THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XXX : NUMBER 1 : JUNE 1988

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.

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 XXX : Number 1 : June 1988

CONTENTS

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY, IN JUNE AND DECEMBER
by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd
(Published by the World Jewish Congress 1959–80)

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION
INSTITUTIONS: £12.00 (U.S. $24.00)
INDIVIDUALS: £10.00 (U.S. $20.00)
SINGLE COPIES: £6.00 (U.S. $12.00)

Applications for subscriptions should be sent to The Jewish Journal of Sociology, 187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England. Telephone: 01 262 8939

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.

JEWISH EMIGRATION FROM ISRAEL

Asher Friedberg and Aharon Kfir

I

SINCE its establishment in 1948, the State of Israel has encouraged and indeed warmly welcomed Diaspora Jews to settle in the Holy Land and has sought to facilitate their absorption. Until 1951 there was mass immigration from camps for displaced persons in Europe, from detainee camps in Cyprus, from the Balkans (especially Bulgaria), Iraq, Yemen, North Africa, and the Middle East. Immense efforts were deployed to house the newcomers, to look after their health, find them employment, and educate their children. After the 1950s, the flow diminished considerably: according to Israel's Central Bureau of Statistics, there were 956,700 immigrants until 1959; 371,700 in the 1960s; 346,260 in the 1970s; and only 103,780 in 1980–86. In 1986, the total Jewish population of Israel was 3,561,400.[1] Apart from the large numbers of Russian Jews who came at the end of the 1960s and the early 1970s, and the more recent immigration of Ethiopian Jews, most of the newcomers since the early 1970s arrived in small groups or as single families or individuals.

The Hebrew word for emigration to Israel is *aliyah* (ascent) and the new arrivals are called *olim* (those who have made the ascent), while *yeridah* (descent) is the term for emigration from Israel and those who leave the country after settling in it are called *yordim* (those who descend). Clearly, the words used in this context are emotionally charged and the implication seems to be that those who abandon Isreal are little better than deserters. Nevertheless, substantial numbers of Israeli Jews left the country in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s and remained abroad not simply for a few weeks or months as tourists or for a limited period as students or business men, but for many years. By the end of the 1970s, according to the Central Bureau of Statistics, there were 342,100 residents who had not returned from abroad within four years of their departure.[2]

Eventually, the Israeli government openly admitted that this large demographic loss was a matter of serious national concern and in 1980 entrusted the then Deputy Prime Minister (Simcha Ehrlich) and the then Director General of the Jewish Agency (Shmuel Lahis) with the

task of investigating the matter. Ehrlich and Lahis were concerned only with *yeridah* to the United States, since it was in that country that there was the major concentration of *yordim*. The Lahis Report was published in 1980.[3] It stated that the number of *yordim* in the United States was between 300,000 and 500,000 and that the majority of them lived in Greater New York and in Los Angeles; the rest were scattered throughout the country. Israelis who came to America were drawn to areas where there were concentrations of *yordim* because this helped them to overcome the anxiety resulting from feelings of alienation.

The clusters of *yordim* had come to constitute a new ethnic minority and they exhibited tendencies and attitudes characteristic of other immigrant groups. For example, the second generation (the children of *yordim*) were becoming assimilated with the likelihood that they might lose their Israeli identity. The Lahis Report pointed out that the *yordim* themselves were greatly attached to Israel and that this feeling must be nurtured; it was wrong to treat these people with contempt. The most important task now was to examine critically the conditions within Israel which had led them to emigrate in the first place and which deterred them from returning to their motherland. It was more constructive to deal with the sources of the problem and attempt to devise solutions. It was essential to instil in the young an appreciation of Jewish values and traditions; and after the completion of their military service to provide for them suitable employment and adequate housing.

The findings of the Lahis Report alarmed the Israeli Jewish public when they were publicized by the media and the Government declared in 1981 that measures would be taken to discourage emigration and to persuade the *yordim* to return to Israel; it added that efforts would be made to increase immigration from both eastern and western countries.[4] The Government Yearbooks for every year since 1981 have repeated these undertakings, using identical words.

Some of those who carried out research into the subject of *yeridah* have tended to conclude that the loss to Israel of so many citizens (most of whom were young, able-bodied, and skilled) was bound to have disturbing implications for the demography, economy, morale, and defence of the country.[5] On the other hand, an Israeli professor was of the opinion that the problem had been greatly exaggerated; according to him, emigration had always occurred, the size of the *yeridah* had been comparatively small and had not had very serious consequences, and any state interference with the free movement of its citizens would only aggravate the situation.[6]

After the public reaction to the Lahis Report, a Deputy Minister in the Prime Minister's Office was appointed to look into the problem of *yeridah* and to make recommendations. (The concentration of the activities to deter emigration in the Prime Minister's Office was an

indication of the public importance of the matter.) In April 1982, an operative director of activities was appointed to the Deputy Minister's bureau in the Prime Minister's Office and he outlined a framework of policies to deter emigration. In the event, no firm decisions were taken, partly because targets and priorities could not be agreed upon by various government bodies and because when there was agreement on some issues, appropriate resources were not allocated. In March 1984, a government committee was constituted, chaired by the same Deputy Minister in the Prime Minister's Office. The committee's members were the Directors General of 14 Ministries and Authorities (including the Ministries of Defence, Labour and Welfare, Education and Culture, Housing, and the director of budgets in the Ministry of Finance). The task of the committee was 'to carry out all necessary activities concerned with deterring emigration';[7] it convened for a single meeting and was subsequently disbanded because of the impending general election of 1984.

Towards the end of 1984, the new Prime Minister decided to transfer the handling of measures to deter emigration from his own office to that of the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption. Another committee was appointed consisting of the Directors General of the Ministries of Defence, Education and Culture, Finance, Housing, and Labour and Welfare, and chaired by the Director General of the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption. After a number of meetings, the committee published in September 1985 the conclusions it had reached about the measures to be adopted to deter emigration.[8] These conclusions were mainly in respect of young persons nearing the age of military service and of demobilized personnel; they recommended particularly an intensification of education in Zionist values and assistance to demobilized personnel in the fields of further education, employment, and housing. However, no practical steps were taken to act on the committee's recommendations. Thus, in spite of repeated government declarations that the problem of Jewish emigration was viewed with concern and that measures to combat that deplorable trend were being actively devised and would be implemented, very little was achieved in the event.

Several years earlier, on the other hand, the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption had decided to encourage *yordim* to return to settle in Israel by offering them benefits that were identical with those granted to new immigrants. These were mainly customs rebates and housing benefits and the *yordim* entitled to them should have been abroad for at least five years and should have returned to Israel between the beginning of April 1968 and the end of December 1970.[9] However, the number of those who returned because of these concessions was insignificant.

At the end of November 1977, the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption decided again to offer inducements to *yordim*, this time to those who had

been abroad before the first of April 1975 and who would return to Israel in the twenty months between the beginning of January 1978 and the end of August 1979. The inducements were basically similar to those granted to *yordim* about a decade earlier. The State Comptroller, in his Annual Report published in 1980, criticized the offer of inducements to *yordim* and pointed out that it would be more effective to adopt measures in Israel which would deter emigration: there should be inducements to remain in Israel in the first place;[10] but he did not offer any further practical suggestions in his Report.

Under existing legislation at the time of writing (January 1988), not only members of Israeli embassies and emissaries of various institutions and organizations returning home, but every Israeli who has lived abroad for more than two years can benefit from rebates up to a maximum of US$10,000 in customs duty on durable goods he brings to Israel on his return; but according to Aharon Fein, this has not proved in most cases to be a sufficient inducement for *yordim* to come back.[11] Moreover, it was even suggested that some Israelis decided to go abroad for a couple of years in order to benefit, on their return, from customs duty rebates on the goods they acquired overseas; that those who had intended to stay away for a shorter period deliberately prolonged their sojourn abroad in order to secure their entitlements to these rebates; and that an illegal trade in those entitlements had developed which was difficult to control.[12]

It could therefore be argued that these rebates encouraged Israelis to go abroad and in March 1983 there was a proposal to reduce the benefits to a minimum level. The Ministry of Finance asked the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Knesset to consider abolishing the customs duty rebates on durable goods and to restrict the list of other duty-free goods, such as used household articles. However, the abolition of these entitlements required the formal or informal consent of, among others, the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption, the Immigration and Absorption Division of the Jewish Agency, and the Foreign Ministry. The former two made outspoken objections while it was rumoured that the Foreign Ministry let it be known that it would not give formal consent. The matter was raised again in 1985 and another committee was appointed; it submitted recommendations to restrict the present entitlements to benefits but by the end of 1987 these recommendations had not been implemented.

II

It was generally recognized that the section of the population most likely to wish to emigrate consisted mainly of young persons in their early twenties who had completed their period of military service and were experiencing difficulties in securing independent adequate housing

and/or in supporting themselves while pursuing their studies in institutions of higher learning. In July 1984, the Demobilized Soldiers Law was enacted. It provided for special entitlements in respect of housing, employment, higher studies, and income tax rebates. However, every paragraph on matters which entailed financial expenditure included the following words: 'with the consent of the Minister of Finance'. The new law provided that the State would cover 75 per cent of the tuition fees in an institution approved by the Ministry of Education and Culture, but when the Ministry requested the necessary funds for the benefit of demobilized soliders, the Ministry of Finance refused to provide them and by the end of 1987 that section of the law had not been implemented.

Another difficulty in implementing the new law was that several ministries were involved in its application. The Ministry of Defence had to confirm that the soldier had been demobilized; the Ministry of Labour and Welfare had to approve the proposed course of vocational training; the Ministry of Education and Culture had to approve the granting of a loan for further education; and the Ministry of Construction and Housing had to approve a housing loan. But even after all these consents had been obtained from these various ministries, the Ministry of Finance could refuse the necessary funds. At the end of 1985, a private member's bill was introduced which would make the Ministry of Defence alone responsible to enact regulations for the implementation of the Demobilized Soldiers Law;[13] in July 1986, the bill was referred to the Knesset Committee on Immigration and Absorption. No further action was taken.

Housing has been identified as one of the key factors in the decision to emigrate or to return to Israel after having lived abroad for some years.[14] Ideally, what young adults wish is to acquire their own apartments. The next best thing is to find reasonably priced and adequate rented accommodation. It has been argued that if apartments were made available for rent to young couples and to some other specified sections of the population at a modest rental, that would have the added advantage of facilitating the mobility of employees generally. The government elected in 1984 was aware of the importance of housing, and in paragraph 19–e of its guide-lines stated that it would help to ensure 'the construction of apartments for lease at a reasonable rent, especially for young couples and for families with numerous children'. Here it should be stressed that the previous government had also made a similar pledge, stating that 'it would continue to make a special effort towards the implementation of the scheme for the construction of housing for rent'.[15]

The Directors General of various ministries who were members of the Committee appointed in 1985 to recommend measures to deter emigration commented in that year: 'The idea of governmental promotion of housing construction projects for rental that would not

exceed approximately one fourth or one-third of an employee's income was raised several times but has failed to be implemented under the circumstances of the Israeli economy. The topic was discussed at various forums and was not found to be implementable'.[16] In the event, therefore, very few apartments for rental were constructed.

III

The question of Jewish emigration from Israel has in recent years been discussed at various symposia and the Israeli media have shown great concern about it. The importance of fostering within the educational system a love of the land of Israel and a respect for Jewish traditional values has been stressed. In 1983, the Ministry of Education and Culture appointed a committee, chaired by Professor Eliezer Schweid of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, to design a course of studies for Jewish pupils which would enhance Zionist values and deter emigration. The Committee recommended, in 1984, a curriculum which would strengthen an 'Israeli identity' by nurturing loyalty to the land of Israel and respect for Jewish traditions within both formal and informal educational frameworks. The committee of Directors General of various ministries, to which we referred above, deplored in 1985 the fact that the recommendations of Professor Schweid and his team had not been implemented.[17]

Did most of the *yordim* in fact lack Zionist values or patriotism? The majority of them could not be described as marginal members of society, or weaklings, or as the classical black sheep encouraged by their families to leave the country. Moreover, it seems that in recent years emigration has not been viewed with undisguised disapproval or contempt by the bulk of the general Israeli Jewish population. There has been understanding by friends and relatives of the socio-economic factors which had led *yordim* to seek their fortunes abroad. Indeed, in many cases those who left Israel claimed that they were going away for a specified period and would return in due course to their native land. It is impossible on the basis of the scant available data regarding the *yordim*'s motivations and original plans when they left Israel to arrive at any definite conclusions about the factors which have influenced them to remain abroad for an indefinite number of years. What we do know is that during the period 1966–1979, as many as 220 Israelis in the United States altered their status from that of Israeli government official to that of permanent resident of America.[18]

From the data available in respect of 1982–85, we also know that during those years, 127 Israelis in the United States altered their status from that of Israeli government official to that of permanent resident. These officials included employees of various Israeli ministries as well as security personnel. A foreign government official and the members of

his household enter the United States with a category A visa, while a temporary worker or trainee needs a category H visa. The Statistical Yearbooks of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service for 1982–85 show that in 1982, 37 Israelis who had received A visas altered their status to that of permanent resident in the United States; in that same year, only two Austrian government officials had done so, two from Ireland, four from Denmark and four from Greece, nine from France, and ten from Italy. For 1983, the figures were 33 from Israel; four from Austria and four from France; three each from Belgium, Denmark, and Finland; and none from Ireland. For 1984, there were 26 from Israel, ten from France, three from Belgium and three from Greece; two from Italy and two from Denmark; and again none from Ireland. For 1985, there were 31 from Israel; seven from Italy; five from Belgium and five from France; four from Austria; three from Greece; two from Denmark; and one from Ireland. Thus, for those four years (1982–85), the Israeli total was 127, while the total for Austria was 11; for Belgium, 11; for Denmark, 11; for France, 28; for Greece, 13; for Ireland, three; and for Italy, 37. As for those who entered the United States with a Category H visa (temporary workers and trainees) and converted their status to that of permanent resident during that same period (1982–85), again the Israeli total was larger than that for any of the European countries above: 504 Israelis, 77 Austrians, 148 Belgians, 83 Danes, 351 French nationals, 127 Greeks, 166 Irish citizens, and 214 Italians.

Clearly, those Israelis who in recent years acquired rights of permanent residence in the United States are mainly from the upper socio-economic strata of Israel; but they chose to change their status officially and therefore openly in larger numbers than did nationals of several other countries whose total population, in each case, is far larger than that of Israel. Moreover, the numbers of Israeli academics and professionals who have settled abroad ('the brain drain') must give cause for concern to the Israeli authorities. They include senior scientists, medical personnel, engineers, technicians, and computer specialists who sought abroad professional advancement and increased earnings; and since their skills were greatly prized in Western countries, they acquired there greater rewards. Their numbers are in addition to those of Israeli students who, after studying abroad and graduating, do not return home but find employment in the countries where they obtained their qualifications.[19]

According to the Statistical Yearbooks of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Services,[20] of the 1,280 Israelis who were naturalized American citizens in 1980, 264 (or 20.6 per cent) were defined as professionals (including technical and related professions); so were 368 (21.6 per cent) of the 1,706 in 1981; 398 (22.2 per cent) of the 1,796 in 1982; and 328 (18.3 per cent) of the 1,793 in 1983. Thus, on

average, about one-fifth of all Israelis naturalized during those years were professionals and many of them had engineering and other technical qualifications. Indeed, it has been claimed that about 20 per cent of adult Israelis abroad are engaged in engineering-technical and related occupations.[21]

On 17 February 1982, the subject of the considerable emigration of graduates from technical schools and institutions in Israel was raised in the Knesset and a joint committee was appointed in March 1982; its members were recruited from among those who served in other Knesset committees concerned with Labour and Welfare and with Immigration and Absorption and thirteen meetings were convened. Several recommendations were made, including one which urged that technicians who had successfully completed their course should be able to have their qualifications count as credits if they wished to continue their studies in order to acquire an engineering degree, thus curtailing the number of years of study usually required for obtaining such a degree. Universities in some countries (for example, France and the United States), recognize the diploma obtained by Israeli technicians after a two-year course and require only a further period of two years of study before allowing them to sit for their engineering degree — and that degree is recognized in Israel. This leads some Israeli technicians to go abroad and when they graduate they may decide to find employment in the same country and thus add to the numbers of *yordim*. Nevertheless, Israel's Higher Education Council refused to allow the introduction of an abridged degree course for qualified technicians, despite repeated requests from the President of Israel, Knesset committees, and professional bodies.[22] Finally, that Council allowed Tel Aviv University, in the academic year 1986–87, to introduce such an abridged engineering degree curriculum for qualified technicians.

Similarly, the diplomas of the Wingate Institute for Physical Education and Sports were not recognized by Israel's Higher Education Council as equivalent to academic degrees, while universities abroad did so —with the predictable result that some of the diploma holders went overseas to obtain postgraduate qualifications, found attractive offers of employment there later, and did not return to Israel. In 1983, Wingate Institute graduates were at last granted full academic recognition by the Council. This is yet another instance of the necessity for bureaucrats and officials to be willing to reconsider entrenched positions and to arrive at practical solutions.

Conclusion

One obvious way to prevent or drastically curtail Jewish emigration from Israel would be to enforce severe restrictions on the rights of law-abiding citizens to leave the country. That solution would be

abhorrent to nearly all Israeli Jews and could not be seriously contemplated. On the other hand, there is understandable public and official concern about the loss to the country of young, able-bodied, and skilled citizens; and it must not be forgotten that the children of the *yordim* born abroad may elect in their turn to settle permanently outside Israel, especially if they take foreign spouses.

One of the most worrying aspects of the problem is the apparent general acceptance nowadays by many Israeli Jews that emigration does not necessarily mean betrayal of one's motherland and that those who wish to live abroad because they can enjoy there a higher personal status and a better standard of living for themselves and their dependents should not be censured. There are several Western countries where Israelis seem happy to settle and where they apparently encounter little overt antisemitism; moreover, they are sometimes warmly welcomed by the local Jewish communities. Many of them make regular visits to Israel and remain closely in touch with relatives and friends there. They may be uneasy about 'abandoning' their country but the crucial test of their patriotism would be their reaction if Israel were again to be in immediate mortal danger. We must remember that just before the Six-Day War of 1967 and during the Yom Kippur War of 1973, Israelis (as well as Diaspora Jews) were anxiously flocking to airports to literally fly to the defence of Israel.

The challenge before the Israeli authorities now is to persuade young and able Jews that their presence is greatly valued and needed in the country, that with their help Israel may achieve greater prosperity and security, and that the government would take energetic steps to provide them with generous assistance in the fields of job opportunities, higher education, and housing. These are promises which must be seen to be kept. It is clearly useless to continue appointing committees which make well-meaning recommendations and then fail to persuade the Ministry of Finance to provide the necessary resources to implement these recommendations. Perhaps some of the funds expended by the government and by non-governmental agencies to persuade Diaspora Jews to settle in Israel might be used instead to help young and able native Israelis with their housing and other difficulties so that they need not seek their fortunes abroad. Furthermore, since emigration in some circumstances is deemed acceptable behaviour, it must be expected that while these circumstances prevail, more Jews will leave Israel to settle abroad without fear that their departure will bring shame upon the members of their families who remain behind. These are considerations to take into account when a policy to deter emigration is conceived and implemented.

NOTES

[1] Central Bureau of Statistics, *Statistical Abstract of Isreal 1987*, no. 38, Jerusalem, 1987, pp. 154–55.

[2] Central Bureau of Statistics, *Statistical Abstract of Israel 1980*, no. 31, Jerusalem, 1980, p. 120. See also Drora Kass and Seymour Martin Lipset, 'Israelis in Exile', *Commentary*, November, 1979, p. 68.

[3] Shmuel Lahis, *Israelis in the United States: A Report* (Hebrew), The Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, 1980.

[4] See *Israel Government Yearbook 5741 (1980–81)*, Jerusalem, 1981, p. 7.

[5] See, for example, Aharon Fein, *The Process of Migration: Israeli Emigration to the United States*, Doctoral Thesis, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, 1978, pp. 3–5; Steven E. Plaut, *The Out Movement of Israelis*, Discussion Paper no. 316, Technion, Haifa, 1982; Reuven Lamdany, *Emigration from Israel*, Discussion Paper no. 82.08, The Falk Institute, Jerusalem, 1982; and Asher Friedberg, 'The emigrants betwixt pulling and pushing forces', *Kivunim* (Hebrew), no. 25, 1984, pp. 77–86.

[6] See Ira Sharkansky, 'Avoiding the Irresistible: Should the Israeli Government Combat Jewish Emigration?', *The Jerusalem Quarterly*, no. 41, Winter 1987, pp. 95–111.

[7] Cabinet resolution no. 471 c of 4 March 1984 (Hebrew).

[8] Ministry of Immigrant Absorption, *Conclusions of the Committee of Directors General for the Prevention of Emigration* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, September 1985.

[9] See the State Comptroller's *Annual Report no. 30* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1980, pp. 490–96. The State Comptroller reviewed the activities of the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption since 1968 to encourage Jewish emigrants to return to Israel.

[10] Ibid., p. 496.

[11] Aharon Fein, *Returnees in the Year of Israel's Thirtieth Anniversary* (Hebrew), Ministry of Immigrant Absorption and the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1980.

[12] See the unsigned letter (dated 1 March 1983) of the then Minister of Finance, Yoram Aridor, to Shlomo Lorincz, the then chairman of the Knesset Finance Committee.

[13] Dov Shilansky, Member of the Knesset, *Demobilized Soldiers Law (Amendment in Charge of Implementation)* (Hebrew); the bill was submitted to the Knesset Speaker and his deputies and tabled in the Knesset on 29 Tishrei 5746 (14 October 1985).

[14] See Aharon Fein, *The Reacclimitization of Returning Israelis* (Hebrew), Prime Minister's Office and the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1984, pp. 44–48.

[15] See *Israel Government Yearbook 5743 (1982–83)*, Jerusalem, 1983, p. 10.

[16] See *Conclusions of the Committee of Directors General for the Prevention of Emigration*, cited in Note 8 above, p. 4.

[17] Ibid., p. 3.

[18] For the data on the years 1966–1979, see Fini Herman and David Lafontaine, *In our Footsteps: Israeli Migration to the US and Los Angeles*, Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles, 1983. For the data on the years 1982–85, see the Statistical Yearbooks of the US Immigration and Naturalization Service for 1982, 1983, 1984 (Tables 3.2) and Detail Run 404, 1985.

[19] See Asher Friedberg, *A Phenomenon Called Emigration: Annotated Bibliography*, Information Centre, Jerusalem, 1984, pp. 18–22.

[20] See the Statistical Yearbooks of the US Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1980, 1981 (Table 26); 1982, 1983 (Tables NAT. 5.1).

[21] See Aharon Fein, *The Reacclimitization of Returning Israelis*, op. cit., p. 36.

[22] See the conclusions of the Joint Committee of the Immigration and Absorption and the Education and Culture Committees on the subject of 'The considerable emigration of graduates of Israeli technical schools' (Hebrew), Tenth Knesset, Fourth Session, no. 12, 13 June 1984.

EDUCATION AND INTEGRATION IN ISRAEL: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS

Bernard Steinberg

FROM its very beginnings, the State of Israel had to deal with the problems and tensions of contemporary plural societies; but even before its establishment in 1948, there existed in the Holy Land multiple ethnic and religious divisions: Muslims, Christians, Jews, and Druze.[1] Within the Jewish community there were pious and non-observant Jews and there were Oriental Jews (loosely termed 'Sephardim' in Israel nowadays, although originally the term applied only to Spanish and Portuguese Jews) and Western or Ashkenazi Jews. The leaders of the *Yishuv* (the Jewish community of Palestine before 1948) were Western Jews, and the early ministerial cabinets of Israel consisted almost entirely of Ashkenazim. There was a mass influx of immigrant Jews from the Middle East and from North Africa in the 1950s; the difficulties of their absorption have been attributed to 'structural factors inherent in a situation in which a powerful "elite" absorbs a mass of powerless immigrants'.[2]

Ashkenazi Jews have been accused of seeking to preserve their dominant position by stressing the superiority of their Western cultural norms and values over 'backward' Oriental traditions. Sammy Smooha maintained in 1978: 'Israel possesses a pluralistic-inequality structure whose study is important per se and is also indispensable for the understanding of wider Israeli society', while existing divisions 'make two significant cleavages in Israeli society, one of structural pluralism and the other of intergroup inequality'.[3]

The education system was regarded as the primary means of integrating the children of Oriental Jews and imbuing them with Western culture. This article seeks first to review the issues and problems of integrating Jewish immigrants from Oriental lands during the first two decades of Israel's existence, and then to consider the implementation of educational policies devised to overcome the difficulties encountered in the absorption of the newcomers. The aim of the Israeli government was to weld together a cohesive and unified Jewish entity within the wider pluralistic framework. The prevailing conditions which impeded the attainment of this goal were significantly related to educational

policies that sought to integrate the newcomers into what was for them in many respects an essentially alien socio-cultural and socio-economic milieu. At the end of this paper, I consider briefly the changes which have occurred since the early 1970s in generally accepted educational theories and policies concerned with redressing social and economic inequalities.[4]

The Two Nations

Before 1948 the Jewish community of Palestine under the British Mandate was a closely-integrated entity, in many ways diverse, but nevertheless united by the ideology of Zionism and the Rebuilding of the Land. With its own governing body, the *Vaad Leumi*, and its own autonomous network of efficient communal institutions — especially its own Jewish schools — it constituted a virtual *imperium in imperio*. Ethnically and culturally, the *Yishuv* was dominated by its European majority, and in spite of internal political and religious differences it did at least maintain the form of a homogeneous, well-disciplined, egalitarian, self-reliant group with one common ideal. It was a unity imposed by outside pressures upon any minority group striving to attain specific goals. Even economically, the Jews of Palestine were geared to the ideology of any pioneering community.[5]

With the advent of statehood, the most urgent of the many concomitant problems specifically related to education were those concerned with the post-1948 mass immigration. There was a resultant complete change in the ethnic and cultural composition of the Jewish population and the newly-created national education system had now to provide for a sudden vast increase in numbers of pupils.[6]

The Jewish population of Israel increased from 649,633 on 15 May 1948 to 1,932,357 at the end of 1960.[7] On 15 May 1948 there were 452,158 Jews who had come to the Holy Land as immigrants since 1919; the vast majority of them (377,487) came from Europe, 40,776 came from Asia, while 4,033 came from African countries. The remainder consisted of 7,579 from North and South America and there were 22,283 'unspecified'. Between 15 May 1948 and the end of 1959, nearly a million Jews (945,261) immigrated, and more than half of that total (500,237) came from Asia and Africa, while 425,564 came from Europe and North and South America; the remaining immigrants were 'unspecified'.[8] Thus, whereas before statehood the majority of immigrants came from European lands, the Western newcomers who landed after 1948 were outnumbered by the Oriental arrivals. The consequences of this influx of predominantly Asian/African immigrants are reflected in the following statistics of the Jewish population of Israel, according to place of birth, in November 1948 and December 1958:[9]

Date	*Total*	*Israel*	*Asia*	*Africa*	*Europe and America*
8.11.48	716,678	35.4%	8.1%	1.7%	54.8%
31.12.58	1,810,148	34.6%	16.7%	12.2%	36.5%

Nearly all the immigrants from Asia and Africa came from Muslim countries; a large proportion of them, especially those from the Yemen,[10] had had little formal school education. With few exceptions (as in the case of Jews from Egypt, Turkey, and Iraq), the majority of them had lived in conditions of poverty and deprivation, and many were in poor health. They suddenly found themselves in a small and compact Jewish state whose predominant cultural values were those of Western countries. Raphael Patai noted in 1953 that these Oriental immigrants had an all-pervasive religiosity consisting of belief, ritual, and morality, and that the extended family was for them a very important social and economic unit to which the individual family member was subordinated.[11] Chaim Adler commented that after coming to Israel, Oriental Jews had to learn to value personal achievement.[12]

The problem of adult illiteracy was one of the earliest to be tackled. At the establishment of the State in 1948, only six per cent of Jews were illiterate; by 1963 the proportion had doubled to 12.1 per cent. Literacy campaigns were launched in which volunteer teachers and soldiers took part. In 1965, some 200 girl soldiers were teaching illiterates.[13] It was important to ensure that the children of Oriental immigrants receive an adequate formal education to acquire skills which would enable them to achieve a standard of living denied to their parents in their countries of origin. Schools would have to cater for an increasingly higher proportion of children of Oriental parentage. In 1960, 60 per cent of all Jewish births were to women born in Asia or Africa, 22 per cent to those born in Europe or America, and the remaining 18 per cent to Israel-born women.[14] The schools would have to provide a system of education with which the Oriental parents were almost totally unfamiliar, in order to avoid a perpetuation of the social and cultural cleavage which existed between the veterans and the adult newcomers. By the mid 1960s it was estimated that 72 per cent of the adult male new immigrants from Oriental countries had not completed their primary education, while the comparative proportion for adult Western males was only 35.7 per cent.[15] The consequent tendency was for the latter to enter the professions and the skilled occupations, while the Orientals provided the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. Income differentials were accordingly very wide. One survey found that for the financial year 1959–60, on a basic income index of 100 points, the average income for Orientals was 75.7 in contrast to the average of 112.1 for Westerners.[16] There developed quickly and inevitably an

increasing awareness on both sides of the close correlation between ethnic origin on the one hand and socio-economic status on the other. The disparity was reinforced by residential patterns; in the cities, the two groups lived in their own districts, while attempts to establish joint Western and Oriental agricultural settlements proved to be unsuccessful. The Oriental Jews bitterly resented their inferior status and amenities, and they laid much of the blame for this on the Westerners.[17]

Large numbers of immigrants were hastily settled in a series of new towns, most of which were set up in remote, unpopulated, and unproductive parts of the country. The pioneering-type conditions inherent in this type of settlement, and the fact that the immigrants were taken to their new homes often straight from the ship at the quayside, were in themselves conducive to serious discontent. Since the vast majority of the newcomers who were placed in the new towns had originated from Muslim countries, this served only to reinforce their belief that Oriental Jews were treated as second-class citizens in Israel.

A detailed survey of a number of the new towns revealed the unsatisfactory educational facilities as one of the most serious defects. For example, the schools remained chronically understaffed, since not enough teachers were willing to live and work under the existing conditions.[18] Moreover, inadequate employment opportunities and poor social amenities converted many of these towns into centres of continuing under-development and depression, a problem with which the government was still grappling more than two decades later.

Additional problems arose from the break-up of the ties of traditional family life. In the process of social and economic integration into Israel, the role of the father as the undisputed head of the family became highly vulnerable. In the same way, the extended family, a common feature of North African and Middle East Jewry, broke down under the pressures of the new conditions. The dissonance between home and school became particularly acute in many cases after the passing of the 1953 Education Act when State-maintained and supervised schools were divided into two systems — secular 'General' (*Mamlakhti*) and 'Religious' (*Mamlakhti Dati*). A considerable proportion of children from families with a devout religious background were allocated to schools in the 'General' sector, despite strong protests from the religious groups in the Knesset and in the country as a whole. These groups claimed that the dissonance between home and school contributed to the disintegration of the traditional family structure, and of religious customs and practices as stabilizing influences.[19]

With the decline in parental authority, with the confusion in a strange new environment, with the growing frustration engendered by a feeling of social inferiority, the three inevitable consequences among the youth of the Oriental immigrants were firstly a proportionately very high rate of crime and delinquency, secondly a lower than average

general standard of academic attainment in the schools, and thirdly the alienation of what was intended to be a potential cadre of leaders.[20] Apart from all this, one further alarming consequence was the rapid rejection by the younger element of religious tradition, belief and practice, without any corresponding ideology or system of norms and values to fill the void. Yet another disturbing reaction was the emerging tendency among children of Oriental immigrants to shun their origins, and to be ashamed of them.[21]

For their part, the authorities strenuously pursued a policy of encouraging fusion between Orientals and Westerners, emphasizing the factors that unite rather than divide Jews from such disparate backgrounds. In a number of instances some progress was noted, but for the most part the groups remained separated. To cite the incidence of ethnically-mixed marriages as an example, these amounted to about nine per cent of all marriages in Israel in 1952, rising to only 14.4 per cent by 1960.[22]

Above all, the complete dislocation of the social and cultural structures within such a large section of Israel's Jewish population boded ill for the future stability of the country as a whole. The Oriental immigrants found it almost impossible to cope with the demands of an evolving society based on European traditions. Raphael Patai commented:[23]

> The customs, habits, mannerisms, behavior and personality traits which are the only ones they possess and which have gone unquestioned and unnoticed even in Israel among people of their own kind, become a stumbling block for them in the contacts to which they are exposed without any previous preparation, and which involve close day-to-day interaction with people different from them by cultural conditioning. Thus, the change of locale in their case often is equivalent to a complete disruption of life-sequence, and a critical break in socio-cultural continuity.

This situation of social cleavage came to a head on a number of occasions, notably when North African Jews in Haifa's Wadi Salib slum district rioted in 1959 in protest against bad housing conditions. The blame for such outbursts was at least in one view placed fairly and squarely upon the defects in Israel's education system.[24] At the same time the reaction of many Jews of European origin — often one of downright hostility — was a cause for particular concern on the part of some sociologists who foresaw the emergence of two distinct types of Israeli Jew.[25] Conditions within the country, exacerbated by such overriding pre-occupations as defence priorities and economic difficulties, unfortunately necessitated the shelving of the urgent steps needed to remedy the situation.

Many of the Oriental Jewish communities from which the newcomers originated had existed for countless generations in a state of isolation from the mainstream of Western Jewish life and cultural

developments. With the establishment of the State of Israel, there was an unprecedented attempt in Jewish history to achieve an ideal synthesis between two totally different types of Jew, each of whom had been subjected for many centuries to the respective influences of two totally different types of cultural environment. Emanuel Shimoni noted in 1965:[26]

> Western Jewry has assimilated the dynamic, rationalistic approach of the western world influenced by the scientific and technological developments of recent decades: class and social mobility; the international connections and mutual influences characteristic of this society; an approach to education expressed by Yanush Korchak [sic] who said the child is a man equal in value to us; and by the unceasing search for truth through the re-examination of accepted conclusions.
>
> . . . Eastern society, on the other hand, is more static and more emotionalistic. Continuity and relative stability; traditional processes of production; well defined and often immutable class differences; the subordination of individuality and ideological differences to social uniformity and homogeneity; these values characterise the approach to life of our Eastern Jewish communities.

In the final analysis, what was at stake was the process of creating a new type of Jew by a desirable amalgam of the existing European and Oriental socio-cultural influences, and on the unifying basis of Jewish religio-spiritual and cultural traditions. An Israeli scholar declared: 'If we belong to the Middle East, as all our ideologues and politicians claim, then let us truly integrate not by westernizing the orientals, but rather by orientating our acculturation policy toward the golden mean.'[27]

The Impact upon the Education System

Before 1948, the *Yishuv* administered its own integral education system, independent of control by the Mandatory power. By contrast, almost all Arab children attending school did so at establishments administered directly by the British authorities. Most Jewish schools functioned under the aegis of the *Vaad Leumi*, but there were also some independent institutions maintained by such organizations as the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* as well as the schools of the very Orthodox communities of the so-called 'Old Yishuv', where education took the form of traditional Jewish studies — as in the *heder*, *Talmud Torah*, and Yeshiva of Eastern Europe, or, for the small Sephardi minority in this sector, the *Kutub* of Jewish communities in Muslim countries.[28]

There were also a number of agricultural schools, of which the oldest and most famous was Mikveh Israel, established by the *Alliance* in 1870. The Youth Aliyah Movement had its own agricultural schools, accommodated in kibbutzim and other villages, as well as a group of

self-contained youth villages. ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training) supervised its own group of vocational schools.

At the pre-school stage there was a country-wide network of kindergartens (administered by *Vaad Leumi*-sponsored bodies, or by independent organizations) and at the tertiary stage there was the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, established in 1925, and the Haifa Institute of Technology (the Technion) with origins dating back to 1913.

The kindergartens were mainly fee-paying but primary education (for children aged six to fourteen years) was generally free. The *Vaad Leumi* primary schools were financed by a system of communal taxation within the *Yishuv*. By contrast, secondary schools (for pupils aged fourteen to eighteen) were maintained largely by fees from parents. Many secondary schools had their own attached fee-paying primary feeder schools but they accepted pupils who transferred at the age of fourteen from the maintained primary system. The secondary schools were administered directly, either by the larger municipalities or by organizations such as the *Alliance*, and they enjoyed a wide degree of independence. Apart from academic secondary schools there were also agricultural and vocational schools. Since only a small number of pupils received scholarships or bursaries, secondary education was generally the preserve of children from families who could afford to pay fees.

One important feature of the *Vaad Leumi* schools was their curricular policies and general ethos based respectively on one of the three main political sectors of the *Yishuv* — 'General', Labour, or Religious (*Mizrachi*).[29] There were thus three clear ideological streams or 'trends' of education from which a parent could choose. Similarly, a high proportion of Jewish children and adolescents belonged to one of the various pioneering-type youth movements affiliated to the respective political parties. Notwithstanding this element of divisiveness, the mainstream schooling system was geared to the Zionist ethos as well as to the established European traditions of education. This Ashkenazi dominance was until 1948 further accentuated, in the view of at least one observer, by the inadequate educational provision for Sephardi children.[30]

With the advent of statehood, one of the earliest items of government legislation was the 1949 Compulsory Education Law. Amongst its provisions was the institution of one year of free compulsory kindergarten education for all five-year olds, the abolition of primary school fees, and the establishment of special, mainly part-time, schools for adolescents who had not completed their primary schooling.[31] This Law provided for the establishment of a state universal system of primary education for children aged six to fourteen years; but the four-year secondary schools retained their modicum of independence and, until the late 1960s, remained fee-paying establishments.

Subsequent legislation, the State Education Law of 1953, replaced the three 'trends' by a dual system of state administered 'General' secular-orientated (*Mamlakhti*) schools and of religious-orientated (*Mamlakhti Dati*) schools. In addition, many of the schools of the ultra-Orthodox community that had previously not operated under the *Vaad Leumi* system now became eligible for substantial state financial aid, while still retaining their independent 'non-official recognised' status.[32]

The new legislation reflected the recognition of the crucial role that schools were to play in welding a unified Jewish national population out of the heterogeneous immigrant and native groups. Consequently, the Ministry of Education and Culture was regularly given the second highest budget of all government departments, its annual financial provision being exceeded only by that of the Ministry of Defence. In the financial year 1964–65 for example, 7.9 per cent of the national revenue was devoted to education, as compared with 5.4 per cent for health services.[33]

One problem of major dimensions which the Ministry of Education had to face was the fact that there were comparatively few schools where pupils of both Western and Oriental origin were enrolled in almost equal numbers. This was because the children generally lived with their families in their own respective districts of larger cities or in homogeneous groups in towns or villages in the development areas. Individual schools could therefore in many cases be described as either Sephardi or Ashkenazi.[34] In areas where the two groups of pupils could have been integrated, many Ashkenazi parents sent their children to Ashkenazi schools further away from home, often at a very great distance, for fear that the local school with a sizeable proportion of Sephardi children would have lower educational standards.[35]

In spite of the 1949 Compulsory Education Law, there was a consistently high drop-out rate of Oriental pupils, even in the primary schools, where in the academic year 1960–61 it reached 17 per cent.[36] Only a minority of Oriental pupils proceeded to secondary and higher education or entered the vocational and agricultural schools; but in their case also there was a high drop-out rate. Between the years 1957 and 1960, the average drop-out rate of these Oriental pupils reached 44.5 per cent in the secondary schools (excluding matriculation failures), 61 per cent in the agricultural schools, and 68.5 per cent in the vocational institutions. In the academic year 1954–55, the drop-out rate among all students (Sephardi and Ashkenazi) at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem was as high as one third; it was even higher in the Faculties of Humanities and of the Social Sciences where only 22.5 per cent of those who had registered for a degree course completed their studies and graduated within the allotted length of time.

In the academic year 1956–57, under six per cent of the students at the Hebrew University and under four per cent of those at the Haifa

Technion were of Oriental origin.[37] A further illustration of this state of disparity was the fact that although in the whole country in 1957, 52 per cent of all Jewish children in the age group 13–14 years and 55 per cent of those aged 14–17 years were of Oriental origin, only 32 per cent of pupils in the final primary school grade (where the usual age was 14) and only 17.7 per cent in all secondary schools were of that background.[38] Chaim Adler warned that 'serious tension threatens any society in which ecological concentration, educational failure, cultural lag, and economic and vocational inferiority coincide with ethnic origin'.[39]

One obvious way of attempting to remedy the situation would have been to train a very large number of young Sephardim to become dedicated teachers. However, since according to one study published in 1958 a comparatively small proportion of Oriental pupils completed their secondary education, only a very limited number could enrol in teacher training colleges — in spite of the fact that these colleges accepted many students who had not obtained a matriculation certificate. That study described the colleges as the weakest link in the Israeli educational system; it pointed out that students from poor families could ill afford the luxury of a two-year full-time course, even with the assistance of scholarships or bursaries; and it added that the colleges had low prestige and attracted few male applicants from the population as a whole.[40]

A number of psychological surveys and standardized texts were carried out on Jewish children of both Western and Oriental origin. One survey claimed that differences in intelligence and in achievement between the two groups were very marked; but the lower scores of the Sephardim were attributed to socio-cultural factors, apart from the fact that the tests themselves were geared to the thought patterns of Westerners and that Western cultural norms had exerted an important influence on all aspects of the school curricula and activities in Mandatory Palestine. The same survey also stressed that many of the children of immigrant Oriental families had a high incidence of emotional disturbance, which did not allow for good performance in the tests. In mixed groups of so-called normally developed children, while the Ashkenazim were superior in the language tests, in verbal adjustment, and in hypothetical situations, it was the Sephardim who were superior in numeracy.[41]

In another survey, selected numbers of Youth Aliyah children and adolescents of both North African and Western backgrounds were given a battery of tests modelled on European criteria. The youngsters were divided into three categories — newly-arrived North African immigrants, North African immigrants who had spent some time in kibbutzim, and kibbutz-born and Western young persons. The results of the tests indicated that the second and third groups had similar standards of attainment.[42]

Israel has a highly developed kindergarten network as an integral part of its education system. As has been mentioned above, under the provisions of the 1949 Compulsory Education Law, the kindergartens officially became the first stage of the schooling process.[43] Every child must receive one year of kindergarten education before starting formal schooling at the primary stage at the age of six. This may appear an extravagance, especially in the light of the State's constant financial difficulties. Nevertheless, from 1949 onwards the kindergarten became a vital stage not only in education, but also in social integration. Before the establishment of the State, its function had been to alleviate a situation resulting from a labour shortage that necessitated the employment of many working mothers.

After 1948, kindergartens became an ideal instrument for the acculturation of immigrant children at an early age. In the school year 1957–58 there were in Israel 2,009 kindergartens with 2,495 teachers and 78,800 children; in Arab communities, where they were not a common feature before 1948, kindergartens numbered 109 in that same school year, with 148 teachers and 4,015 children.[44] Parents who wished to send children under the age of five to kindergartens usually had to pay fees. The importance attached to kindergartens is illustrated by the fact that in the school year 1964–65 17,000 children aged between three and five years from all communities were enrolled free of charge.[45]

A second group of institutions, comprising Schools for Working Youth and the network of agricultural and vocational schools, also traced their origins to pre-State times. They had developed as a source of much needed skilled labour for a rapidly expanding agricultural and industrial economy. After 1948 their importance was enhanced by the mass entry of immigrants from Oriental countries, where they had not usually followed productive trades or vocations. Since in so many cases they were settled straight on to the land, in small, newly-constructed agricultural villages, they had virtually overnight to transform themselves from town dwellers and pedlars into hardworking farmers and labourers. While the agricultural schools were for obvious reasons day schools, the Schools for Working Youth functioned in the evenings as well as in daytime. They were attended by boys and girls aged between fourteen and seventeen years who had not completed their primary education. The status of these schools as an integral part of the national education system was clearly established under a very important section of the 1949 Compulsory Education Law, which made such schooling obligatory for every adolescent who had not completed his or her elementary education. Responsibility for registration was placed upon the parents of such pupils and, where applicable, upon the employer of any working adolescents.[46] In the Schools for Working Youth the curriculum included Hebrew Language, Bible, Mathematics,

Citizenship, and Crafts. Special emphasis was placed upon social activities, and during the summer holidays the schools served as clubs for adolescents.[47] In 1959, the Cabinet approved a bill to extend this form of schooling by enacting 'a limited form of free compulsory secondary education for boys and girls aged 15–17 who were not at the time continuing their studies after the primary stage'.[48]

However, many adolescents did not attend the Schools for Working Youth, when they were under legal obligation to do so. For example, at the end of 1958, there were about 12,500 pupils in some 700 evening classes, but it was estimated that at least a further 4,000 should have complied with the law and enrolled.[49] It must be admitted that the schools achieved only a limited measure of success in purely educational terms. They were staffed by teachers who were tired after a day's work; and they were attended by reluctant adolescents who would have preferred to spend their evenings in recreational activities.

On the other hand, the agricultural and vocational schools were needed to fulfil an even more urgent function: they had to educate and train the children from immigrant families settled in rural areas. In the school year 1964–65, there were 25,474 pupils in agricultural secondary schools.[50] The government had tried for some years to encourage new immigrants to remain in the countryside rather than move to the large and already overcrowded urban centres, since its 'town to village' campaign in the 1950s had been only partially successful. The Youth Aliyah Movement co-operated with this policy of rural settlement; it provided agricultural and vocational training for about a thousand boys and girls every year, most of whom came from city slums or from broken homes, and had not even completed their primary education.[51] It also looked after the training of other children from the immigrant transit camps (*ma'abarot*) and the new immigrant villages. During the late 1950s, 64 per cent of the Youth Aliyah children came from families originally hailing from North Africa and the Middle East.[52] By 1957, at the height of Youth Aliyah's work in this sphere, there were about 13,000 children in 235 of its centres; 160 of these centres looked after Youth Aliyah pupils in existing agricultural settlements, while the rest were youth villages such as Ben Shemen.[53]

It is worth mentioning here that after the establishment of the State, Youth Aliyah decided to accept groups of Arab boys and girls to study and work side by side with Jewish pupils. At Ben Shemen (which had been founded as a youth village by Dr. Siegfried Lehmann during the 1930s for Jewish refugee children from Europe), special courses in Hebrew language and in Arabic were part of the curriculum.[54]

Several detailed studies and surveys were carried out to assess the merits of the educational work of Youth Aliyah. One of these was a follow-up piece of research about a group of Jewish boys and girls, mostly children of Oriental immigrant families, who had been trained

in Youth Aliyah institutions. It claimed that when the vast majority of them returned after completing their education to their families and home villages, there was no 'return crisis' and that, moreover, the adolescents exercised a positive influence on their families and communities.[55] On the other hand, Chanoch Reinhold (the then director of Youth Aliyah) admitted that there was a fifty per cent drop-out rate among the boys and girls of the older age range within the Youth Aliyah groups.[56] Whether these adolescents left of their own accord or whether they were withdrawn by their parents, Reinhold did not state. And Moshe Kol (a former Youth Aliyah director), in writing about groups placed by Youth Aliyah in kibbutzim and other established rural settlements, expressed criticism of the effectiveness of the training methods and policies, stating: 'Quite frankly, in many settlements the attitude towards these young people is not all it should be'.[57]

In the field of vocational training, most of the schools were (and still are) under the aegis of institutions such as ORT and supervised by the Ministry of Education and Culture. In 1960, apprenticies accounted for 1.8 per cent of the entire labour force of Israel, a figure which compared favourably with the proportion in many industrialized countries.[58]

One well-known institution, Boys' Town in Jerusalem, serves as a good example of the important constructive role which the vocational schools can play in the process of cultural integration. It was founded in 1950, largely with the help of contributions from the Diaspora, as a residential secondary vocational school for 17 pupils; by 1964, there were 545. The school provides courses in graphic arts, electro-mechanics, technology and design, and mechanics and carpentry; it sets out to achieve a synthesis between Jewish religious tradition and modern technology. An analysis of the family backgrounds of the pupils in the school year 1964–65 showed that their origins reflected the demographic situation then prevalent in Israel as a whole: about a third of the boys had been born in Oriental countries, another third came from Europe, and the remaining third were born in Israel. More than half of the total were of Sephardi origin and the vast majority came from poor families and boarded at the school with the help of full or partial scholarships.[59] Apart from providing a model setting for integrating Ashkenazi and Sephardi youngsters, Boys' Town introduced many of its Oriental pupils to skills and vocations unknown in the communities from which they had originated, thus preparing them to contribute towards a modern, industrialized society.

Before 1968, secondary schools in Israel were fee-paying and they consequently had a smaller enrolment of pupils from poorer families. The educational authorities made strenuous efforts to facilitate the entry of larger numbers of Sephardi children to full-time secondary

education and provided help for the payment of school fees to encourage these pupils to complete their studies. (However, it is relevant to bear in mind that even if poor families did not have to pay fees, older children still at school after the statutory minimum leaving age of 14 years could not earn wages to help support the family.) There was the further difficulty that many of them did not do well in their annual examinations and were not able to progress to a higher form or grade, but had to repeat the year's courses. This applied to both primary and secondary schools. The education authorities were concerned and carried out a number of experiments and investigations to discover the root causes of academic failure among underprivileged pupils and to devise and test new methods and syllabuses. Moreover, special boarding schools for gifted boys and girls from underprivileged families were established; one of them was the Mae Boyer High School which was opened in Jerusalem in June 1965.[60]

In 1959 the Jerusalem Municipality, acting on a directive from the Ministry of Education and Culture, introduced a system of lower pass marks for underprivileged pupils in its primary and secondary schools.[61] By now the principle of class repetition was being abandoned in State schools in the country as a whole, since in the past it had only brought about an accumulation of failures. Instead, in the late 1950s special 'Norm B' examinations with modified standards were introduced for these pupils at the conclusion of their years at primary school, with special facilities having been arranged for pre-examination coaching in the top grades.[62] In this way, if they passed the alternative examination, such pupils could still qualify for entry to secondary schools.

These special measures became an established part of the policy of providing a more intensive form of schooling by means of an extended school day, an extended school term, as well as supervised homework for the pupils concerned. In the school year 1964–65, there were 28,350 children in 945 classes in both primary and secondary schools receiving their education in this manner. In 1962, a centre had been established to provide assistance to schools in which the majority of the pupils came from underprivileged families; it devoted special attention to those at both extremes of aptitude — the retarded and the gifted. By the school year 1964–65, it had under its supervision nearly one third (31 per cent) of all classes in government primary schools. In that same year there were 761 supplementary classes in 160 primary schools with an extended school day, and 650 pupils in the last two years of primary education were given intensified tuition, extra lessons, and homework supervision in preparation for secondary school selection tests.[63]

In 1965 the Minister of Education and Culture, Zalman Aranne, reported that the policy of reduction or complete remission of secondary school fees was widespread, that one third of secondary

school pupils paid no fees, and that 28.1 per cent of all secondary school pupils were from poor families who had originated from Muslim countries.[64] He stated that there were in that same year 81 secondary schools in 31 development areas, settled mainly by immigrants from North Africa and the Middle East. There were also 12 academic boarding schools for some 900 gifted children from underprivileged families; these were fully subsidized by the government. The policy of the extended school day with homework supervision was being maintained for groups of children in many schools. Aranne explained: 'The object is to give them a better foundation in general knowledge, proper study habits, acquaintance with supplementary literature, and to enable them to prepare their homework under the supervision of teachers'.[65]

By the following year, 1966, the policy of extending all possible help to underprivileged pupils was in full force. Nearly one third (30 per cent) of all children in primary education were given special help in 4,400 classes in 380 schools in one or more of the following ways: an extended school day, special coaching at school, and extra lessons in the three R's (reading, writing and arithmetic). In these classes pupils were graded or streamed in accordance with their standards of ability and attainment. As for the older children, 45 per cent of all post-primary pupils were receiving free education, and a further 35 per cent had been granted reductions in their school fees.[66]

In spite of all these efforts, however, the academic progress of pupils of Oriental parentage was generally disappointing. Gad Ben-Meir noted that in the school year 1962–63, only under two per cent of such children were enrolled in the twelfth grade in academic secondary schools and that two years later, in 1964–65, there had been an increase of just half a per cent.[67] During that same year, 1964–65, it was officially recorded that one-fifth (20.2 per cent) of the pupils in all State schools were above the normal age for their particular grades.[68] Finally, while one university student in eight was of Oriental origin, the proportion of Sephardi graduates was only one in thirty;[69] this could be attributed both to the high drop-out rate and to failures in the final examinations.

In 1963, the Ministry of Education and Culture appointed a Commission to look into the current social problems and to consider their implications for the educational system. The Commission submitted its Report in January 1965 and made a number of recommendations which were subsequently adopted. These included the setting up of a Junior Comprehensive High School system to link the primary and secondary stages. The new structure of the State schooling system would thus comprise six years of primary education, three years at junior high school, and three years at high school. In addition, the Commission recommended that all fees for secondary

schooling be abolished. A further recommendation was for the establishment of a curriculum centre which would give priority to the development of post-primary education; an 'intensive approach' towards Oriental children in kindergartens; and a general policy of streaming or 'inter-class grouping' for pupils of all ranges of ability and from all social backgrounds for such subjects as Hebrew, English, and Mathematics. The Commission's Report (known as the Prawer Report, after its chairman, Professor Joshua Prawer) heralded one of the great turning points and landmarks in the history of education in the State of Israel.[70]

Conclusion

Recent research studies and evaluations of the problems of education in plural societies have been strongly influenced by power and conflict theories. The various groups in such societies have been considered, especially since the 1970s, largely in terms of successful or disadvantageous educational outcomes. The hitherto widespread faith in universal education and in compensatory policies as the effective means of minimizing social inequalities and divisiveness within modern nation states has been subjected to much analytical criticism. Similarly, the idealistic perception of universal state schooling as the most just avenue of upward social mobility, as well as the ladder to higher status and privilege through personal achievement, as opposed to ascription, has been strongly challenged. The widely prevalent view since the 1970s has been that the actual provision of educational amenities does not necessarily by itself alter the existing correlations between social class, educational attainment, and subsequent status; and that educational systems may be the means (intentional or otherwise) of preserving the status quo, through which the privileged sector of society retains its advantages in such a way as to manipulate any social change in its own favour.[71]

Case studies from several countries (including Israel) dealing with ethnicity and social class have been cited to support the contention that educational systems fulfil the function of enabling the ruling group to maintain its position of dominance and to restrict the socio-economic development of other ethnic groups.[72] The latter, for example, have to adjust to the cultural norms of the former, which perpetuates their subordinate position in the social structure.[73] According to this view, the processes of schooling become the very means by which one ethnic group can preserve its privileged position at the expense of the others.

There has been a further opportunity to test these theories with the mass migrations after the Second World War from economically underdeveloped lands to the more affluent Western industrialized countries. Studies have claimed that, as in the case of Israel in the 1950s

and 1960s, although the children of immigrants are enrolled in educational systems which are compulsory, universal, and free, their socio-cultural background hinders them from achieving results which are comparable with those attained by the indigenous Western population. Their initial disadvantages have not usually been overcome by their educational opportunities and the fear is that the succeeding generation will again face similar difficulties.[74]

For Israel, the Six-Day War of June 1967 — coming at the culmination of the State's first two decades — provided a crucial opportunity of testing the loyalty of the country's disparate social and ethnic Jewish groups. They withstood the test heroically but they have since had to confront other problems and crises.[75] A potentially alarming situation arose in the early seventies with the emergence of militant groups of young Oriental Jews, rebels who called themselves 'Black Panthers' and violently demonstrated their resentment at the disadvantaged position of Sephardim. The prevailing defects of the education system were once again cited as one of the main causes of their frustration.[76]

In 1968, integrated schooling was first introduced; parents were required to send their children to specific schools in order to create a suitable mix from different socio-ethnic backgrounds. Although the practice is still not universal, it has become established policy in several towns. In Jerusalem, some primary schools with a reputation for high academic standards were carefully restructured to accommodate integration programmes and accept significant numbers of children from disadvantaged family backgrounds and with a wide range of academic ability. Investigations carried out in these schools subsequently confirmed the positive results of integration.[77] The policy of integration, combined with the restructured secondary school system in accordance with the recommendations of the Prawer Commission, inevitably produced problems of transition. Nevertheless, it was generally considered a step in the right direction.[78]

Within the schools themselves, as well as within the wider context of educational policy as a whole, those measures adopted before 1967 to benefit underprivileged pupils have also been to a large extent retained. The fact that to this day they have proved only partially successful in eliminating tendencies towards perpetuating the correlation between social class and academic attainment is an indication of the endemic nature of the problem. For example, while Oriental pupils have benefited from the establishment of compulsory secondary education, following the 1965 Prawer Commission Report, they are still under-represented in the universities. On the other hand, educational statistics do show that there has been a slow but steady narrowing of the gap between the two broad ethnic divisions of Israeli Jewry.[79]

There has been a resurgence of ethnic pride among Oriental Jews, expressed in a renewed interest in the traditions of their lands of origin.

For example, those whose families emigrated from Morocco annually celebrate the *Maimouna* festival, which has become an established feature of the Israeli scene. The present trend is against a deliberate policy to 'Westernize' or 'modernize' or 'assimilate' Oriental Jews into Ashkenazi culture, but rather towards a recognition of the importance of their own cultural heritage. Meanwhile, the closing of the Ashkenazi–Sephardi education gap has yet to be achieved; it is part of the wider problems of pluralism within the Jewish sector of Israeli society, with which social scientists are still concerned.[80]

Many among the young generation of Sephardi pupils have acquired a degree of self-confidence which their immigrant parents and grandparents lacked. They are nearly all Israeli-born, and grew up speaking Hebrew, so that the medium of instruction is their native language; if the tendency towards the narrowing of the education gap continues and gathers momentum into the 1990s, Sephardim will have the opportunity to compete on equal terms with Ashkenazim. Some will be more successful than others but this is of course the case in the most homogeneous societies. While the best education systems can provide equality of opportunity, no system has as yet produced complete equality of achievement, without drastic and controversial social engineering. However, perhaps by the end of the present century the main divisions between Israeli Jews will be based on broad socio-economic indicators unrelated to the continent of origin of the immigrant generation.

NOTES

[1] Sammy Smooha, *Israel: Pluralism and Conflict*, London, 1978.

[2] Erik Cohen, 'Ethnicity and Legitimation in Contemporary Israel', *Jerusalem Quarterly*, no. 28, 1983, pp. 111–24, pp. 111–12. See also Eliezer Ben-Rafael, *The Emergence of Ethnicity: Cultural Groups and Social Conflict in Israel*, Westport, Ct., 1982, pp. 3–8, 13–19.

[3] Smooha, op. cit., p. 259.

[4] See Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey, *Power and Ideology in Education*, New York, 1977, pp. 1–85.

[5] See S. N. Eisenstadt, *The Absorption of Immigrants*, London, 1954, pp. 31, 84–89.

[6] For figures relating to the vast influx of immigrants entering Israel during the ten years following the establishment of the State, see *Statistical Abstract of Israel, No. 10 (1958–59)*, p. 61, and ibid., *No. 12 (1961)*, p. 85, Jerusalem, 1960 and 1962.

[7] *Statistical Abstract of Israel, No. 13 (1961–1962)*, Part 2, Table 2, p. 32.

[8] *Statistical Abstract of Israel, No. 11 (1959–1960)*, p. 70.

[9] Ibid., p. 25.

[10] *Statistical Abstract of Israel 1984, No. 35*, p. 139. An account of the airlift from May 1949 to September 1950 that brought some 50,000 Jews from the Yemen to Israel is given in Shlomo Barer, *The Magic Carpet*, London, 1952.

[11] Raphael Patai, *Israel Between East and West*, Philadelphia, 1953, p. 55.
[12] Chaim Adler, *The Role of Israel's School System in Elite Formation* (mimeographed), Jerusalem, n.d., p. 3.
[13] Arie Hauslich, 'The Azulais Learn to Read and Write', *Jewish Observer*, 26 Nov. 1965, p. 17.
[14] *Statistical Abstract of Israel, No. 13 (1961–1962)*, Table 26, p. 83.
[15] Judah Matras, *Social Change in Israel*, Chicago, 1965, p. 74.
[16] Giora Hanoch, 'Income Differentials in Israel', *Falk Report for Economic Research in Israel: 5th Report, 1959 and 1960*, Jerusalem 1961, pp. 37–132 (Table 4, p. 57).
[17] Nissim Rejwan, 'Israel's Communal Controversy: An Oriental's Appraisal', *Midstream*, vol. 10, no. 2, June 1964, pp. 14–26.
[18] Raphael Levy and Benjamin Hanft, eds., *21 Frontier Towns*, New York, n.d., pp. 1–8. This report cites Shderot, Town No. 16, as an example.
[19] J. Goldschmidt, 'Integration in Israel and the Future of Religious Jewry', *Jewish Life*, vol. 27, no. 5, June 1960, pp. 41–52.
[20] Saul B. Robinson, 'Problems of Education in Israel', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 7, no. 2, Oct. 1963, pp. 125–41; see p. 127.
[21] Abraham Shumsky, *The Clash of Cultures in Israel*, New York, 1955, pp. 42 and 60.
[22] Matras, op. cit., p. 178.
[23] Patai, op. cit., pp. 285–86.
[24] Raphael Patai, 'The Riots in Wadi Salib', *Midstream* vol. 6, no. 1, Winter 1960, pp. 5–14; see p. 9.
[25] See, for example, J. Robert Moskin 'Prejudice in Israel', *Integration*, vol. 2, no. 20, December, 1965, pp. 4–5.
[26] Emanuel Shimoni, 'The Face of Israel Society', *Jewish Frontier*, Summer 1965, pp. 18–23; see pp. 18–19.
[27] Pinchas Lapide, 'East and West in Israel', *Jewish Life*, vol. 13, no. 3, March–April 1963, p. 10.
[28] For an account of Jewish education in Palestine under the British Mandate, see Noah Nardi, *Education in Palestine, 1920–1945*, Washington D.C., 1945.
[29] See *The System of Education of the Jewish Community in Palestine. Report of the Commission of Enquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1945*, London, 1946, pp. 7–8.
[30] Nathan Goldberg, 'Jewish School Systems in Palestine', *YIVO Annual*, vol. 1, 1946, pp. 134–55; see p. 145.
[31] Ruth Stanner, *The Legal Basis of Education in Israel*, Jerusalem, 1963, pp. 32–47. This work contains translations of the 1949 Compulsory Education Law and the State Education Law of 1953.
[32] Ibid., pp. 47–68.
[33] *Statistical Abstract of Israel 1984, No. 35*, pp. 628 and 696.
[34] Shumsky, op. cit., pp. 91–92, cites examples in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.
[35] Aryeh Rubenstein, 'Israel's Integration Problem', *Midstream*, vol. 9, no. 1, March 1963, pp. 46–59; see p. 59.
[36] Adler, op. cit., p. 5.
[37] Ibid., pp. 9 and 11.
[38] Moshe Smilansky, 'Education and Integration of Youth from Different Backgrounds' (Hebrew), *Megamot*, vol. 8, No. 3, July 1957, pp. 229–46; see p. 236.

[39] Adler, op. cit., p. 10.

[40] Richard J. Bernstein and Morris E. Eson, *A Study of Some Aspects of Education in Israel* (mimeographed), Jerusalem, 1958, pp. 15–17.

[41] Gina Ortar, 'A Comparative Analysis of the Structure of Intelligence in Various Ethnic Groups', pp. 267–90, in Carl Frankenstein, ed., *Between Past and Future. Essays and Studies on Immigrant Absorption in Israel*, Jerusalem, 1953.

[42] R. Feuerstein and M. Richelle, *Children of the Mellah* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1963, pp. 226–31.

[43] Compulsory Education Law, 1949, Ch. 2, Section 2 (a), cited in Stanner, op. cit., p. 152.

[44] Sara Faians-Glueck, 'Care of the Pre-School Child in Kindergartens and Nursery Schools', pp. 65–71, in Moshe Smilansky *et al.*, eds, *Child and Youth Welfare in Israel*, Jerusalem, 1960.

[45] Shlomo Tadmor, *L'évolution de l'enseignement, 1964–5*, Jerusalem, 1965, p. 7.

[46] Compulsory Education Law, 1949, Ch. 2, Sections (2c) and (2d) and Sections 3 and 4, cited in Stanner op. cit., pp. 152–57.

[47] Mordecai Levin, 'Schools for Working Youth', pp. 93–98, in Smilansky *et al.*, op. cit.

[48] *The Jewish Agency's Digest of Press and Events in the Middle East*, vol. 2, no. 7, 3 April 1959, p. 5.

[49] Levin, op. cit., p. 97.

[50] Tadmor, op. cit. p. 18.

[51] Moshe Kol, *Youth Aliyah. Past, Present and Future*, Jerusalem, 1957, p. 37.

[52] Chanoch Reinhold, 'Youth Aliyah', pp. 127–40, in Smilansky *et al.*, op. cit., see p. 130.

[53] Kol, op. cit., pp. 41 and 56.

[54] Norman Bentwich, *Ben Shemen. A Children's Youth Village in Israel*, Jerusalem, 1958, pp. 38 and 41–42.

[55] Tikvah Honig-Parnass, *Training Youth from New Immigrant Settlements*, Jerusalem, 1960, p. 89.

[56] Reinhold, op. cit., p. 134.

[57] Kol, op. cit., p. 60.

[58] P. Harburger, 'Vocational Education', pp. 112–19, in Smilansky *et al.*, op. cit.; see p. 112.

[59] *Boys' Town in 1964–5: Facts and Figures* (mimeographed), Jerusalem, n.d., and Boys' Town Scholarship Committee, *A Report on Students: Background and Analysis*, Jerusalem, n.d.

[60] *Israel Digest of Press and Events in the Middle East*, vol. 8, no. 14, 2 July 1965, p. 7.

[61] *Jewish Agency Digest*, vol. 2, no. 18, 4 September 1959, p. 6.

[62] Adler, op. cit., p. 11.

[63] Tadmor, op. cit., pp. 7–9.

[64] Zalman Aranne, 'Education and Cultural Activity in Israel', *Jewish Frontier*, Summer 1965, pp. 13–18; see p. 14.

[65] Ibid., p. 15.

[66] Report by the Director General of the Ministry of Education and Culture, quoted in *Israel Digest*, vol. 9, no. 18, 9 September 1966, p. 10.

[67] Gad Ben-Meir, 'Overhaul Needed in Israel Education', *Jewish Vanguard*, 6 May 1966, p. 4.

[68] *Statistical Abstract of Israel, No. 16 (1965)*, p. 583.

[69] See Ben-Meir, op. cit.

[70] See Ministry of Education and Culture, *Educational Developments, 1965–6*, Jerusalem, 1966, pp. 5, 6, 10, and 12. The report of the Prawer Commission elicited a positive government response, and several comprehensive schools were immediately established. At all these schools, experimental curricula and appropriate organizational changes were introduced, in which many children of Oriental immigrant families were involved. See also Aharon P. Kleinberger, *Society, Schools and Progress in Israel*, Oxford, 1969, pp. 146 ff.

[71] See, for example, Raymond Boudon, *Education, Opportunity, and Social Inequality*, New York, 1974; Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America*, New York, 1976; Basil Bernstein, 'Education Cannot Compensate for Society', *New Society*, no. 387, 26 February 1970, pp. 344–47; and Louis Althusser, 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses', in B. R. Cosin, ed., *Education: Structure and Society*, Harmondsworth, 1972, pp. 242–80.

[72] John Ogbu, *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, New York, 1978, Ch. 12, 'Oriental Jews in Israel', pp. 321–42.

[73] Nell Keddie, ed., *Tinker, Tailor, . . . The Myth of Cultural Deprivation*, Harmondsworth, 1973, comprises a series of essays dealing with this theme.

[74] See, for example, Maurice Craft, ed., *Education and Cultural Pluralism*, London, 1984 and A. J. Cropley, *The Education of Immigrant Children*, London, 1983.

[75] Solomon Poll and Ernest Krausz, eds., *On Ethnic and Religious Diversity in Israel*, Ramat-Gan, 1975.

[76] Erik Cohen, 'The Black Panthers and Israeli Society', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 14, no. 1, June 1972, pp. 93–109; see pp. 95–96, 100.

[77] Z. Klein and Y. Eshel, *Integrating Jerusalem Schools*, New York, 1980.

[78] Michel Chen, 'Some Outcomes of School Reform in Israel', pp. 61–68, in Stephen Goldstein, ed., *Law and Equality in Education*, Jerusalem, 1980.

[79] See *Statistical Abstracts of Israel*, 1968, No. 19, pp. 542 and 551; 1976, No. 27, pp. 589, 613 and 620; and 1987, No. 38, pp. 574, 611 and 617. The Tables confirm a very gradual but steady progress over the years, although the marked discrepancy remains.

[80] See S. N. Eisenstadt, *The Development of the Ethnic Problem in Israel: Observations and Suggestions for Research*, Jerusalem, 1986, pp. 36 ff. See also Herbert S. Lewis, 'Yemenite Ethnicity in Israel', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 1, June 1984, pp. 5–24; Shlomo Sharan, Yehuda Amir, and Rachel Ben-Ari, 'School Desegregation: Some Challenges Ahead', pp. 219–36, in Yehuda Amir and Shlomo Sharan, eds., *School Desegregation: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, Hillsdale, N.J., 1984; and Avram Leslau, Ernest Krausz, and Sara Nussbaum, 'Feelings of Discrimination among Iraqis and North-Africans in Israel', *Plural Societies*, vol. 17, no. 1, May 1987, pp. 34–41.

REGISTER OF SOCIAL RESEARCH ON THE ANGLO-JEWISH COMMUNITY 1987–88

Marlena Schmool

Introduction

PREVIOUS editions of this Register in 1968, 1971, and 1984[1] listed respectively 18, 22, and 21 projects. In the third Register, the emerging interest in Jewish local history and the appreciation by communal institutions that research findings are necessary for community planning were noted. These factors were believed to account for a maintained level of interest at a time of financial stringency. It is therefore encouraging to report that this current compilation, drawn up on the basis of information collected between November 1987 and January 1988, contains 45 entries. The increase is to some extent accounted for by a broadening of scope in this present Register to include details of historical projects about British Jewry for the period since 1918. For example, we have included the work of the London Museum of Jewish Life, covering both exhibitions and publications which are major resources for students of the social–historical development of British Jewry. Without this category of projects, the Register would number 33 entries — which is still a healthy increase in 4 years. It is also noteworthy that studies of British Jewry by scholars at universities outside Britain have, for the first time, found their way into the listing.

The Register, as in past editions, includes details of current social research together with information about recently completed projects (including recent publications). 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.

Earlier Registers were divided into two parts. The present one is divided into three. As in the past, Part A includes research undertaken or sponsored by Jewish communal organizations while Part B covers research undertaken under university or other academic auspices (as a research thesis or otherwise). Part C has been added to include individuals who have undertaken research privately. Within each part, the entries have been listed in alphabetical order of the institution or individual sponsoring the research. 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, except in the case of private persons. In this latter case, enquiries should be directed to the author, c/o Community Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews for forwarding.[2]

PART A: Research undertaken by Jewish communal organisations

BIRMINGHAM JEWISH HISTORY RESEARCH GROUP

10, Lenwade Road, Oldbury, Warley, B68 9JU

1. a. *The Refugees of the 1930s who settled in Birmingham*
   b. How people escaped from Germany, settled in Birmingham, and contributed to the general community. Based on personal interviews, newspapers, and minute books.
   c. Dr Z. Josephs.
   d. Mr E. Lesser, Mr D. Price, and Mr R. Wolf.
   e. March 1985.
   f. October 1987.
   h. 1988.

BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS, COMMUNITY RESEARCH UNIT

Woburn House, Tavistock Square, London, WC1 0EP

Established as the Statistical and Demographic Research Unit in 1965; changed to Community Research Unit in 1987. Compiles statistical data on various aspects of British Jewry, prepares interpretative studies

of trends; sets up and advises on local surveys; and collaborates with other research bodies and with social service agencies to provide data for community planning. Functions under a Special Committee of the Board (Chairman: Mr Eric Moonman; Research Director: Mrs Marlena Schmool).

2. a. *Annual Compilation of Community Births, Marriages and Deaths*
   c. d. As above.
   h. 1987 figures will be available July 1988.

3. a. *International Census of Jewish Education 1986–87*
   b. In conjunction with the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University, collecting and reporting statistics on pupil enrolment, syllabus content, and teacher-numbers at Jewish day and supplementary schools in Great Britain.
   c. d. As above.
   e. September 1986.
   h. 1989.

4. a. *Jewish Population of Greater Manchester*
   b. A sample survey of Jewry in Greater Manchester to provide data needed for community planning. Topics to be examined include: demographic profile; economic and social structure; geographical dispersion and migration; synagogue membership; Jewish educational experience; and religious practices.
   c. d. As above, in conjunction with a local steering committee comprising lay leaders, research users, and academics.
   e. 1986.
   g. Background paper: Autumn 1988.

5. a. *Use of Distinctive Jewish Names in Pinpointing Populations for Sampling*
   b. Analyses of a variety of community lists to ascertain patterns of Jewish names in Great Britain, with special reference to regional variations.
   c. d. As above.
   e. February 1988.
   f. July 1988.
   h. December 1988.

6. a. *Women in the Organised Jewish Community*
   b. A postal survey to examine the extent of women's participation in the formal organizational structure of the community, noting changes over the past 15 years.

c. d. As above.
e. Autumn 1988.

BRISTOL JEWISH HISTORY GROUP
70 Cranwells Park, Weston, Bath, BA1 2YE

7. a. *Bristol Jewry from 1750 to the Present Day*
b. Elaboration of existing written sources by examining local and Jewish newspapers, census records, and by oral history.
c. Mrs J. A. Samuel.
d. Mr J. Adler, Mr A. Elman, Mr R. Emanuel, Mr T. Reese, Mr N. Smith, Mr M. Sutton, Mr H. Vegoda, Ms B Woll, and Mr and Mrs E. Jacobs.
e. September 1986.
g. 1989.

CENTRAL COUNCIL FOR JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE
221 Golders Green Road, London, NW11 9DW

8. a. *Illicit Drug Use and Solvent Abuse in the London Jewish Community*
b. Exploratory study of the nature and extent of illicit drug use and solvent abuse within the Jewish community in Greater London, excluding dependency on prescribed and legal drugs. The study covers a wide spectrum of drug-taking. Areas investigated included voluntary agencies providing services for drug users, Jewish social work and youth agencies, drug dependency units, Jewish and non-Jewish schools, and Jewish societies in institutions of higher education. There was also a pilot interview study of Jewish former drug users and their close relatives.
c. Mr M. Jimack.
e. June 1986.
f. December 1986.
h. April 1987, Central Council for Jewish Social Services.

9. a. *Jewish Residents in London Borough of Hackney Homes for the Elderly.*
b. To ascertain, in a borough which has a significant minority of elderly Jews, the number in local authority homes for the elderly, the full circumstances of their admission, the nature of contact with parallel Jewish agencies, residents' satisfaction with their environment, and the extent of contact between residents and their next of kin.
c. Mr M. Jimack.
e. January 1988.

f. May 1988.
h. June 1988.

GLASGOW JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

49 Coplaw Street, Glasgow, G42

10. a. *Demographic Study of Glasgow Jewry*
b. To estimate the current population level and distribution of the Glasgow Jewish Community.
d. Dr K. E. Collins.
e. January 1988.

THE LONDON MUSEUM OF JEWISH LIFE

The Sternberg Centre, 80 East End Road, London, N3 2SY

11. a. *The Garment Trade 1910–1950*
b. The Jewish contribution to the women's wholesale clothing industry, examining the development of production methods, working conditions in factories, as well as innovations in style, textile, and sizing.
d. Ms L. Watson and Mrs A. Kershen.
e. December 1987.
f. November 1988.

12. a. *The Jews of the West End*
b. An operation to rescue and preserve oral histories, documents, photographs, and artefacts relating to the Jewish community of London's West End, for both archival and exhibition use.
c. Mrs A. Kershen and Mr and Mrs Flinders.
d. Staff of the London Museum of Jewish Life.
e. January 1988.
h. 1989 catalogue.

13. a. *Refugees from Nazism*
b. The history of the Jews who escaped from Nazi Germany and the occupied European countries, comparing their situation before the advent of the Third Reich in 1933 with the conditions they experienced in London — with special reference to their religious, working, and social life.
c. Mrs A. Kershen.
e. January 1988.
f. July 1988.
h. 1989.

14. a. *The Role of Jewish Women, 1880–1930*
    b. Research using oral history and documentary sources, examining changes in the role of Jewish women, with particular reference to economic and religious life; continuing work begun at the Manchester Studies Unit, Manchester Polytechnic.
    d. Ms R. Burman.
    h. 'Women in Jewish Religious Life: Manchester 1880–1930', in J. Obelkevitch, L. Roper, and R. Samuel, eds., *Disciplines of Faith*, pp. 37–55, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1987.

MERSEYSIDE JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

1 Hornby Lane, Liverpool, L18 3HH

15. a. *Demographic Study of the Liverpool Jewish Community*
    b. Analyses both the membership of, and affiliation to, major communal organizations and the ages at which children receive Jewish education.
    c. Dr M. Goodman.
    e. June 1987.
    f. March 1988.

NORTH-EAST JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL, CENSUS COMMITTEE

2 Carlton Close, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE3 4SA

16. a. *The Size and Structure of the Jewish Community of Newcastle upon Tyne*
    b. Census of the local Jewish population. Replication of the community census of 1983. It is intended to compile figures every five years.
    c. d. Mr W. Sharman, Mr M. Blakey, Mr G. Stern, and Mr M. Josephs; and Dr. P. Caller.
    e. May 1987.
    f. 1988.
    g. 1989.

SCOTTISH JEWISH ARCHIVES CENTRE

Garnethill Synagogue, Hill Street, Glasgow

17. a. *History of Scottish Jewry*
    b. Collection of historical records of Scottish Jewry; cataloguing; and arranging temporary and permanent exhibits in the Archive Centre at Garnethill Synagogue. Preparation of

material for establishing a Jewish Museum and compilation of the definitive community history. Oral History project.
c. Mr H. L. Kaplan, Dr I. E. Miller, and Dr K. E. Collins.
d. Mr B. Braber.
e. April 1985.
f. 1990.
g. Dr K. E. Collins, ed., *Aspects of Scottish Jewry*, 1987, Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, £4.95.

SHEFFIELD JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

276 Ecclesall Road South, Sheffield, S11 9PS

18. a. *Sheffield Jewish Community Census 1987*
c. Mr E. Isaacs.
f. November 1987.
h. Reported to the Sheffield Representative Council, 30 November 1987.

WEST CENTRAL, CONSULTANCY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

3 Gower Street, Bloomsbury, London, WC1E 6HA

19. a. *Divorce in Anglo-Jewry: Setting up a New Agency to Meet New Needs*
b. Report on, and critical analysis of, the setting up of the Jewish Family Mediation Service and its pilot programmes.
c. Mr S. Chelms.
h. 1988.

20. a. *Outmarriage: Communal Needs and Strategies*
b. A study based on questionnaires filled in by Rabbis and/or Ministers; a series of discussion groups with community executives; study groups; and review of the literature on outmarriage.
c. Mr S. Chelms.
e. 1987.
f. July 1988.

PART B: Research undertaken under academic auspices

CITY UNIVERSITY, JEWISH SOCIAL RESEARCH UNIT

Northampton Square, London, EC1V 0HR

21. a. *South African Jewish Immigration and Identity*
b. Examination of the impact of migration to, and residence in, the United Kingdom on patterns of Jewish identity among

expatriate South Africans; investigating their perceptions of the Anglo-Jewish community and identifying obstacles to their increased involvement in communal life.

c. Kaplan Centre, University of Cape Town and JSRU, City University.
d. Dr S. Frankental (Cape Town) and Dr S. Miller (London).
e. January 1988.
f. August 1989.
g. 1989, internal interim report.

22. a. *Religiosity and Attitudes to Ethnic Minorities*
b. A comparative study of attitudes to minority rights among young Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, examining the relationship between religiosity, education, social contact, and tolerance of minority rights.
c. Dr S. Miller.
d. Ms A. Greenwood.
e. August 1987.
f. October 1988.
h. 1989.

23. a. *Relationship between Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism in a Student Population*
b. An attempt to measure positive and negative stereotypes of Jews and attitudes to Israel and the Middle East conflict in a sample of university students; and an examination of the relationship between antisemitism and anti-Zionism and personal characteristics associated with pro- and anti-Jewish attitudes.
c. Group Relations Educational Trust.
d. Dr J. Gerwitz and Dr S. Miller.
e. January 1987.
f. January 1990.

BIRMINGHAM UNIVERSITY

PO Box 363, Birmingham, B15 2TT

24. a. *Special Provision for Orthodox Jewish People with Special Needs*
b. Examination of the needs of Orthodox mentally handicapped Jews and their families, looking at existing services, and the gaps in existing provisions and options which might lead to improved services for this client group. Investigation of how experience in the Jewish community might assist other ethnic minority groups in setting up appropriate services for their special needs.

c. d. Mrs E. Stern.
f. April 1988.
h. M.A. Thesis, University of Birmingham.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
Waltham, MA 02254, USA

25. a. *The Anglicization of Russian-Jewish Immigrant Women in London: 1880–1939*
b. The anglicization process of London's Jewish immigrant women as indicated by an analysis of the records of public health, education, work, home life, and associational networks — focusing on the uniqueness of women's experiences and providing a comparison with other ethnic groups in London and in New York.
d. Ms S. L. Tananbaum.
e. 1986.
f. Autumn 1988.
h. Doctoral Thesis, Brandeis University.

GLASGOW COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICS
Cowcaddens Road, Glasgow, G4 0BA

26. a. *The Politics of Religious Slaughter*
b. Monitoring developments since the publication of the Government's response in October 1987 to the Farm Animal Welfare Council Report of 1985.
c. Mr R. Charlton and Mr R. Kaye.
g. 'Defending the Religious Slaughter of Animals: A study of Ethnic Issue Management', *Politics* vol. 5, April 1985; 'The Politics of Religious Slaughter: an ethno-religious case study,' *New Community*, vol 13, no 3, Winter 1985–6; 'Animal Rights Versus Human Rights', *Contemporary Affairs Briefing*, February 1987.

HAIFA UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY
University of Haifa, Haifa, 31999, ISRAEL

27. a. *The Choice of Destination Made by Tourists and its Impact on their Spatial Behaviour*
b. The prefered and actual tourist choices of North West London Jewry.

c. d. Mr Y. Mansfeld.
e. November 1984.
f. June 1987.
h. Doctoral Thesis, University of Haifa, 1987.

28. a. *Jews in an Outer London Borough: Barnet*
b. An analysis for the London Borough of Barnet of Small Area Statistics which have been estimated to have a Jewish majority. The statistics comprise social and economic data taken from the 1981 Census and the study analyses internal socio-economic differentiation within the Jewish population and compares it with areas with non-Jewish majorities.
c. d. Professor S. Waterman.
f. November 1987.
h. 1988, Queen Mary College, London, Occasional Papers in Geography.

LEICESTER UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH

29. a. *The East End Jewish Community in Politics, 1918–1939*
b. The study includes a review of the social and economic structure of East End Jewry; Jewish pressure groups; and political lobbying.
c. d. Ms E. R. Smith.
e. October 1984.
f. August 1988.
h. Doctoral Thesis, University of Leicester, 1989.

30. a. *The Establishment of the Reform Beth Din 1935–1965*
b. Investigation of the reasons for the establishment of the Reform Beth Din, covering internal developments within the Reform Movement and changing trends within Anglo-Jewry as a whole.
c. d. Rabbi J. Romain.
f. 1988.
h. Doctoral Thesis, University of Leicester.

LONDON UNIVERSITY, KING'S COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
Strand, London, WC2R 2LS

31. a. *Role Perceptions of Anglo-Jewish Wives in Mid-life*
b. A study of married women starting a mid-life career or course of study, with particular reference to ultra-Orthodox,

traditionally observant, and non-observant women within Anglo-Jewry — examining the interdependence between the woman, her family, and her cultural background.
c. d. Mrs A. Baker.
e. September 1987.
f. Doctoral Thesis, University of London, 1991.

LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, CENTRE FOR VOLUNTARY ORGANISATION

Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE

32. a. *Administration in Churches and Synagogues: the Role of the Clergy*
b. An organizational study focusing on problems and issues of role implementation in the case of Jewish and of Christian ministers.
c. Mrs M. Harris.
e. December 1988.
f. December 1993.
h. 1994.

QUEEN MARY COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL STUDIES

Mile End Road, London, E1 4NS

33. a. *British Immigration Control Procedures and Refugees, 1933–45*
b. Britain's response to the refugee crisis, 1933–1945, looking at the experience of Jews and other refugees trying to enter Britain, with particular reference to records concerning administrative and legal processes.
c. d. Ms L. London.
e. September 1987.
f. September 1990.
h. Doctoral Thesis, Queen Mary College.

34. a. *Chronicle of a Community: The 'Jewish Chronicle' and Anglo-Jewry 1841–1991*
b. A history of the *Jewish Chronicle* (weekly newspaper), its place in Anglo-Jewry, and its influence on and perception of events in the community.
c. d. Dr D. Cesarani.
e. October 1987.
f. September 1991.
h. 1991

MARLENA SCHMOOL

ROYAL HOLLOWAY AND BEDFORD NEW COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Egham Hill, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX

35. a. *Married Hassidic Women*
    b. An extended-interview study of a random sample of Chabad-Hassidic married women in North London examining life-histories, current roles, and attitudes to these roles.
    c. d. Dr K. Loewenthal.
    e. 1979.
    f. 1980.
    g. 'Patterns of Religious Development and Experience in Chabad-Hassidic women', *Journal of Psychology and Judaism:* vo. 12, part 1, Spring 1988.

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL

36. a. *Growth and Development of Reform Judaism in Manchester 1938–1985*
    b. Historical research to show and explain the growth and development of Reform Judaism in Manchester, with particular reference to phenomenal growth after 1945.
    c. d. Mr M. Kramer-Mannion.
    e. Autumn 1985.
    f. Doctoral Thesis, University of Manchester, April 1989.

NORTH LONDON POLYTECHNIC, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Holloway Road, London, N7 8DB

37. a. *Class, Status and Gender*
    b. Comparative study of perceptions of class and status among Ultra-Orthodox Jews, people of Afro-Caribbean origin, and non-Jewish white English people in Stamford Hill.
    c. Ms A. M. Fronde.
    h. Doctoral Thesis, July 1987.

UNIVERSITY OF READING, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 2AA

38. a. *Jokes about Jews*
    b. Content analysis of ethnic jokes on a comparative basis including a section on jokes about Jews.

c. d. Professor J. C. H. Davies.
g. 'Jewish Jokes, Anti-semitic Jokes and Hebredonian Jokes' in A. Ziv, ed., *Jewish Humour*, Tel Aviv, 1986.
h. *Jokes Are About Peoples*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana (in press).

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON, FACULTY OF LAW
Highfield, Southampton, SO9 5NH

39. a. *English Law and Ethnic Minority Customs*
b. Interaction between English legal provisions and the cultures and traditions of ethnic minorities in the United Kingdom.
c. d. Dr S. Poulter.
e. 1980.
g. *English Law and Ethnic Minority Customs*, Butterworth, London, 1986.

40. a. *Jews in British Society, 1945–51*
b. Study of the impact of the Holocaust, Palestine/Israel, and national British trends on Jewish-Gentile relations in Britain in the immediate post-war years.
c. d. Dr A. Kushner.
e. October 1986.
f. October 1989.
h. 1990.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF SWANSEA, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
Singleton Park, Swansea, SA2 8PP

41. a. *Changing Structure and Organization of a Small South Wales Jewish Community*
b. Anthropological study focusing on growth and decline in a provincial community.
c. d. Dr L. Mars.
e. October 1983.
g. 'Ceremonies of Barmitzvah and Batmitzvah', paper delivered at the 1988 conference of the Association of Social Anthropologists.

PART C: Research by private individuals

MR M. FREEDMAN

42. a. *Leeds Jewry: A Statistical and Sociological Profile*
    b. Historical and socio-demographic review of Leeds Jewry based on community records and on a questionnaire study.
    e. 1986.
    f. 1988.

MR N. GRIZZARD

43. a. *A Socio-Demographic Survey of an Anglo-Jewish Community Using Telephone Survey Techniques*
    b. A pilot survey on the use of the telephone rather than face-to-face interviewing for research on the Leeds Jewish Community.
    e. 1988.
    f. 1989.

PROFESSOR U. R. HENRIQUES and MR A. J. GLASER

44. a. *Studies in the History of the Jewish Communities of South Wales*
    b. A number of detailed studies of the history, communal institutions, and activities of the Jewish communities of the South Wales Valleys, 1850–1939.
    e. October 1987.
    f. March 1988.
    h. June 1988.

MR B. WILLIAMS

45. a. *The History of Manchester Jewry, 1875–1933*
    b. Continuation of an earlier study, which took the history of Manchester up to 1875, looking at the evolution of the community in social, economic, political, and institutional terms, using documentary sources and a 'bank' of taped life-history interviews.
    f. 1988.
    h. 1989.

NOTES

[1] See *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 10, No. 2, December 1968, pp. 281–86; vol. 13, no. 2, December 1971, pp. 189–96 and vol. 26, no. 2, December 1984, pp. 129–38.

[2] This Register was compiled as part of the programme of the Community Research Unit of the Board of Deputies. The author's thanks go to Mark Freedman, Ann Fine, and Deborah Seitler, who helped in collating data; and to all who submitted entries, whether or not they were included.

STUDIES ON POLISH JEWRY

(Review Article)

Jonathan Webber

EZRA MENDELSOHN and CHONE SHMERUK, eds, *Studies on Polish Jewry. Paul Glikson Memorial Volume*, viii + 73pp. in English and viii + 183pp. in Hebrew, published by the Center for Research on the History and Culture of Polish Jews, Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and distributed by the Zalman Shazar Center for the Furtherance of the Study of Jewish History, Jerusalem, 1987, n.p.

THE significant relaunch of Polish Jewish studies in the past few years — marked for example by the founding in this country of the journal *Polin* and of its parent body, the Institute for Polish–Jewish Studies in Oxford — promises a renewed focusing of scholarly attention on the complexities and mythologies of the history, culture, and society of what was one of the world's major Jewish communities until a generation or so ago. In Poland itself, Catholic intellectuals now reconsidering the troublesome question of 'Who is a Pole?' or 'What is Polishness?' have taken up an interest in the Jews (amongst other pre-war minorities) precisely so as to help redefine their own identity and sense of future direction; and, for example, a new Institute devoted to Polish Jewish Studies has recently been established at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków. In short, a new academic field — with the classical defining features of international conferences, student and scholar exchanges, new kinds of research projects, and so forth — is slowly but perceptibly coming into being. In such a context it is indeed gratifying that the death of Paul Glikson in 1983 has now been appropriately marked by the appearance of a volume of collected papers that will surely come to be seen as a part of the founding scholarly apparatus through which this field will develop in the future.

Older readers of *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* will remember Paul Glikson as its editorial secretary and the author of the 'Chronicle' section during its first five years (1959–63); he then emigrated to Israel and went on to become a senior member of the staff of the Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics at the Hebrew University, collaborating with U. O. Schmelz and Sergio DellaPergola in the editorship

of the definitive *Papers in Jewish Demography* series produced by the University's Institute of Contemporary Jewry. A native of Warsaw, Glikson had an abiding interest in the demography of Polish Jewry and at the time of his death was preparing a systematic compendium on the subject. The volume now published in his honour does credit to his important scholarly contribution; the fact that the editors chose to include papers in both English and Hebrew nicely symbolizes the dual directionality of his academic orientation and environment, though this will inevitably entail the side-effect of limiting the scope of the book's potential readership, particularly in Poland. The English-language summaries provided for the Hebrew papers are unfortunately uneven in both length and subtlety, and in some cases clearly do not do sufficient justice to the richness of the material presented. It is a pity, moreover, that despite the warm words written here about Glikson's personality and wide-ranging interests (and a useful list of his publications), there is no attempt to review his work systematically, or for that matter to propose a more global view of Polish Jewish studies and Glikson's place in it.

The absence, in fact, of a general introduction by the editors of this book reflects not only the usual shortcomings of a Festschrift containing important but randomly selected case-studies from various disciplines; it also reflects the current lack of any unified vision of this newly rediscovered field of Jewish studies. From among the fifteen contributors to the book it is not possible to discern any collective set of technical or theoretical proposals regarding an appropriate methodology —sociological or otherwise — for dealing with the particularities of the Polish material, or some other analytic framework for circumscribing the field. From a formal point of view, it can be said that these studies describe assorted features of Polish Jewry rather than being a joint presentation of some sort of working hypothesis about the specific nature and history of Polish Jewish society based on the necessary interrelation between such features.

That much said, however, what does come across very strongly is the extraordinary richness of each of the papers taken individually, based in many cases on the rich possibilities for research offered by the extant archives still in Poland. The paper by Jacob Goldberg, for example, which occupies nearly one third of the Hebrew section (or nearly one quarter of the whole book), represents a meticulously detailed linguistic and sociolinguistic historical analysis of eighteenth-century documents relevant for the study of the contemporary Jewish retail trade. A veritable gold-mine exists out there in Poland, and is now slowly but surely being uncovered by historians profiting — at long last — from the Polish government's willingness today to allow in foreign Jewish scholars to work through the records. It is very likely that the cumulative effect of this research will eventually bring about a

reshaping of historiographic approaches to the study of the Jewish experience in Poland, both in terms of the development of a broad view of the subject and also in relation to particular issues of detail useful for the historical sociology of Jewish society there.

The fruits of this archival work by historians now begin to fill out and complement the studies in literary criticism and other fields represented in this volume so as to offer a more rounded picture of Polish Jewish life than has normally been available since before the last war; and so now it is the gaps that become noticeable — the absence here of a contribution from the field of women's studies, for instance. But such defects are amply compensated for: an important paper by Ephraim E. Urbach on some rabbinical responsa in the interwar period clearly indicates the degree to which eminent Polish rabbis of the time addressed themselves to matters preoccupying their colleagues in the West (in London, in particular) and did so moreover through a consideration of factors strictly speaking extraneous to halakhic principles. Another valuable contribution of a sociological kind is provided by the paper by Shaul Stampfer on the short-lived appearance in the early nineteenth century of very early marriages (viz. at the onset of puberty) among the children of educated, prosperous Jews (*sheyne yidn*), a subject of considerable significance for the history of the Jewish family. Such forays into relatively uncharted terrain do much to consolidate the field as laid out in this book.

What is lacking, however, is the sense of intra-disciplinary argument over method or rules of sociological evidence. The two state-of-the-art papers on Jewish demography, by Schmelz and DellaPergola respectively (inexplicably left out of the other-language summaries), do not adequately tackle the considerable unease felt in some quarters about the need for a redefinition of the subject because of the implications of the voluntary nature of Jewish self-identification in many Western countries. One of the principal objections that has been raised is that membership of the Jewish community is not conveniently measurable not just because of technical difficulties in collecting the data but because of the less easily quantifiable socio-cultural conditions that lead to Jewish self-identification in the first place (see, for example, Dominique Schnapper's recent review of the problem in the *Revue française de sociologie* (vol. 28, no. 2, 1987) or, for a more generally anthropological perspective on the perceptual criteria that inevitably define individual 'populations', Edwin Ardener's 'Language, Ethnicity and Population' in the *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1972). There is no good reason to suppose in advance that 'minorities' or 'nationalities', specified before the law at certain times and places though they may be, are in fact bounded, and that they must by definition generate their own self-contained ethnographic — or demographic — realities. What actually is being counted or measured?

The meaning of the statistics or the cultural stereotypes may need to be carefully set according to the context.

This is something which the paper by Ezra Mendelsohn does indeed reach out to: Jewish minorities in various Central and Eastern European countries during the interwar period, as he describes in excellent analytic detail, seem to exhibit a number of features in common with ethnic German (*Volksdeutsche*) minorities, such as a receptivity to external influences in shaping a heightened degree of ethnic self-awareness and hence its corresponding modes of social organization. The point is an important one, since in the study of identity one would normally expect the existence of wider factors that account for different strategies of acculturation, attitudes to received religion, or cultural trajectories more generally. Mendelsohn's suggestion that comparative research on the emergence of the European 'non-historical' peoples or the incorporation of other minority groups into the nation-states would in itself assist in the understanding of the Jewish experience (and, more importantly perhaps, vice versa) is a good example of how modern Jewish sociology can fruitfully benefit from the study of Eastern European societies generally.

Unfortunately, Mendelsohn has little to say here about Poland or Polish Jewry itself, though the inclusion of his contribution in the book is a valuable counterweight to many of the papers that do base themselves on the Polish Jewish ethnography but with less forceful theoretical significance. (I am not in a position to comment on the three papers devoted to literary criticism.) The paper by Gershon David Hundert, an account of Jewish relations with the aristocratic Polish owners of the town of Opatów (Apt) in the eighteenth century, similarly tackles the Jewish-Gentile interface; the archival material is well presented in support of the author's claim that Polish magnates who managed the towns that they had founded or purchased did so to increase their revenues or otherwise promote their own interests. If they 'interfered' in Jewish life, such as in connection with the authority of the *qahal*, this was not out of 'antisemitism' but merely out of the desire to maintain order; there was certainly no whim involved. But in dismissing whim as a category Hundert confuses internal and external history — if Jews perceived the way they were being treated by the owners of the towns in which they lived as a matter of whim, this is important evidence also and should be taken into account in any historical reconstruction of social relations. It cannot be true in any deep sense that the authority of the *qahal* over Jews rested principally on the *ad hoc* approach adopted by a Gentile ruler. The idea that Jews and Christians in such towns enjoyed 'a complementary relationship', as Hundert further proposes, is similarly too functional and external an approach to convey the realities of this interface. Another paper that in effect also deals with this subject is by Olga Goldberg-Mulkiewicz: on

the subject of cultural stereotypes, it offers fascinating evidence of the use of the book as a symbolic motif in Polish folk art (for instance, on small figurines) that characterizes the Jew and makes him instantly recognisable as such to the Polish peasant. But her conclusion that this book motif signifies similar features in both Polish and Jewish culture is not at all clear. Poles use the book to indicate an outsider, in this case the Jew; whereas Jews treat books iconographically (for instance, on tombstones) as a mark showing the attainment of their *own* cultural ideals. Poles and Jews do not have the symbol of the book in common, despite the apparent convergence when seen from a distance; rather the symbol in each case functions and takes its meaning from its position within the set of values (and range of other stereotypes) peculiar independently to the two societies.

How far, of course, the study of Polish Jewish identity will find itself branching further out into the nature and importance of boundaries, along with certain contemporary sociological preoccupations, remains to be seen; but it is interesting to note that there is no paper in this book devoted to the classic but extremist model, viz. antisemitism (although the subject does come up in the paper by Shmuel Krakowski on the subject of Jews in the Polish Army). The popular Jewish stereotype of an antisemitic twentieth-century Polish state, already reconsidered in any case by Ezra Mendelsohn ('Interwar Poland: Good for the Jews or Bad for the Jews?', in Chimen Abramsky *et al.*, eds., *The Jews in Poland*, Oxford 1986), has fortunately been bypassed here. In this as in other senses, the Paul Glikson Memorial Volume is by no means a book for beginners in Polish Jewish history.

BOOK REVIEWS

SHMUEL ALMOG, *Zionism and History: The Rise of a New Jewish Consciousness* (translated from the Hebrew by Ina Friedman), 330 pp., The Magnes Press, Jerusalem and St Martin's Press, New York, 1987, $30.00.

This book, which was originally a Ph.D. thesis prepared under the guidance of Professor Shmuel Ettinger, first appeared in Hebrew in 1982. It concentrates on the years from 1896 to 1906 to elucidate the role of Zionism in revitalizing Jewish life. It is in four parts. The first deals with early Zionism's preoccupation with historical consciousness — the stress placed on the historical continuity of the Jewish people as a means of restoring Jewish dignity. This involves defining what is meant by the concept of the Jewish people; some definitions attempted to find direct links with the people of Biblical times, treating 2,000 years of Diaspora as irrelevant.

The second part of the book deals with the issue of Jewish culture and why this seemingly anodyne issue aroused so much fierce controversy. The 'spiritual' Zionists and the Democratic Faction (with which Weizmann was associated) favoured the idea of 'cultural work'; the religious Zionists opposed it as possibly encouraging secularization; and Herzl deplored any controversy that might distract energies from political goals. Dr Almog relates these attitudes to more fundamental perceptions of the nature of Zionism and Jewish culture (although he does not describe precisely what carrying out 'cultural work' would have consisted of). The transition from the era of emancipation and assimilation to nationalism involved a new stance on historic Judaism: an attempt to develop a cultural spiritual 'third force' between orthodoxy and liberal Judaism. This part also deals with 'muscular Judaism' — the thesis that Eastern European Jewry was physically degenerate in the Diaspora but that this could be changed by Zionism, as had already begun to happen in the agricultural colonies of Palestine. The author also analyses the influence of different traditions in Jewish thought: those of the Eastern Europeans, who had been exposed to Western culture but were still attached to the Jewish mass milieu; of the Central Europeans, over-influenced by German culture; and of the Galicians, interpreting the Haskalah ('Enlightenment', the movement for spreading modern European culture among Jews) in the spirit of German culture.

The third part deals with the relationship between those Jews who would settle in the new Jewish state and those who would remain in the

Diaspora as well as with the question of 'practical work' and its relationship to other Diaspora issues. The fourth part is about the Uganda crisis; it is the clearest section of the book because it deals chronologically with the issues as they developed. One wonders how far all the participants really understood the problems. Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, no less, published in 1905 a pamphlet supporting settlement in East Africa on the ground that once the agreement was signed, 'we will officially have a Jewish State' — which was not Joseph Chamberlain's perception of the relationship of an internally autonomous Jewish colony to the British Government. The participants in the Uganda polemics seem often to have been arguing with each other rather than with the facts of the case.

The structure of the book is thematic rather than chronological (except for the part dealing with Uganda) and there is no introduction to set the scene by presenting the different parties and personalities in their political alignment. It is, however, the result of wide research and obviously contributes to the understanding of cross-currents of opinion in a vital period for the future of the Jewish people. The style varies from the didacticism of a doctoral thesis to obscurities resulting from undue compression — as in the following sentence: 'This leap was the counterpart of the historiography spawned by emancipation and the Haskalah, which had shattered the integrity of Jewish history by subjecting it to the norms of the Christian outlook' (p. 21).

The bibliography distinguishes between works in Hebrew and in other languages, and between books and articles — but not between primary and secondary sources. Nothing later than 1982 is listed — thus missing, for example, Jehuda Reinharz's biography of Weizmann, a work of major importance for the 1896–1906 period.

V. D. LIPMAN

DANIEL J. ELAZAR, *Israel: Building a New Society*, xi + 287 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1986, $29.95.

Professor Elazar argues that in order to understand Israeli politics one must look, not at the structures of government, but at the complex, emergent, and often contradictory political culture that underpins political power and its distribution. Thus, although the political organization of the Israeli state appears hierarchical, centralized, and bureaucratic, in reality the efficient functioning of the system and its day-to-day relations are dependent on '... myriad contractual obligations' (p. 4).

The individuals party to these relationships are influenced in their conduct by the differing political traditions inherited from the Jewish Diaspora. Political attitudes shaped by the pre-modern societies of the Middle East and North Africa co-exist alongside those fashioned by the

statist culture of Eastern Europe. An indigenous political style also flourishes, characterized by the author as participatory, republican, and covenantal with its roots in the Yishuv (the Jewish settlement in Palestine). It is this latter strand that Professor Elazar predicts will be most influential in the future development of the Israeli political system.

Despite Professor Elazar's advice to look beyond political institutions and social structures for the key to Israel's politics, it is in his chapters on 'The Compound Structure of the Israeli Polity' and 'Serving the Public in an Emergent Society' that we learn most about the political life of the country. Elazar's special interest lies in his research on federalism; indeed, he is President of the Jewish Institute for Federal Studies, and he uses a federalist framework to link both historical events and structural developments into a coherent analysis of Israel's political system. In his chapter on 'The Compound Structure of the Israeli Polity', he briefly outlines the functions of institutions such as the Knesset, the executive, and the courts (both civil and religious), and the role of the President. We are reminded that the Knesset decided early in the history of the State not to enact a formal constitution. The few basic laws, the legislative acts which have constitutional import, and the guarantee of universally recognized human and civil rights and freedoms, safeguarded by the courts, will present a constitutional basis of the polity that will be familiar to British readers from their own experience. What gives Israel its uniqueness, not merely among the newly formed states of the post-war world but among those longer established, is the concept of the country as but one entity within a much larger and scattered community known as the Jewish People.

Israel is, therefore, not only a politically sovereign state within the international community of nations, having all the rights and obligations that status implies, but it is also specifically a Jewish state, having as an additional task (some would argue as its principal task) the maintenance of an environment in which all Jews may express their particular Jewish culture, values, and identity. The state, therefore, has not only the basic duty to protect Israeli citizens, but assumes responsibility also for the well-being and indeed the very continuation of all the Jewish people. This responsibility, Professor Elazar suggests, is partly discharged through organizations which he calls 'national institutions' that function within the state's territory but stand in a federal relationship to the government and administration of the State of Israel. Among these institutions are the Jewish Agency for Israel and the World Zionist Organization (which are responsible for settlement of the land and the Zionist education of Jews in Israel and abroad) and the Jewish National Fund. Here then is but one aspect of the federal or shared nature of power and responsibility within the state.

Because of the ethnic pluralism of the state, the Israeli government has accorded many groups under its jurisdiction the legal status and institutional framework within which they might protect their corporate identity. The ethnically homogeneous pattern of Arab village settlement, common throughout the Middle East, puts a heavy emphasis on local government organization not only to provide local services but also to offer a basis for the expression of the cultural identity and values of the residents.

The proliferation of institutions which may lay claim to the loyalty of individual citizens is further compounded by the fact that in Israel matters of personal status are by law the province of religious communities — again following a pattern common to the countries of the region. Every person, therefore, when he marries, is divorced, or buried must be a member of some religious community, no matter how nominal that membership is. Religious belief and practice among Jews as well as among the minorities is a significant factor in the state and various religious communities have substantial institutional structures of their own, recognized in law. In some cases, they are governed by bodies chosen under state law because they provide state-supported services and must conform to certain state procedures with regard to selection and representation. Though the competence to function is granted through state law, the religious communities, including the Jewish authorities, see the state as peripheral to their real needs. Their powers flow directly from heaven and their laws represent divine will. In an interesting footnote, Professor Elazar comments that it is probable that 'as many as one-third of all Israelis hold the religious law of their respective communities in higher regard than the law of the state, including a small group of Jews (perhaps several thousand) who reject state laws altogether' (p. 71). Another way by which Israeli society manifests diversity in both urban and rural contexts is through what is known as 'sectors' — an organizational arrangement whereby socio-economic activity is divided between distinctive governmental, private, and co-operative spheres.

In his search for the key to understanding Israel's political system, Professor Elazar would downgrade the very factor to which this reviewer has paid special attention: the structure of government. Indeed, *pace* Elazar, Chapters 4, 5, and 6 of his book, which deal with the concrete reality of institutions and organizations, are central to the understanding of Israeli political behaviour. The institutions that grew out of the disparate ideological and ethnic groups present in the country during the pre-State days have now assumed an overwhelming importance and in their turn shape and influence a society far more homogeneous in its composition. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the role and function of the political parties and in the working of the electoral system. While the complex, sometimes bizarre, alliances of

the numerous political parties might have served the wish of the disparate groups to collaborate pragmatically while retaining their ideological integrity, one is hard put to describe this as a federal process. Indeed, it is difficult to go along with Professor Elazar's underlying thesis that Israel is becoming (possibly there is even the implication that it *must* become) a society where the overwhelming dominance of the central state is transmuted by the growing strength and confidence of institutions once considered on the periphery of political power.

Federalism, to a British or an American reader, implies at the very least a certain separation of political powers, with different parts of the system carrying out functions defined by law. Professor Elazar himself describes Israel as 'a government-permeated society' (p. 102). Many services that in other countries are provided by municipal authorities are supplied directly by the state. Others provided by the Histadrut and co-operatives are linked closely to state services or policies. Again, the author describes Israel as a country in which 'political decisions are determinative even in economic situations' and public and institutional demands 'are evaluated from the point of view of the social goals of the state and the political goals of the parties in power' (p. 106).

In describing the political institutions, their pre-State histories and the role they have played in the last forty years, Professor Elazar has presented a clear and concise exposition of the practical day-to-day working of the Israeli political system. However, it is perhaps in the last part of his book that the ideas for future research, debate, and argument are to be found. He indulges in a form of futurology. He uses the metaphor of the frontier to describe not merely the settlement and spread of the Israeli population but also the intellectual advances being made and to be made in the future. In the most speculative and yet most interesting part of his book, he discusses the development of the new technologies in Israel that have grown coterminously with the spread of urban populations. Thus, the new communications technology and modern transport have fostered and encouraged large metropolitan regions where workplace and home are separate and where loyalty to district or municipal needs and goals begins to take precedence over the demands of society as a whole.

The book seems to suggest that we are seeing the gradual embourgeoisement of the Israeli public. Israel is being forced, necessarily, into the post-industrial age if only because the country lacks the resources to build a thriving economy based on heavy industries. The new technologies demand a highly educated public and education engenders greater individuation and fosters the skills to become self-reliant in the sphere of the workplace. Individuality and the increasing ability on the part of the working population to compete for desirable jobs on the basis of skills, rather than patronage, presages the decline of party

political power and of the centrality of the state as an all-powerful provider of material well-being and status.

In a book that is useful rather than original in its contribution to the understanding of Israeli politics, Professor Elazar's emphasis on the growth of federalism and the gradual demise of the central state machine appears to lie in the realm of wish fulfilment rather than reality. The reader is finally left with the impression of Israeli society as a nascent reproduction of Silicon Valley on the shores of the Mediterranean.

DAVID CAPITANCHIK

JACQUES GUTWIRTH, *Les Judéo-chrétiens d'aujourd'hui* (*Sciences humaines et religions* series), 293 pp., Les éditions du cerf, 29 boulevard Latour-Maubourg, Paris, 1987, n.p.

The present-day Hebrew Christians of the title are Messianic Jews. Dr Gutwirth has based his scholarly study not only on exhaustive research of published and unpublished data on the subject but also on his own fieldwork. The unpublished material includes theses and dissertations as well as private communications. He has carried out fieldwork over a number of years in the best traditions of social anthropology; he is clearly a talented and skilled observer and he has the further and less common ability of objectively analysing the wealth of material he has gathered.

In his Introduction, he describes a visit he made in the Los Angeles area on a Friday evening in 1976 to what he believed to be a synagogue. He sees seven-branched candelabra, a Holy Ark with Torah scrolls, there are respectably dressed families, some of the male worshippers are wearing skullcaps and prayer shawls, the congregation chants a traditional Hebrew hymn welcoming the Sabbath, and the *Shema Yisrael* (the Jewish confession of faith) is recited. But this is followed by a reference to Yeshua (Jesus) the Messiah and the Lord and to his astonishment he hears fervent incomprehensible mutterings and speaking in tongues while arms are stretched upwards. He is among Messianic Jews. By 1983, there were about forty 'fellowships' of this persuasion in the United States, varying in size from only ten members — one may be forgiven for wondering whether this is because of the traditional minimum number of ten adult Jewish men required for a *minyan* (communal prayer) — to about 200.

Dr Gutwirth describes in meticulous detail Temple Emanuel, which was founded in Los Angeles in 1974 and later changed its name to Ahavat Zion Synagogue ('Love of Zion Synagogue'). His excellent photographs of the building show the façade with a stylized *menorah* (seven-branched candelabrum) and a notice-board giving details of the services: Temple Emanuel had services on *Erev Shabbat* and *Yom Rishon*

(Sabbath Eve and Sunday) but when it changed its name to Ahavat Zion Synagogue the services advertised take place on Friday evening and Saturday morning. The author attended the synagogue for about three months in 1979; he found that these services were almost identical with those which took place in American Conservative synagogues. The men who were not wearing their own head cover were firmly invited by an usher to take a skullcap from a basket at the entrance. The prayers were taken from the Jewish liturgy and after the *Shema Yisrael* there was no mention of Yeshua. (However, Ahavat Zion members met informally on Wednesday evenings either in the synagogue or in a private home; there were discussions, singing of hymns, prayers for the relief of illness or other afflictions, speaking in tongues, and chanting reminiscent of Pentecostal practices.)

The two sons of the spiritual leader of the congregation had attended university courses in Jewish studies and while one of them took on the function of cantor, the other coached the young sons of members for their *bar-mitzvah.* A paradoxical situation develops: some of the converts who had been non-practising Jews now learn a great deal about Jewish religion and are encouraged to be proud of their Jewish heritage and traditions. (Readers of this Journal will be reminded of the article by Rachael Kohn in the last issue (vol. 29, no. 2, December 1987) in which she showed that missions to Jews stressed the importance of preserving a convert's Jewish identity.) On the other hand, some are resentful because they did not become believers in Yeshua in order to follow traditional Jewish rituals and to hear praises of Judaism.

The leaders of the movement also sought out Jews who had (misguidedly, according to them) been converted to an established Christian denomination and urged them to attend Messianic services to find out for themselves that Judaism and Christianity could be harmoniously blended so that one need not renounce the religion of one's birth in order to believe in the New Covenant (that is, the New Testament) and in Jesus as Messiah. Ahavat Zion preachers were fiercely pro-Zionist and passionately defended the State of Israel. They also adopted Jewish causes: a photograph of the synagogue taken in 1979 shows a large poster on the wall proclaiming 'Freedom for Soviet Jewry'. At a Passover *seder,* the meal was prepared by *kasher* caterers for several hundred participants and there were no obvious signs that the celebration differed from the style of traditional Jewish observance of that festival; the spiritual leader pronounced the ritual blessings and read the *Haggadah.*

A map published by *The American Messianic Jew* (a quarterly journal) in 1983, reproduced in the book under review, shows the distribution of Messianic congregations and fellowships in the United States and Canada. Some cities have more than one group: apart from Los

Angeles, one can note San Francisco, Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Miami. They attract many households where one of the partners is of Jewish and the other of Christian origin — thus, a mixed couple could be said to be attracted to the practice of a mixed religion. Some of the new recruits often have moved away from their home towns and wish to join a community which would welcome them; they may come first out of simple curiosity and then stay on. However, Dr Gutwirth stresses that the members of these Messianic groups are not usually uprooted or marginal individuals; on the contrary, they are often solid citizens, of middle-class background and style of living.

Conventions are organized every summer by the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America in the aptly named Messiah College, a private evangelical institution in Grantham, Pennsylvania, when the students' comfortable quarters are available. They last eight days and the charges are modest: in 1980, the cost for the whole period was only 135 dollars per person and was inclusive of full board and all amenities and activities; there were between 500 and 600 participants then and by 1983 the attendance had doubled. The usual pattern is to have classes and study groups in the morning; free afternoons; and in the evening lectures, debates, folk dancing, and concerts. In the assembly room, a large Israeli flag is stretched on the wall facing the audience and there is a *menorah* on the speaker's desk on the platform. Jacques Gutwirth attended the 1980 convention and states that on Friday night there was a special eve of Sabbath dinner while on the following day there was baptism in the river for those who wished to undergo ritual immersion. Delegates of Messianic groups outside the United States attend and are warmly welcomed. These summer meetings afford the opportunity of assessing the merits of potential spiritual leaders for congregations in search of them while unmarried young persons hope to find partners of the same persuasion. There are also some who frankly admit that they come to the convention in order to have an enjoyable holiday at a bargain price.

On a table at the entrance to Ahavat Zion Synagogue, there are cards which reproduce the announcement on the large notice-board outside the building about the times of the services. On the reverse of these cards there is a 20-line description of Messianic Judaism which stresses that it is a branch of Judaism; that Jewish festivals and traditions are observed; that Messianic Jews do not forsake their heritage or their Jewish culture to become assimilated or to convert to a new religion; that they believe in the whole of the Old Testament; and that they also believe in the *Brith Chadasha* (literally, 'The New Covenant', that is, the New Testament). This last is described as being an entirely Jewish book, written entirely by Jewish men of God. It is not therefore surprising that Jewish lay and religious leaders have been indignant

about the methods employed by missionaries of the Messianic movement to attract Jews to their congregations. They have exerted pressure on established Christian dignitaries to condemn such activities. The Lubavitch Hassidim have been particularly diligent in their efforts to 'reclaim' the converts and to warn those who might be tempted to join them.

The Messianic Jewish movement already has to contend with the criticisms of traditional Christian missionaries that its services contain far too many Hebrew prayers and Jewish rituals while rabbis argue that Messianic Judaism is conversion to Christianity under false pretences. The movement, however, can rightly claim that it promotes many Jewish beliefs and practices and that it wishes to preserve the Jewish identity of its followers. The latter are considered apostates by traditional Jews who show contempt for them but since they have already accepted Jesus as the Messiah they might well decide in the circumstances that it would be simpler for them to go over completely to Christianity, forsake their Jewish heritage entirely, and join one of the established Christian churches. If they do so, Dr Gutwirth points out in his well-reasoned Conclusion, they almost certainly would be irretrievably lost to Judaism.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

MORDECAI ROTENBERG, *Re-Biographing and Deviance: Psychotherapeutic Narrativism and the Midrash*, x + 221 pp., Praeger, New York, Westport, and London, 1987, £30.95.

This book is interdisciplinary, moving between the psychiatric and the Talmudic/Midrashic. I can claim no competence whatsoever in the former discipline and, consequently, find it hard to grasp accurately the tenor of the author's thesis, particularly when he uses professional jargon. What is a layman to make, for example, of the following (p. 1)? 'This book addresses itself to the psychotherapeutic-actualizing components inherent in the Judeo-Midrashic system of hermeneutics. More specifically, it is the purpose of this book to argue that the Judeo-Midrashic narrative system contains a pluralistic free-choice-based metahermeneutic code that is amenable to a psychotherapeutic perspective for reinterpreting life stories, in the sense that it urges people to select their personally suiting interpretation of life from a multiplicity of available narratives'. Neverthless, with perserverance and with the benefit of a personal conversation with Dr Rotenberg I feel able to try my hand at describing his argument briefly in non-technical language, hoping I have not misunderstood him.

The Midrashic method is open in the sense that it allows various, even contradictory, interpretations of the Biblical texts, all as part of

the 'Oral Torah', conceived of as a constant human reflection on the divine word which often results in a creative re-working of the past; as when, for instance, the Talmud avers that David did not really sin or that Solomon is only said to have worshipped idols because he did not prevent his wives from engaging in idolatrous worship. This re-creating of the past is applied to the sinner in the famous saying of the third-century teacher, Resh Lakish (himself a reformed bandit chief, according to the tradition): 'When a sinner repents of his sins out of the love of God his former sins are treated as merits'. In the Bible, too, Joseph says to his brothers that while they had evil intent when they sold him into slavery, their act was, in fact, a blessing in disguise; God used Joseph as His instrument in saving the Egyptians and his own family from starvation during the famine.

In helping guilt-ridden sufferers, then, the psychotherapist, relying on this Midrashic methodology, should not seek to persuade them to try to erase the past or to make an entirely fresh start to become better in the future; for that would still allow their past to haunt them. Rather, he should help them to tell the right story about their past, one which not only shows the past to have been as bad as they had thought but one containing positive, life-affirming elements. This is the 're-biographing' of the title. Of course, to be effective the offender's creative re-working of his past must not be personal fantasy but must be accepted by his neighbours. Rotenberg (on pp. 87–88) quotes the true story of the son of a renowned holy man in the State of Israel who had been convicted of embezzelement. Before the father died he appointed the ex-convict as his successor. Far from denying his past, this man gloried in the role of a penitent; winning in the process a far greater number of followers than his father ever had. To 're-biographize' is not to indulge in self-delusion. It is to use, in the language of the Kabbalah, 'descent for the purpose of ascent'. Another case-history quoted by Rotenberg (pp. 161–62) is that of an ex-convict who became a prominent student in a Yeshivah:

> I want to remember this [criminal] period in my life so that I shall be reminded from where I came and to where I was able to go, from a low pit to a high roof. I don't want to erase my past, the past helps me today to know what life is all about, nobody can sell me out. It helps me to scrutinize matters correctly, to judge when things are serious and when they are not. I am not a new person, life fills me with joy . . . I am happy that today I know why I live. I was sub-human and therefore I don't look down at no one because I was at these low levels myself. That is my greatest joy. The future depends on me . . . I have only to do my best.

It would be interesting to learn what Rotenberg's colleagues in psychotherapy think of his theories.

LOUIS JACOBS

PAUL SPOONLEY, *The Politics of Nostalgia. Racism and the Extreme Right in New Zealand*, 318 pp., Dunmore Press, P.O. Box 5115, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 1987, n.p.

Paul Spoonley, a university teacher of sociology, has made a thorough study of the manifestations of right-wing extremism and racism in New Zealand. In the late nineteenth century there had been some resentment against Chinese and Indian migrants; the White Race League and the Anti-Asian League were two of the active organizations which eventually led to the passage of an act of parliament in 1920 which required immigrants who were not of British birth or parentage to obtain an official permit before they could be allowed to enter the country.

In the 1930s, antisemitism was openly manifested; one of its most outspoken exponents was A. N. Field, whom Spoonley quotes as saying in 1938: 'The Jewish question is the most important question in the world today. . . . It is the root of many other problems. All economic literature, for example, which ignores the Jewishness of international finance and the Jewishness of Socialism and Communism is a mere beating of the air' (p. 47). Four years earlier, in 1934, he had asserted in *The World's Conundrum* that there was a 'universal Jewish despotism over the entire world'. Field was not alone in his denunciation of Jews. The Loyalty League, which was established in Wellington in 1925, and a publishing company called 'Plain Talk' disseminated antisemitic propaganda. The latter published a pamphlet entitled *Is There a Jewish Peril? The Hidden Hand Revealed* as well as a reprint of the infamous forgery, *The Jewish Peril. Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.*

After the Second World War, and with the emancipation of former British colonies and the waves of Black and Asian immigrants who settled in the United Kingdom, there was a movement whose ideology was that people of British origin were 'racially superior' and that their dominance was a force for good; links were to be encouraged between members of the white Commonwealth. The League of Empire Loyalists and the New Zealand–Rhodesia Society were two organizations which were in favour of such beliefs; others were the Friends of South Africa and the League of Rights. (There was also an Australian League of Rights and a Canadian League of Rights.) The 1958 race riots in England led some families to emigrate to New Zealand; they claimed that they were seeking refuge from racial problems and they then apparently helped to promote racist organizations. A small number of young New Zealanders who grew up after the Second World War, with little knowledge of Nazism and the massacres of European Jews in the 1930s and 1940s; saw Israel as an aggressive nation and became active in neo-fascist groups which were established in the late 1960s.

In a chapter on the League of Rights, the author shows that its leaders repeat the well-known allegations of an international Jewish

conspiracy and of collusion between communists and Jews (pointing out that the Soviet Union had strongly supported the establishment of the State of Israel). As recently as December 1983, one of its publications, *On Target*, stated: 'The League is opposed to Zionism for the same reason it opposes Communism — it is totalitarian'. The League also claims that the Holocaust is a Zionist myth created to engender sympathy for Jews and for Israel; it cites as evidence the publications of the National Front in Britain and of the Institute for Historical Research in the United States — *Did Six Million Really Die?* and *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* — and asserts that the authors of these revelations have produced 'well-researched and documented refutations of such an extermination programme' (p. 126).

The Jews, however, are praised by the League of Rights for being 'realistic' about preserving their identity by refusing to integrate with other groups; it goes on to argue that there should therefore be no reason to blame white South Africans who also believe that separate development is the only way in which they can preserve their own culture and identity. Since there are not many Jews in New Zealand (only about four thousand, according to the Jewish Year Book published in London) and since those who do live in the country cannot be seriously accused of exploiting local commercial or financial institutions, the League makes general accusations of international Jewish plots and uses the terminology of anti-Zionism.

At the end of his short Preface, Paul Spoonley warns against complacency about the stability and tolerance of New Zealand society. He says that many white New Zealanders find it hard to believe that there is a racist right-wing movement which is often extreme in its views and actions while others who are aware of its existence dismiss it as unimportant. He comments: 'To the many myths that we hold about this country, we can add the belief that New Zealnad is somehow immune from right-wing extremism. By extension, a fascism that would attract popular support is unthinkable. Unfortunately, I think this myth will be proven wrong as so many others have been. This country will increasingly replicate the experience of other western societies and extremism is one feature that ought to be anticipated.' Jewish graves were desecrated in 1979 and a Wellington synagogue was damaged in 1981; in both cases there were also offensive signs and slogans but there were no prosecutions.

New Zealand has a Human Rights Commission and a Race Relations Counciliator but, according to the author, they make little use of the powers granted to them by law. He states that they tend to refrain from taking action on the grounds of the greater importance of freedom of speech — even when they admit that statements and publications referred to them expressed views concerning matters of race which might be 'unpalatable or unsound'; they ruled in February

1982 that that was 'not sufficient cause for the publication of those views to be circumscribed'. That ruling was apparently welcomed by the media. Spoonley comments somewhat bitterly that the Commission, the Conciliator, and the media are in agreement with racist organizations that 'freedom of expression should include a relatively free market in prejudice, although the philosophies and assumptions that characterize the three groups are fundamentally different' (p. 249). That official and general tolerance of undisguised racism is one of the causes of the author's unease about the political future of New Zealand; he is well aware that extremists do sometimes achieve power and that they then do not in turn allow their opponents much freedom of expression.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

ERNEST STOCK, *Partners and Pursestrings: A History of the United Israel Appeal*, with an Introduction by Daniel J. Elazar, xiv + 242 pp., University Press of America for the Center for Jewish Community Studies of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, Lanham, New York, and London, 1987, $13.75 (hardback, $26.50).

The flow of funds from the American Jewish community to Israel is channelled through a network of committees, organizations, and agencies; in this book, Ernest Stock mentions (and lists in the Appendix) more than sixty in connection with the United Israel Appeal. One of the reasons for the plurality of organizations is the variety of causes which American Jewry supports in Israel. Another reason is the lack of unity when conceiving or adopting solutions. Thus, after the First World War, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee clashed with Keren Hayesod (the Palestine Foundation Fund) about resettling Russian Jews. Keren Hayesod, which had strong links to the Zionist movement, was in favour of emigration to Palestine while the 'Joint' had doubts about the practicality of resettlement in the Holy Land.

Herein lies an important division, which Daniel Elazar summarizes in the Introduction, between 'the Zionist movement and the so-called non-Zionists for control of the American Jewish community' — which holds the pursestrings. Ideally, a fund-raising organization could benefit from both, with American non-Zionists (also known as 'assimilationists') making contributions for the settlement of Jews in Palestine. The United Palestine Appeal was an effort to recruit the support of both camps and in 1925 amalgamated the five major fund-rasing compaigns for Palestine: the Jewish National Fund, Hadassah, the Hebrew University, the Mizrachi Foundation and, finally, its largest beneficiary, Keren Hayesod. In 1950, two years after

the establishment of the State of Israel, the UPA became the United Israel Appeal.

The history of the UPA/UIA was not an untroubled one. By the end of 1929, there was such dissension within the Zionist faction that the UPA had to suspend its campaign. In 1930, the Jewish Agency took over the task of fund-raising for Palestine. Reorganization of the United Palestine Appeal in 1935 generated further controversy as two of its constituents, Karen Hayesod and Keren Kayemet, lived in unhappy amalgamation. In 1946, the struggle for control of the UPA was at its height, with accusations that the UPA 'was controlled by Zionists to the exclusion of the bulk of Jewish contributors' (p. 134). In 1952, when the Israeli Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, upbraided American supporters of Zionism for remaining in America instead of emigrating to Israel, he seemed to forget that the hundreds of millions of dollars they raised each year for Israel (some of which was solicited by the UIA in the form of grants from Washington) depended on the existence of a prosperous Jewish community firmly rooted in the United States. Many American Jews did not want to be militant Zionists lest they be accused of dual loyalty but their massive donations showed an unrivalled commitment to the establishment of Palestine (and later Israel) as a Jewish National Home.

Partners and Pursestrings is a valuable book because, as stated in the Preface, there are few publications which delineate the criss-crossing network of organizations that link the Jewish communities of Israel and America. One could easily imagine the usefulness of a larger study which would include the Israel-centred fund-raising efforts of other Diaspora communites — such as Canada, Britain, and Australia, to name only three. As it is, this serial account of the complex network of liaisons, affiliations, amalgamations, and schisms associated with the development of the UPA/UIA is a dense text, alleviated considerably by the author's short chapters, on average five pages in length, and the Appendix providing an annotated list of the organizations.

RACHAEL L. E. KOHN

CHRONICLE

The population of Israel at the end of 1987 reached a total of 4,404,000. There were 3,611,000 Jews, accounting for 82 per cent of the total; Muslims numbered 615,000, representing 14 per cent; there were 102,000 Christians, accounting for 2.3 per cent; while Druze and others constituted the remaining 1.7 per cent. There were 98,000 births and 30,000 deaths in the course of 1987.

In the Jewish year from September 1986 to September 1987, 12,000 new Jewish immigrants came to Israel, an increase of 2,800 over the preceding year.

*

According to the Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel, 1987 was a record year for tourism, with more than one and a half million visitors: 1,515,400. This represented an increase of 9 per cent over the previous record year of 1985. Even December 1987, when the number of tourists was smaller than the total for any of the other months of 1987, showed an increase of 19.6 per cent over December 1985: 122,000 tourists against 102,000.

*

The Central Zionist Archives of the World Zionist Organization submitted a *Report of Activities August 1982–July 1987* to the 31st Zionist Congress last year. The report states: 'The library of the Zionist Archives, which is the largest special library in the world in the field of Zionism and Eretz Israel in modern times, numbered in the summer of 1987 some 98,700 catalogued books, an increase of about 9,200 books during a five-year period'. The Archives also 'continued its methodical collection of private archives of personalities who were active in the Zionist Movement. In July 1987 it had in its custody the archives of approximately 640 personalities'.

*

The Summer 1987 issue of *News from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem* (received in London last November) states that the Faculty of Law's Institute for Research in Jewish Law and the Faculty of Humanities of the Hebrew University, in co-operation with Haifa University, organized an international congress on 'A Member of Another Religion in Religious Law'. About 80 scholars from various countries attended the congress, including three Vatican academics: the rectors of Laterana Univeristy and of the Pontifical University for Christian Archaeology and a professor at the Gregorian University. The participants from Israel included a Qadi from the Haifa Islamic Court. The contributions were delivered in English, French, Hebrew, and Italian. The attitudes of one religious group towards those of other religions were examined in three different periods: from Biblical times to the

Byzantine Empire; in the medieval period; and in the modern era. The Rector of Laterana University 'spoke of the evolution of the liberal attitude of the Catholic Church toward non-Christians, as exemplified in the changes in canon law adopted by Vatican Council II'.

*

An international research conference on Jewish Education was held at the Hebrew University under the auspices of the Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora. It was 'the first of its kind to be devoted entirely to the question of the study of Jewish texts in elementary schools. . . . How does one adapt adult philosophical concepts found in religious texts to children's understanding? How does one 'humanize' biblical characters so they seem relevant and alive to the students? . . . How does one overcome the difficulty of teaching texts in a language (Hebrew) that is not well known to the children?'. The participants addressed themselves to these questions; they came from North America and from Europe and represented all streams of Judaism.

*

The Autumn 1987 issue of *Hebrew University News* states that in the academic year 1987–88 there were 'some 18,000 students, more than one-third of them graduate students, studying in the seven Faculties, 12 schools and Pre-Academic Center, on the University's four campuses'. The Faculty of Humanities is the largest, with a total enrolment of 5,040 in 36 departments. The Faculty of Science has 2,650 students; 422 of them are registered for a doctorate. The Faculty of Medicine has an enrolment of 1,760 in its five schools (Medicine, Public Health, Pharmacy, Nursing, and Occupational Therapy). The School of Public Health and Community Studies has introduced social science studies. The Faculty of Agriculture has about 1,500 students; nearly two-thirds of them are undergraduates. The School of Social Work has a total of 515 students; 16 of them are registered for a doctorate.

The Faculty of Social Sciences has an enrolment of 3,670; 2,520 are undergraduates; it has a Center for Research in the Social Sciences which aims to 'carry out basic and applied research in sociology and social anthropology, with special emphasis on Israel's social problems'. The Faculty of Law has about 650 students; 25 are registered for a doctorate. The Graduate School of Library and Archive Studies 'has an enrollment of over 100 in its Masters and Diploma programs. Two new courses are offered this year, one an advanced course on the history of Hebrew printing and the other on the history of Jewish collections'.

About 150 students from 20 countries attended the International Congress of Pharmacy Students hosted by the Hebrew University's School of Pharmacy. An international forum on 'Communication and International Development: Tradition and Innovation', held at the University, was attended by journalists, broadcasters, and senior researchers in communications from 19 foreign countries. They came from Antigua, Barbados, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malawi,

Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, St Kitt's, and Thailand.

*

The March 1988 issue of *Bar-Ilan University News* states that more than 11,000 students were registered at Bar-Ilan University in the academic year 1987–88; the foreign students among them have come from 21 different countries — from Western Europe as well as from Australia, Canada, Ethiopia, Hong Kong, Hungary, Japan, Romania, South Africa, South America, and the United States. Women account for about 60 per cent of the total student body; and 'no less than 9 women head important departments', including the Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

The University is sponsoring, jointly with the Arabic Department of the army intelligence service and the Ministry of Education and Culture, a new programme to train teachers of Arabic in the state school system. 'The program is also hoped eventually to spur high school students, about to enter the army, to fill a serious void in a most sensitive area.'

The Canadian Friends of Bar-Ilan University have endowed the Raoul Wallenberg Chair in Human Rights in honour of the Swedish diplomat who saved many thousands of Hungarian Jews during the Second World War. The chair 'will focus on teaching fundamentally and systematically legal defense of human rights in Israel and in other countries around the world within the framework of international law'. Research will be initiated to 'advance the observance of human rights in Israel by learning from comparative sources alien to and within the Jewish heritage. An additional aim of the Chair will be to encourage the setting up of international conferences on human rights for the exchange of ideas with experts in the field from abroad'.

*

The First International Conference on 'Individual Differences: Psychological, Educational and Neurological Implications' will be held at Bar-Ilan University on 10–15 July 1988. A few weeks later, on 28 August–1 September, the University will host an International Symposium on Victimology and in the autumn an 'International Conference on Problems of Absorption of Intellectual Immigrants'. In May 1989 it will be the venue for a Conference on the Holocaust.

*

The Autumn 1987 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that 'Tel Aviv University concluded an agreement of scientific co-operation with the University of Konstanz, Federal Republic of Germany. ... the Rector of the University of Konstanz ... travelled to Israel for the occasion. The new agreement constitutes a contract for long-term cooperation in teaching and research. It provides for the exchange of academic staff as well as for exchange programs for graduate and undergraduate students. ... Also during the past academic year, the University signed academic exchange agreements with the

University of Tokyo; the University of Tubingen, West Germany; Hanyang University, South Korea; and the Ibero-American University, Mexico.'

The same issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that 30 Arab physicians from the West Bank cities of Tulkarm, Jenin, and Nablus completed a postgraduate course in internal medicine and received diplomas at a ceremony held at the University. The previous year, Arab doctors from Beit Jala, Bethlehem, Ramallah, Jericho, and Hebron were the first to register for the course, which is 'intended to familiarize West Bank doctors with the latest developments in internal medicine, while promoting cooperation between Arabs and Jews in the field of public health. The Histadrut Health Fund and the West Bank Civil Administration cooperated with the Sackler Faculty of Medicine and government hospitals in developing the program.'

*

The Winter 1987–88 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that Tel Aviv University's Institute for Cancer Research hosted an international conference on 'Contemporary Topics in Cancer Research'. Scientists came from Belgium, Canada, France, Great Britain, Hungary, the Netherlands, Sweden, West Germany, and the United States. 'Some 250 scientists and graduate students from all of Israel's institutions of higher learning participated in the conference. Among the topics covered were the basic mechanisms of carcinogenesis; the genetic and biochemical basis of the resistance of cancer cells to chemotherapy; environmental and dietary factors; and the relationships between infection with the AIDS virus and cancer.'

The same issue of *Tel Aviv University News* has a report of a conference on 'The Domestic Determinants of U.S. Policy in the Middle East', jointly sponsored by Tel Aviv University's Center for Strategic Studies and its Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies in co-operation with the United States Information Service. 'Participants at the three-day conference included leading American and Israeli scholars, public figures and former diplomats. Discussions centered on the roles of the many factors on the American scene which influence U.S. policy in the Middle East — including the various branches of government, public opinion and the media, the political parties, and lobby groups'.

*

The Ministry of the Interior of France published last December a report entitled *Lutte contre le racisme et l'antisémitisme*. It states that there were a total of 235 recorded antisemitic acts in France since 1978 and lists the various measures undertaken by the government to combat antisemitism. It also notes that the study of human rights is to be introduced into the syllabus of French secondary schools.

*

The November 1987 Report of the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization states that the Center conducted seven workshops in July 1987 in Jerusalem on the following subjects: Contemporary Jewish Civilization; Hebrew Language; Jewish History: Sephardi and

Oriental Studies; Jewish Political Studies; Modern Hebrew Literature in Translation; Teaching Jewish Civilization in Universities and Institutions of Higher Learning with Emphasis on Comparative Religion; and Western Societies and the Holy Land. About 140 university teachers from 23 countries participated. They came from Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, Italy, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Tanzania, the United States, and Yugoslavia. The Center also sponsored a colloquium on the interaction between Jewish culture and Iberian culture during the last five hundred years.

The Report, in a section entitled 'New Developments in the University World', states that in the academic year 1985–86, China's 'Beijing University opened the Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies in its Institute of Oriental Studies. The curriculum includes Hebrew Language, Geography of Israel, and Jewish History'. In New Zealand, the English Department of Waikato University 'will be offering a new course at Honors level in 1988 dealing with the foundational documents of both Christianity and Judaism'. In Argentina, a new course is being taught on 'the History of the State of Israel 1948–1987 at Belgrano University in Buenos Aires. The course is given in the framework of the Department of Middle Eastern Studies and is attended by seventy students'.

*

The February 1988 issue of *Les Cahiers de l'Alliance Israélite Universelle* states that in the academic year 1986–87 there were 16,466 pupils in 41 of its institutions and affiliated schools in nine countries, a small increase over the previous year's total of 15,644. There were 360 pupils in Belgium in a Brussels school; 4,242 in 11 schools in Canada, all of them in Montreal; 583 in three establishments in France, in Paris and its environs; 1,652 in four schools in Iran, one each in Teheran, Ispahan, Kermanshah, and Yezd; 7,659 in Israel in ten establishments: five in Jerusalem and one each in Tel-Aviv, Haifa, Nahariya, Sderoth, and Mikveh-Israel (the agricultural college); 1,186 in eight schools in Morocco: five in Casablanca and one each in Fez, Meknes, and Marrakesh; 170 in one school in the Netherlands, in Amsterdam; 266 in two schools in Spain, one in Madrid and one in Barcelona; and 348 in one school in Syria, in Damascus.

In Iran, only 362 pupils out of the total of 1,652 are Jewish; about two-thirds of them (234) are in the Teheran school, 90 in Kermanshah, and 38 in Ispahan. The School in Yezd has 80 pupils but none of them is Jewish. The Ispahan and Yezd schools are under the full control of the Iranian educational inspectorate although they belong to the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* — which in theory is expected to be responsible for the cost of repairs and maintenance of the establishments, since it owns the buildings.

The library of the *Alliance* in Paris had 2,438 readers in 1986 who consulted about 7,000 books and references on the premises; a further 1,690 items were borrowed, 60 of those at the request of other libraries.

*

Sixty teachers from Jewish schools in European countries (Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, and Yugoslavia) and in Morocco participated in a three-day seminar, held in London last March, on the subject of computers and resource media in education. The seminar was organized by the World ORT Union (ORT is the Organization for Rehabilitation through Training) with the collaboration of the European Council of Jewish Community Services and of the United Synagogue's Board of Religious Education.

The World ORT Union earlier this year approved a budget of 145 million dollars for 1988, an increase of 20 million dollars over 1987. The additional funds are needed to finance expansion plans in Argentina, where ORT has two schools and is planning to build a third one, and in Israel where ORT has more than a hundred schools with some 65,000 pupils.

*

The Minister of Education and Culture of the Croatian Republic opened last April an exhibition in Zagreb of some 1,500 items reflecting the life of Jews in Yugoslavia throughout the centuries. The exhibition was mounted by the Federation of Jewish Communities of Yugoslavia with the expert assistance of the Zagreb Art Museum. Only about 7,000 Yugoslav Jews out of a community of some 70,000 survived the Second World War.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill, and Bryan S. Turner, eds., *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*, second edition, xi + 320 pp., Penguin Books, London, 1988, £4.95 (paperback).

Berghahn, Marion, *Continental Britons. German-Jewish Refugees from Nazi Germany*, second edition, ix + 294 pp., Berg Publishers, Oxford, Hamburg, and New York, 1988, £9.50 (paperback).

Bergmann, Werner, ed., *Error Without Trial. Psychological Research on Antisemitism*, vol. 2 of Current Research on Antisemitism series (edited by Herbert A. Strauss and Werner Bergmann), xii + 546 pp., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 1988, DM. 138.

Cohen, Richard I., *The Burden of Conscience: French Jewish Leadership During the Holocaust*, The Modern Jewish Experience Series (edited by Paula Hyman and Deborah Dash Moore), xiii + 237 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1987, $27.50.

Cohen, Steven M., *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?*, Jewish Political and Social Studies series (edited by Daniel J. Elazar and Steven M. Cohen), xii + 140 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1988, $27.50.

Endelman, Todd M., ed., *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World*, xi + 344 pp., Holmes and Meier, New York and London, 1987, $39.50.

Etzioni-Halevy, Eva, *National Broadcasting Under Siege. A Comparative Study of Australia, Britain, Israel and West Germany*, xii + 228 pp., Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 1987, £29.50.

Fein, Helen, ed., *The Persisting Question. Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Antisemitism*, vol. 1 of Current Research on Antisemitism series (edited by Herbert A. Strauss and Werner Bergmann), xiv + 430 pp., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 1987, DM. 106.

Gross, Jan T., *Revolution from Abroad. The Soviet Conquest of Poland's Western Ukraine and Western Belorussia*, xxii + 335 pp., Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1988, £14.00.

Gurock, Jeffrey S., *The Men and Women of Yeshiva: Higher Education, Orthodoxy, and American Judaism*, xv + 302 pp., Columbia University Press, New York, 1988, $35.00.

Gutwirth, Jacques and Colette Pétonnet, *Chemins de la ville: enquêtes ethnologiques* (vol. 1 of Le regard de l'ethnologue series), vi + 271 pp., published by the Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques of the Commission d'anthropologie et d'ethnologie françaises, Paris, 1987, 120 francs.

Kahn, Alison, *Listen While I Tell You: A Story of the Jews of St. John's, Newfoundland* (no. 35 of Social and Economic Studies series of the Institute of Social and Economic Research of Memorial University of Newfoundland), xii + 202 pp., published by ISER, St John's, 1987, $23.95.

Mendelsohn, Ezra, ed., *Studies in Contemporary Jewry. An Annual*, Volume III: *Jews and Other Ethnic Groups in a Multi-ethnic World*, xiii + 343 pp., published for the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem by Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, £25.00.

Nettler, Ronald L., *Past Trials and Present Tribulations. A Muslim Fundamentalist's View of the Jews*, Studies in Antisemitism series (edited by Yehuda Bauer), xi + 92 pp., published for the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem by Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1987, £11.50 or $20.95.

Ruud, Inger Marie, *Women and Judaism. A Selected Annotated Bibliography*, xiv + 232 pp., Garland Publishing, 136 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016, $45.00.

Schmelz, U. O., *Modern Jerusalem's Demographic Evolution* (no. 20 of Jewish Population Studies series), 136 pp., published for the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem by the Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies, Jerusalem, 1987, n.p.

Smooha, Sammy, *Social Research on Jewish Ethnicity in Israel 1948–1986. Review and Selected Bibliography with Abstracts*, 277 pp., published by Haifa University Press in co-operation with the International Sephardic Education Foundation and the American Jewish Committee, Haifa, 1987, n.p.

Solomon, Norman, *Jewish Responses to the Holocaust. An Address to the Consultation of the Anti Defamation League of Bnai Brith and the Polish Bishops' Conference* delivered in Cracow in April 1988 (no. 4 of Studies in Jewish/Christian Relations series), 23 pp., available from the Centre for the Study of Judaism and Jewish/Christian Relations, Selly Oak Colleges, Bristol Road, Birmingham B29 6LQ at £2.00 (outside the United Kingdom, $5.00 including airmail postage).

Watson, G. Llewellyn, *Dilemmas and Contradictions in Social Theory*, xiv + 192 pp. University Press of America, Lanham, Md., 1987, $12.75 (hardback, $26.50).

Weiler Gershon, *Jewish Theocracy*, xiv + 332 pp., E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1988, 70 guilders.

Weinberg, Henry H., *The Myth of the Jew in France 1967–1982*, xvi + 181 pp., Mosaic Press, Oakville, Ontario, $12.95 (hardback, $19.95).

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

FRIEDBERG, Asher; Ph.D. Lecturer, Political Science Department of Haifa University. Chief publications: *A Phenomenon Called Emigration. Annotated Bibliography* (Hebrew), 1984; 'The Emigrants Between Pulling and Pushing Forces' (Hebrew) in *Kivunim*, no. 25, 1984; 'Characteristics of Public Health Audit in Israel' in *Studies in State Audit* (Hebrew), no. 40, 1986; 'State Audit, Politics and the Media' in *State Audit in the Nineties*, 1987; and editor, *State Audit in Israel: Theory and Practice* (Hebrew), 1987.

KFIR, Aharon; Ph.D. Senior Lecturer and Chairman, Political Science Department of Haifa University. Chief publications: *Governmental Reorganizations: An Analysis of Selected Organization Studies in Israel*, 1971; co-author, *Staff and Line in Modern Organizations* (Hebrew), 1975; *Emigration from North America to Israel: Vision and Reality*, a World Zionist Organization publication, 1981; 'The establishment of Government Offices in the State of Israel' in Yehuda Wallach, ed., *We Were Dreaming. Selected Papers on the Israeli War of Independence* (Hebrew), 1988; and co-editor (with Asher Friedberg), *Emigration from Israel*, forthcoming.

SCHMOOL, Marlena; B. Soc. Sc. Executive Director, Community Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. Chief publications: co-author, 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population 1969–65' in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 10, no. 1, June 1968; co-author, 'Synagogue Marriages in Great Britain 1966–68' in *JSS*, vol. 12, no. 1, June 1970; co-author, 'Statistics of Milah and the Jewish Birth-Rate in Britain' in *JJS*, vol. 12, no. 2, December 1970; and (in addition to the three earlier Registers of Social Research on the Anglo-Jewish community published in the *JJS* and cited in the first Note of the present Register) 'What We Still Need to Know' in *L'Eylah*, no. 23, Pesach 1987.

STEINBERG, Bernard; Ph.D. Associate Professor, Department of Hebrew Studies (formerly Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education), University of Cape Town. Chief recent publications: 'The Present Era in Education: A Global Comparative Perspective' in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 2, December 1984; 'The New Education: Fifty Years After' in *Journal of Education*, vol. 16, November 1984; 'Origins, Attitudes and Aspirations of Student Teachers' in *The South African Journal of Education*, vol. 5, no. 4, November 1985; 'Social Change and Jewish Education in Great Britain' in *Jewish Education*, vol. 54, no. 3, 1986; and 'Comparative Education in South Africa: An Irrelevant Academic Exercise?' in Douglas Young and Robert Burns, eds., *Education at the Crossroads*, 1987.

WEBBER, Jonathan; D.Phil. Fellow in Jewish Social Studies, Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies and editor of *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* (JASO). Chief publications: 'Some Notes on Biblical Ideas about Language: An Anthropological Perspective' in *European*

Judaism, vol. 15, no. 1, 1981; 'Resacralization of the Holy City: The Capture of Jerusalem in 1967' in *RAIN* (*Royal Anthropological Institute Newletter*), no. 47, 1981; 'Between Law and Custom: Women's Experience of Judaism' in Pat Holden, ed., *Women's Religious Experience*, 1983; 'Religions in the Holy Land: Conflicts of Interpretation' in *Anthropology Today*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1985; and 'Rethinking Fundamentalism: The Readjustment of Jewish Society in the Modern World' in Lionel Caplan, ed., *Studies in Religious Fundamentalism*, 1987.