic movement.

SOLOMON POLL

MILTON SHAIN, *Jewry and Cape Society: The Origins and Activities of the Jewish Board of Deputies for the Cape Colony*, xvi + 144 pp., Historical Publication Society, Rustica Press, Cape Town, 1983, R.21.00.

Jewry and Cape Society is an historical monograph on the nascent Jewish community of the Cape Colony at the turn of the century. That community numbered only 3,009 in 1891 (0.8 per cent of the white population) but rose to 19,537 (3.37 per cent of the white population) by 1904 as a result of immigration, primarily from the Lithuanian region of tsarist Russia. This slim volume, enhanced by a number of instructive illustrations from contemporary newspaper cartoons and a useful documentary appendix, thoroughly and competently examines the response to this Jewish immigration by local government and by the English-speaking public (the Afrikaners receive but little attention).

The author focuses upon the manifestations of anti-alien reaction and uncovers its considerable antisemitic component. He then goes on to trace the somewhat controversial emergence of a representative body for the local community, modelled on the Board of Deputies of British Jews, whose purpose was to watch over and, where necessary, defend the civic rights of Jews in the Cape Colony. The leading light in the formation of that body was a young barrister, Morris Alexander, who went on to become the foremost Jewish political figure in South Africa in the period before the Second World War. Alexander was a deeply committed Jew. He was born in 1877 in Czinn, East Prussia, but brought up from the age of three in South Africa. He obtained a degree

in law at Cambridge University and was befriended by Solomon Schechter's household. He later married that famous scholar's daughter, Ruth.

A subject of so limited a compass risks many pitfalls of parochial and trivial detail. Milton Shain has coped well with these difficulties and has made a contribution to the broader perspective not only of South African Jewry but also of the history of the Jewish dispersion in the modern period. Above all, his study illustrates the ubiquity of the West's culture-bound anti-Jewish prejudices, aggravated by contact with 'alien' Jewish immigrants. It is particularly the student of the modern history of Anglo-Jewry who will be struck by the familiarity of the issues and of the prejudices displayed by the host society towards this new Jewish community which, much like Anglo-Jewry itself, was experiencing rapid growth as a consequence of immigration. In its attitude to Jews, the British-controlled white society of the Cape Colony mirrored the home country to a most remarkable degree. But if this is true of the correlation between antisemitism and the manifestations of anti-alien agitation, it is no less true of the ultimately prevailing fairness and moderation of government policy towards the Jewish community; in the South African case, this was all the more salient in contrast to the treatment meted out to the 'non-European' racial groups.

The general outlines of Jewry's development in the Cape Colony have been known since the pioneering work of Israel Abrahams (*Birth of a Community*, Cape Town, 1955) and of Gustav Saron (*The Jews in South Africa*, Cape Town, 1955) whose research has placed all those interested in the history of South African Jewry in their debt. Shain has now made a more definitive contribution to our knowledge of the Cape Colony chapter of that history by drawing upon a wider range of Cape archival sources and of the contemporary press, notably the weeklies *The Owl* and *The South African Review*.

The seminal event which generated a Jewish response leading to the creation of a Jewish Board of Deputies in the Cape was the passing of the Immigration Restriction Act of 1902. That Act stemmed the 'undesirable' immigration of Indians into the Cape Colony without mentioning the Indians by name. It defined a 'prohibited immigrant', inter alia, as 'any person who when asked to do so by any duly authorized officer shall be unable, through deficient education, to himself write out and sign in the characters of any European language an application to the satisfaction of the Minister'. Rather curiously, this clause could affect Jewish immigrants from eastern Europe, since doubts were current as to whether Yiddish was a European language. Whereas in earlier historical literature that had been regarded as an unforeseen or inadvertent result of the legislation, Shain's research reveals that although the primary purpose of the Act was to control the

Indian influx, the implications for Jews 'were not only foreseen, they were intended' (p. 26). He shows this by referring to discussions in the Cape Assembly for a number of years preceding the Act, exposing the antisemitic motifs in the anti-alien press agitation, and examining various government sources.

The Medical Officer of Health, Dr A. J. Gregory, who was consulted by the drafters of the bill, had commented: 'When all is said and done, what is really aimed at? Neither more nor less than the exclusion of Asiatics and perhaps, Russian Jews' (p. 25). However, it is important to note that the Cape government authorities, far from resisting the pressures to exclude Jews from the possible implications of the Act, responded sympathetically to Jewish representations. Not only did the Attorney General readily agree to the Reverend Bender's request that declarations in Yiddish be accepted as complying with the Act, but he also told a deputation led by Morris Alexander that he fully appreciated its insistence that the law be officially amended. In the final analysis, therefore, the intention to use the Act against eastern European Jewish immigrants represented only a current of opinion within the Cape government and may be regarded as incidental to the Act's purpose rather than as a firmly determined policy.

It is in revealing the abundance of antisemitic stereotypes at so early a stage in the history of South African Jewry that Shain's research makes its most significant contribution — as can be seen in some detail in his article in the present issue of this Journal. A comparison with the imagery of contemporary antisemitism in Britain shows that the English-speaking society of the Cape was a faithful offshoot of British society. Shain's monograph provides an interesting addendum to Colin Holmes's *Anti-Semitism in British Society* (London, 1979), which had already emphasized the importance of stereotypes generated in South Africa during the Anglo-Boer War.

Shain also describes the early institutionalization of a leadership affirming a national (essential Zionist) self-awareness, independent of rabbinical authority, although not hostile to it. He states that 'a new secular identity' emerged from the decision to establish a Jewish Board of Deputies. However, there were those who, whilst resisting the Reverend Alfred Philipp Bender's opposition to the creation of such a Board (which supplanted the authority he claimed for himself), nevertheless remained observant Jews. This was so in the case of Morris Alexander, who often delivered Sabbath sermons at the New Hebrew Congregation in Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Shain skilfully examines the conflicting roles played by Alexander and Bender. The latter represented a pale counterpart of what was, in Britain, a powerful mode of Jewish religious leadership, patrician and patronizing in style and anti-Zionist in opinion. But he might have put more stress on the influence of Bender's background as the son of a

former minister of the Dublin Hebrew Congregation and as a Cambridge University graduate. Apart from his position as minister, since 1895, of the 'mother' congregation of Cape Town, he held the Chair of Hebrew at the South African College (later, the University of Cape Town). He was highly respected by the upper circles of Cape English society and had limitless trust in British liberty, benevolence, and fairness. Since he was convinced that Cape Jewry had not the slightest reason to fear any civil or religious disabilities, he set himself adamantly against the creation of any body aimed at defending putative Jewish interests beyond those of the synagogue, Jewish schools, and charities, all of which he considered properly to fall under his own spiritual aegis.

By contrast, Alexander insisted upon the need for a representative Board of Deputies to entrench unequivocally, and watch over, Jewish rights in all religious and civic matters, including immigration and naturalization. In this he enjoyed the support of L. L. Goldsmid, editor of *The South African Jewish Chronicle*, and of the Yiddish newspaper editor, David Goldblatt, who during the debates about the implementation of the Immigration Restriction Act published a pamphlet entitled *Yiddish: Is It a European Language?* in which he convincingly presented arguments for the European pedigree of Yiddish.

Leaving aside the dimension of personal rivalry revealed by Shain, it is the lay personality, Morris Alexander, rather than the religious figure, Reverend Bender, who exemplified the pattern of leadership which came to characterize South African Jewry as a whole. For Alexander was, from the outset, a convinced and leading Zionist. He was also, at least by the unique standards of South African white society, a liberal political figure. That is to say, he was an exponent of the 'Cape liberal tradition' which upheld the rights of all 'civilized men' (a considerable reservation in the South African context) without regard to race, colour, or creed and he often associated himself in parliament with the struggles of the Indians and the Coloureds against some of their disabilities. In this, he was much influenced by his first wife, Ruth Schechter, who became a close friend of Olive Schreiner and was deeply repelled by the injustices of the South African social system.

However, in *Jewry and Cape Society* there is no evidence that whilst striving boldly to exclude the Jews from the restrictions of the 1902 Act, Alexander and his associates also spoke up for the Asians. Indeed, the essence of the argument put forward on behalf of the Jews lay in differentiating them from all 'non-whites' in order to entrench their status as whites in every respect — an argument that was to be used a number of times in later years.

Jewry and Cape Society is a revised version of a Master's dissertation and reflects great credit both on its author and on the History Department of the University of South Africa. It is to be hoped that

Milton Shain will make further contributions to the historiography of South African Jewry.

GIDEON SHIMONI

AARON STEINBERG, *History as Experience: Aspects of Historical Thought — Universal and Jewish*, vii + 486 pp., published under the auspices of the World Jewish Congress by Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1983, $37.50 or £25.00.

Collected essays — in this case the volume of 'Selected Essays and Studies' by Aaron Steinberg — are notoriously difficult to review. At best one can draw attention to their publication, especially when the publication is designed to serve also as a homage and memorial to a scholar. And Aaron Steinberg (1891–1975) was a very remarkable scholar. He was a 'Jewish intellectual' in the almost technical, sociological sense of the term, and an early twentieth-century intellectual to boot. But one should be more specific. He was an intellectual of Russian origin and background, and hence both his Jewishness and his universality bore the imprint of the cultural climate that had shaped him. Of course that background did not lack western, especially German, elements. Steinberg studied at St Petersburg (where for some time he also was a professor) as well as at Heidelberg.

During the years which he spent in Germany (the 1920s and early 1930s) he wrote, among other things, two books on Dostoyevsky. Many of the essays collected in this volume were originally written in Russian, Yiddish, Hebrew, and German, though some also appeared in French and English. Unfortunately, the English translation of several of these essays is not always very satisfactory. During the Second World War, Dr Steinberg was already in England where his life and activities were devoted to the survival and future of the Jewish people, especially in their cultural aspects. This commitment led him to his close association with the World Jewish Congress (later also with the work of UNESCO), and to many other initiatives one of which at least should be mentioned here: the founding of the Journal in which this review appears.

Many students of Jewish history know Steinberg as the translator into German of Dubnow's *World History of the Jewish People*. (There are, incidentally, several very illuminating essays on Dubnow in the volume.) But Steinberg was not a translator. He was a thinker spellbound by the phenomenon of history, its rhythms, its meaning, the ways it conditions and shapes our experience. Our experience of the past shapes our experience of the present, and both shape our experience of the future, the 'not yet' — that is, in practical terms, our plans, programmes, and choices for the future. On the other hand, he was not a historian in the professional academic sense either. He was

not even a philosopher of history in the narrow technical sense. He was essentially a thinker who combined wide knowledge and erudition with a passionately philosophical mind. And being at the same time a deeply committed Jew (to the point of strictly observing the halakhic tradition, in spite of his open-minded attitude to other forms of Judaism), the central object of his intense thinking about history in general was Jewish history in particular, but Jewish history in its universal dimensions. His Russian background gave his thinking a very special cachet, and evidently the universalist elements of Jewish messianism would be analysed in a perspective different from that of most western Jewish writers by a philosopher whose intellectual universe included also the messianic dimensions of Russian-Pravoslav 'Third Rome' ideologies. How many Jewish scholars today would take as a starting point for their considerations of the philosophy of history not Hegel or Ranke or Dilthey or Meinecke, but Lavrov?

The essays collected in this volume are not research papers but *Publizistik* of the highest order and in the best sense of the word. The editors did their best to arrange their selection according to criteria of related contents and inner cohesion. Hence the forty essays are presented in four sections entitled 'The Cultural Factor in Historical Change', 'Jewish Morals and Messianic Hopes', 'Varieties and Distortions of Messianism', and 'Towards the Future'. The titles of the three last sections betray, deliberately or unintentionally, the essentially messianic, future-orientated historical thinking of Steinberg, particularly evident in some of the essays in Section 4: 'Why remain Jewish?', 'Moscow, New York, Jerusalem', and the concluding essay 'A Parliament of World Education' — originally a short broadcast address on the role of Non-Governmental Organizations (The NGOs, like the World Jewish Congress) in UNESCO, about which at that time one could still reasonably entertain some hopes.

Steinberg's originality of mind and independence of judgement are in evidence throughout the volume. Two examples must suffice here. First, his profound and sympathetic analysis of Dostoyevsky, including his powerful arguments against those who glibly write off the great writer as 'just another Russian antisemite'. Second, he has equally strong words against the cult of Spinoza that began to become fashionable in some circles. Steinberg was the very opposite of a dogmatist and heresy-hunter. But he held very definite views about Jewish history, and hence could also envisage the possibility of a great Jew being profoundly and essentially un-Jewish.

The value of this volume is enhanced by an eloquent portrait of the man by his close collaborator and friend, Dr Gerhart Riegner, and by a learned and penetrating Introduction to Steinberg's thought from the pen of the late Professor Uriel Tal.

R. J. ZWI WERBLOWSKY

CHRONICLE

According to the Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel, the total population of the country last September, at the end of the Jewish year 5744, was 4,200,000 of whom 3,486,000 were Jews. There were 15,000 new immigrants during the year.

*

The Ministry of Absorption of Israel announced last July that the number of immigrants and potential immigrants in January to June 1984 was 6,769 — 194 fewer than the total for the first half of 1983 (6,963). There was a marked increase from African countries (1,698 against 1,070) while immigration from Romania almost doubled from 534 to 1,041, and from the Soviet Union rose from 180 to 194.

On the other hand, the total from the United States declined from 1,267 to 947 and from Latin American countries from 1,516 to 1,155. But there was a slight increase in the number of returning Israelis: 971 as against 953 in January–June 1983.

*

The Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews reported that there were 1,180 synagogue marriages in Great Britain in 1983. This represented an increase of 70 such unions over the previous year (1,110) as well as a return to the 1981 total (1,180).

In 1983, the Central Orthodox group led with 772 marriages (65.5 per cent of the total), followed by the Reform (188 or 15.9 per cent), the Right-Wing Orthodox (104 or 8.8 per cent), the Liberal (71 or 6 per cent), and finally the Sephardim (45 or 3.8 per cent). About three quarters of all synagogue marriages (74 per cent) were celebrated in London and 26 per cent in the provinces; in 1972, 72 per cent took place in London and 28 per cent in the provinces.

The total number of burials and cremations under Jewish religious auspices in 1983 was 4,715, a decline of 131 over the previous year (4,846). There were 3,876 Orthodox burials, accounting for 82.2 per cent of the total while the number of burials and cremations under Reform and Liberal auspices was 522 (11.1 per cent) for the former and 317 (6.7 per cent) for the latter. The distribution of deaths between London and the provinces has remained unchanged since 1981: 66 per cent in London and 34 per cent in the provinces.

*

The Institute of Jewish Studies of University College London and the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies sponsored a conference last July on the changing character of Jewish authority in the modern age.

*

The Spring 1984 issue of *News from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem* states that the University's Rothberg School for Overseas Students runs a special course of studies in co-operation with the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome. The course lasts seven months and was attended last year by 17 priests and two nuns who came from 13 countries: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Hong Kong, Ireland, Lesotho, Mexico, the Netherlands, the United States, and Yugoslavia. The subjects they studied in Jerusalem included the Hebrew language, archaeology, and Jewish history.

*

The International Sephardic Educational Foundation (ISEF), based in New York and sponsored by a group of American Sephardim, awards substantial scholarships to Sephardi students at all the universities of Israel. There are at present some 500 students in receipt of ISEF scholarships who also tutor disadvantaged schoolchildren, supervise youth centres in depressed neighbourhoods, and engage in other similar community projects.

*

In the academic year 1983–84, there were 21 students from 13 developing countries registered for the Master of Public Health degree at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem's Hadassah School of Public Health and Community Medicine: 11 physicians, two dentists, two nurses, two pharmacists, an occupational therapist, a health instructor, a statistician, and a psychologist. They came from Bolivia, Burma, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kenya, Nepal, Panama, the Philippines, Thailand, and Uruguay. The course is jointly sponsored by the United Nations World Health Organization and the Division for International Co-operation of the Foreign Ministry of Israel.

*

It was announced last May that the world's first academic centre for the study of Jewish medical ethics is to be established at Ben Gurion University of the Negev. A South African businessman has endowed the centre.

*

The First International Colloquium on Jewish Humour was held at Tel-Aviv University last June. It was attended by some 150 anthropologists, sociologists, educationalists, and psychologists. The Fourth International Congress on Humour was held the following week also in Tel-Aviv and a professor of psychology at Tel-Aviv University was the chairman of the organizing committee of each gathering.

*

It was announced last September that Israel and Belize (formerly British Honduras) are to establish full diplomatic relations. Since its independence in 1981, Belize has been receiving agricultural assistance from Israel.

*

CHRONICLE

The September 1984 issue of *On Board*, the Newsletter of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, states that more than 40 delegates from 16 countries attended the first conference of the Commonwealth Jewish Council in Gibraltar in the first week of September. The Council was established in London in December 1982 and there are now 22 member-countries, some of which have small Jewish communities.

*

Five French synagogues were declared historic monuments last September by the Ministry of Culture. They are in Nancy, Mulhouse, Soultz, Colmar, and Guebwiller. The Ministry will now be responsible for the cost of any restoration work.

*

More than 300 delegates from 34 countries attended the International Council of Jewish Women's thirteenth triennial convention in Bournemouth last May. Great Britain's League of Jewish women was the host and Queen Elizabeth sent the delegates a message of goodwill. Representatives of recently affiliated groups came from Costa Rica, Colombia, and Taiwan. There were workshops on the family, community service, intermarriage and assimilation, the disabled, and the elderly. There were also sessions dealing with Jewish education, Soviet Jewry, and antisemitism. Delegates from Brazil, South Africa, and the United States spoke about antisemitism in their respective countries. The final session of the convention was on the status of women.

*

A three-day international symposium on the Nazi extermination of the Jews was held in Stuttgart last May. It was attended by some 200 scholars from Great Britain, Israel, the United States, and West Germany. The Symposium was organized by Stuttgart University in co-operation with the city's Library of Contemporary History and the West German Committee of the International Society on the History of the Second World War.

*

The Jews of Prague have a rabbi again, fourteen years after the death of the last Chief Rabbi of Bohemia and Moravia. The new rabbi was ordained last May at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Budapest in the presence of communal leaders of Czechoslovakia. He underwent training as a *mohel* (ritual circumciser) in London in 1983. There are said to be about 15,000 Jews in Czechoslovakia, a very small remnant of the 375,000 who lived in the country before the Second World War.

*

A professor of sociology at Vienna University carried out a detailed survey of more than a thousand Austrians between 1976 and 1980. Some of the results were published last September. A quarter of those questioned (25 per cent) displayed 'distinct antisemitic prejudice', a further 25 per cent manifested 'milder signs of prejudice' but rejected discriminatory measures, and only 15

per cent claimed to have no prejudice against Jews. The rest had 'no opinion' on the matter. Antisemitism was most marked in areas where no Jews lived while in Vienna, where the majority of Austrian Jews are to be found, only eight per cent of the respondents admitted anti-Jewish prejudice.

The majority believed that Jews account for ten per cent of the population of Austria while, in fact, they constitute only about one per cent of all Austrians. Almost two thirds of the respondents (64 per cent) thought that Jews played too great a role in finance and trade; nearly half (47 per cent) believed that the influence of world Jewry was under-estimated; and 45 per cent wanted Jews to have only restricted access to influential positions — 17 per cent of them advocating practical measures to implement such restrictions.

Just over one fifth (21 per cent) said that the elimination of Jews from Austria 'also had some positive aspects' while exactly the same percentage conceded that Jews could make a positive contribution to Austrian life. More than half (57 per cent) said that they did not like to be reminded of the Holocaust.

*

The Church of Scotland and the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council issued last May a joint statement against the evil of antisemitism: '. . . We are agreed that antisemitism must be combated in all its manifestations. Those of us who are Christians recognize our need to acknowledge the Church's guilt through many centuries in fostering anti-Jewish attitudes and to seek forgiveness of God and our Jewish brothers and sisters'.

The Church of Scotland had passed a resolution at its 1981 General Assembly calling for closer understanding and friendship between Christians and Jews and a series of meetings between Church of Scotland ministers and Jewish communal leaders began in 1982.

*

A conference on antisemitism and anti-Zionism was held at the Institute of Jewish Affairs in London last summer. It was organized by the IJA in conjunction with the Centre for the Study of International Antisemitism of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Programme for the Study of Political Extremism and Antisemitism of Tel-Aviv University. Some 30 scholars from seven countries attended and the three sponsoring bodies decided to produce a volume on anti-Zionism.

*

The municipality of Rome commissioned a survey on the city's Christians, Jews, and Muslims. It was carried out by the Centre for Socio-educational Research and some of the results were published last August. The Jewish sample consisted of 150 persons; 130 were born in Rome and the remaining 20 were immigrants from Libya. Three quarters said they had visited Israel at least once and 20 per cent have some knowledge of Hebrew. More than half (56 per cent) have a diploma or a university degree. Two thirds (66 per cent) observe only the main Holy days and festivals and only 14 per cent described themselves as Orthodox. However, 80 per cent are married to, or intend to

marry, Jewish spouses. The very large majority (90 per cent) described their relations with non-Jews as excellent.

*

During his recent official visit to Israel, the Chancellor of West Germany spent several hours on the Mount Scopus campus of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He announced that the West German government will fund a new Chair in Economics at that University; it will be named after the German Jewish banker, Carl Melchior, who was the first German representative to the Bank for International Settlements established in Europe after the First World War.

*

A Jewish summer camp was organized in Barcelona this year. It was the first such camp in Spain and was attended by 180 young people from 12 communities: Barcelona, Benidorm, Madrid, Marbella, Malaga, Palma de Majorca, Seville, Valencia, the Canary Islands, Andorra, and the two Spanish enclaves in North Africa — Ceuta and Mellila. The Youth and Hechalutz department of the Jewish Agency held a training course at the camp for Jewish youth leaders.

*

The European Council of Jewish Community Services met in Athens last May. There were representatives from 19 European countries, including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania, and observers from the World Zionist Organization and the Foreign Ministry of Israel. The main theme of the conference was 'the survival and development of Jewish communities in Europe'. The delegates discussed the Council's social and educational programmes and decided to promote co-operation between European youth organizations and similar bodies in Israel's development towns.

There were 76,500 Jews in Greece before the Second World War; there are only about 5,000 now, 2,000 of whom live in Athens.

*

The Spiro Institute for the Study of Jewish History and Culture was established in London in 1979. Its summer 1984 Newsletter states that in the first term of the 1984–85 academic year, the Institute 'shall be teaching over fifty different classes in schools and to adult groups'. The Institute aims 'to bring a knowledge of Modern Jewish History and Culture to all sections of Jewry . . . and to interested non-Jews as well'. About a third of its school students are not Jewish.

Its activities fall into three main categories. First, it has introduced courses in modern Jewish history in general secondary schools as part of their normal sixth-form curriculum. Second, it runs adult classes in general adult institutes, synagogues, and private homes and hopes to organize in 1984–85 regular seminars in modern Jewish history at the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London. Third, it trains teachers in regular weekly classes

'combined with intensive summer seminars held in conjunction with the Hebrew University of Jerusalem'.

The Greater London Council has approved a grant to the Spiro Institute on the recommendation of the Ethnic Minorities Committee.

The address of the Spiro Institute for the Study of Jewish History and Culture is 3 St John's Wood Road, London NW8 8RB, England.

*

The May 1984 Report of the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization states that the Center has established a register which is designed to include an inventory of course descriptions and programme requirements; a directory of faculty members teaching in the field; and a repository of syllabi and related information. The Center's 'present store of data already covers well over 700 institutions in 16 countries. When the project is fully developed, systems will be in place for updating the information on a regular basis and retrieving it selectively'.

The address of the Center is at the Office of the President of Israel, Rehov HaNassi, Jerusalem 92188, Israel.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

Cohen, Steve, *That's Funny, You Don't Look Anti-Semitic: An Anti-Racist Analysis of Left Anti-Semitism*, 103 pp., published and distributed by Beyond the Pale Collective (Box no. 6, 59 Cookridge Street, Leeds LS2 3AW, England), 1984, £2.00 or $4.00.

Frankel, Jonathan, ed., *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, vol. 1, xvii + 584 pp., published for the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem by Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1984, $22.00.

Frankel, William, ed., *Survey of Jewish Affairs 1982*, 295 pp., Associated University Presses, London and Toronto, 1984, £16.50.

Israel, Benjamin J., *The Bene Israel of India: Some Studies*, xii + 248 pp., Sangam Books (36 Molyneux Street, London W1H 6DS), 1984, £14.95.

Jimack, Michael, *Jewish Senior Citizens in South London. A Study of Social and Community Needs*, v + 54 pp., Central Council for Jewish Social Service (221 Golders Green Road, London NW11 9DW), 1983, n.p.

Kaplan, Jonathan, ed., *International Bibliography of Jewish History and Thought*, xviii + 483 pp., K. G. Saur Verlag, Munich, 1984, distributed in the United Kingdom by Library Association Publishing (7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE), £33.00.

Keren, Michael, *Ben-Gurion and the Intellectuals: Power, Knowledge, and Charisma*, x + 210 pp., Northern Illinois University Press, DeKalb, 1983, $20.00.

Legters, Lyman H., ed., *Western Society After the Holocaust*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 1983, distributed by Bowker Publishing Co. (Erasmus House, Epping, Essex CM16 4BU, England), £18.50.

Luel, Steven A. and Paul Marcus, eds., *Psychoanalytic Reflections on the Holocaust: Selected Essays*, xii + 239 pp., Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1984, $20.00.

Oring, Elliott, *The Jokes of Sigmund Freud: A Study in Humor and Jewish Identity*, xv + 151 pp., University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1984, $14.95.

Schmelz, U. O., *Aging of World Jewry*, 289 pp., Jewish Population Studies no. 15, The Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and JDC-Brookdale Institute of Gerontology and Adult Human Development, Jerusalem, 1984, n.p.

Semi, Emanuela Trevisan, *Gli Ebrei Caraiti tra etnia e religione*, 247 pp., Carucci, Rome, 1984, n.p.

Smooha, Sammy, ed., *Social Research on Arabs in Israel, 1977–1982: A Bibliography*, 104 pp. (English and Hebrew), The Jewish–Arab Center, University of Haifa, 1984, $10.00.

Smooha, Sammy, *The Orientation and Politicization of the Arab Minority in Israel*, revised edn., viii + 225 pp., The Jewish–Arab Center, University of Haifa, 1984, $15.00.

Vegh, Claudine, *I Didn't Say Goodbye*, translated by Ros Schwartz, with a Postface by Bruno Bettelheim, 179 pp., Caliban Books (25 Nassington Road, London NW3), 1984, £7.95 (paperback, £3.95).

Wigoder, Geoffrey, ed., *Contemporary Jewry. Studies in Honor of Moshe Davis*, 431 pp. (English and Hebrew), The Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1984, n.p.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

EDLESON, Jeffrey L.; Ph.D. Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota. Chief publications: 'Teaching Children to Resolve Conflict: A Group Approach', *Social Work*, vol. 26, 1981; co-author, 'Group Training in Marital Communication: A Comparative Study', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 45, 1983; co-author, 'The Emotional Health of English Speaking Immigrants to Israel', *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, vol. 60, no. 2, Winter 1983–84; and 'Working with Men Who Batter', *Social Work*, vol. 29, 1984.

ROSKIN, Michael; Ph.D. Director, Department of Social Work, Hadassah Medical Organization and Lecturer, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Chief publications: 'Primary Prevention and Social Work Practice', *Social Work*, vol. 25, no. 3, May 1980; 'Coping with Life Changes — A Preventive Social Work Approach', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 10, no. 3, June 1982; co-author, 'On the Validity of the Symptom Check List 90: A Comparison of Diagnostic Self-Ratings in General Practice Patients and "Normals" Based on the Hebrew Version', *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, vol. 29, no. 3, Autumn 1983; co-author, 'The Emotional Health of English Speaking Immigrants to Israel', *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, vol. 60, no. 2, Winter 1983–84; and 'A Look at Bereaving Parents — Five Years Later', *Bereavement Care Journal*, Spring 1984.

SCHMOOL, Marlena; B.Soc.Sc. Member of the Special Research Committee of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. Formerly, Research Officer of the Board's Statistical and Demographic Research Unit. Chief publications: co-author, 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population 1960–65', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 10, no. 1, June 1968; 'Register of Social Research on the Anglo-Jewish Community', *JJS*, vol. 10, no. 2, December 1968; co-author, 'Synagogue Marriages in Great Britain 1966–68', *JJS*, vol. 12, no. 1, June 1970; co-author, 'Statistics of Milah and the Jewish Birth-Rate in Britain', *JJS*, vol. 12, no. 2, December 1970; and 'Register of Social Research on Anglo-Jewry, 1968–71', *JJS*, vol. 14, no. 2, December 1971.

SHAIN, Milton, M.A. Lecturer in History, University of Cape Town. Chief publications: *Jewry and Cape Society. The Origins and Activities of the Jewish Board of Deputies for the Cape Colony*, 1983 and 'Diamonds, Pogroms and Undesirables. Anti-alienism and Legislation in the Cape Colony 1898–1910', *South African Historical Journal*, no. 12, November 1980.

STEINBERG, Bernard; Ph.D. Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Town. Chief publications: 'Jewish Education in Great Britain During World War II', *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1, January 1967; 'Jewish Eduation in South Africa', *Jewish Education*, vol. 39, no. 4, December 1969; 'European Immigration and Ethnicicity — Some

Considerations Relating to South Africa', *The South African Journal of Sociology*, 13, June 1976; 'Jewish Education in the United States: A Study in Religio-Ethnic Response', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 21, no. 1, June 1979; and 'Policy and Change in Education Systems — Some Implications for South Africa', *South African Journal of Education*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1982.

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR Judith Freedman

VOLUME TWENTY-SIX 1984

Published on behalf of Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd
by William Heinemann Ltd

CONTENTS

BOOKS REVIEWED

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS

SOVIET JEWISH AFFAIRS

A Journal on Jewish Problems in the USSR and Eastern Europe

Volume 14 Number 2 May 1984 Published three times yearly

Published by the INSTITUTE OF JEWISH AFFAIRS
11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX
Annual subscription: £9.50 ($15.00); single issue: £3.50 ($6.50)