

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XXXI : NUMBER 1 : JUNE 1989

CONTENTS

The Swastika as Dramatic Symbol: A Case-study
of Ethnic Violence in Canada

CYRIL LEVITT and WILLIAM SHAFFIR

Naming Patterns Among Jews of Iraqi Origin in
Sydney

MYER SAMRA

Holocaust, Antisemitism, and the Jews of France

JONATHAN WEBBER

The Politics of Statelessness: Jewish
Refugees in Austria

After the Second World War

AVIEL ROSHWALD

Book Reviews

Chronicle

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 XXXI : Number 1 : June 1989

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| The Swastika as Dramatic Symbol: A Case-study of Ethnic Violence in Canada CYRIL LEVITT and WILLIAM SHAFFIR | 5 |
| Naming Patterns Among Jews of Iraqi Origin in Sydney MYER SAMRA | 25 |
| Holocaust, Antisemitism, and the Jews of France JONATHAN WEBBER | 39 |
| The Politics of Statelessness: Jewish Refugees in Austria After the Second World War AVIEL ROSHWALD | 47 |
| Book Reviews | 53 |
| Chronicle | 67 |
| Books Received | 72 |
| Notes on Contributors | 73 |

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

EDITOR Judith Freedman

ADVISORY BOARD

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| R. Bachi (<i>Israel</i>) | Lloyd P. Gartner (<i>Israel</i>) |
| Howard Brotz (<i>Canada</i>) | Nathan Glazer (<i>USA</i>) |
| Percy S. Cohen (<i>Britain</i>) | Jacques Gutwirth (<i>France</i>) |
| Moshe Davis (<i>Israel</i>) | Elie Kedourie (<i>Britain</i>) |
| S. N. Eisenstadt (<i>Israel</i>) | S. J. Prais (<i>Britain</i>). |

© MAURICE FREEDMAN RESEARCH TRUST LTD 1989

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

BOOKS REVIEWED

| <i>Author</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>Reviewer</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------|-------------|
| Thomas Albrich | <i>Exodus durch Oesterreich — Die Juedischen Fluechtlinge, 1945-1948</i> | Aviel Roshwald | 47 |
| Richard I. Cohen | <i>The Burden of Conscience: French Jewish Leadership during the Holocaust</i> | Jonathan Webber | 39 |
| Richard Cockett | <i>Twilight of Truth: Chamberlain, Appeasement and the Manipulation of the Press</i> | Max Beloff | 53 |
| Moshe Davis, ed. | <i>With Eyes Toward Zion — Volume II. Themes and Sources in the Archives of the United States, Great Britain, Turkey and Israel</i> | Judith Freedman | 55 |
| Daniel Elazar and Chaim Kalchheim | <i>Local Government in Israel</i> | Max Beloff | 57 |
| Yehoshafat Harkabi | <i>Israel's Fateful Decisions</i> | Max Beloff | 60 |
| Meir Hovav, compiler | <i>Index to Series 1-13 of the Publications of the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry (in Hebrew)</i> | Lloyd P. Gartner | 61 |
| Alison Kahn | <i>Listen While I Tell You: A Story of the Jews of St. John's, Newfoundland</i> | V. D. Lipman | 62 |
| Henry H. Weinberg | <i>The Myth of the Jew in France 1967-1982</i> | Jonathan Webber | 39 |
| Irving M. Zeitlin | <i>Jesus and the Judaism of His Time</i> | David Martin | 64 |

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 *JSS*.

MSS (please send at least two copies) should be typewritten on one side only and double-spaced with ample margins. Pages (including those containing illustrations, diagrams, or tables) should be numbered consecutively. All quotations should be within single inverted commas; quotation marks within quotations should be double inverted commas.

Notes should follow the style of this *Journal* and should be given at the end of the article in numerical sequence according to the order of their citation in the text.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

A. *Books*

Give author, title, place of publication, year, and page reference. Underline all titles of books.

B. *Articles*

Place titles of articles within single inverted commas. Underline the title of the book or journal in which the article appears. In the case of a journal, cite numbers of volume and part, and year of publication.

PROOFS. Authors making major revisions in proof will be required to bear the cost. Unless proofs are returned to the Managing Editor promptly, authors' corrections cannot be incorporated.

OFFPRINTS. Each contributor receives thirty free offprints of his article. If there are two or more authors, the thirty offprints are shared between them.

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL: A CASE-STUDY OF ETHNIC VIOLENCE IN CANADA

Cyril Levitt and William Shaffir

A REVIEW of the literature on social unrest reveals that many scholars attribute rebellious or riotous behaviour to the actualization of predispositions rooted either in the personality of the individual or in the social structure.¹ Thus, as Herbert Blumer notes, 'they assert that social unrest is but a reflection of personality instability or an expression of acute structural strains on the existing social order'.² While such analyses have identified the important determinants of collective behaviour, they have only paid limited attention to the process by which such behaviour is shaped. Attention to this process necessitates an examination of how people define and interpret the stream of events unfolding in their experience. As the literature has shown, social unrest does not suddenly emerge fully formed, but undergoes a process of growth and development.³

In identifying the more vital features affecting the maturation of social unrest, Herbert Blumer draws attention to the role of dramatic events which serve as the nucleating points in their formation:⁴

It is the dramatic event which incites and focalizes predispositions, and brings them to bear on a concrete situation; which shocks, arouses, enlivens, and shakes people loose from their routines of thought and action; which catches collective attention and stirs imagination; . . . which incites heated discussions and initiates intense interaction; and which stimulates the novel proposals and the impulsive tendencies that are so characteristic of social unrest.

The centrality of the dramatic event in the unfolding of social unrest is, of course, not unique to Blumer's formulation of collective behaviour. Others have also emphasized its significance. For example, Smelser claims that ' . . . it is nearly always a dramatic event which precipitates the outburst of violence',⁵ and provides the generalized beliefs with concrete and immediate substance.

The significance of the dramatic event lies in the fact that it serves as a central turning point affecting the career route of the social unrest. It

brings into sharper focus the existing social arrangements, arouses passions of moral indignation, and rallies persons to redress some perceived injustice collectively. The object recognized as the turning point must be defined by the participants as something qualitatively different from what has occurred up to that point in the unfolding of events.

This paper examines the role of the swastika emblem in fomenting the virulent antagonism between Canadian Jews and Gentiles which culminated in the Christie Pits riot in the summer of 1933.⁶ It focuses specifically on the dramatic event in the development of the riot — the sudden appearance of the swastika symbol along Toronto's eastern beaches and, about two weeks later, at a baseball game in Willowvale Park (commonly known as Christie Pits). Toronto's Jews had been made fully aware by both the English-language city's newspapers and the Yiddish daily (*Der Yiddisher Zhurnal*) of the savage Nazi persecution of Jews in Germany and of the symbolism of the swastika. They were also aware of overt antisemitic prejudices in Canada but had not considered such manifestations to be a serious threat to their safety or to their very existence, until the swastika was displayed provocatively in Toronto.

In referring to those objects which are the focal points of 'the impulses, feelings, and imagery of ... people',⁷ Blumer fails to distinguish between those objects which have a passive symbolic value and those which have a highly-charged meaning for some groups. We suggest that dramatic symbols are best understood as objects which denote beliefs, ideas, or ideals that are capable of arousing intense feeling, emotion, passion, or energy. Admittedly, a merely formal symbol may become dramatized under certain conditions, just as a dramatic symbol may be demoted to passive status or even, under extreme conditions, robbed of its symbolic value completely.⁸ For instance, the Japanese flag, once a dramatic symbol of treachery in the United States, is now trotted out and flaunted in public as a symbol of technological, scientific, and economic achievement. The symbols of the civil rights movement in the United States, which occasioned riots in the American South during the early 1960s, are now looked upon with indifference or occasionally only with passive disapproval. The dramatic symbol is highly contextual in nature, a lightning-rod of collective sentiments and shared emotions not for all time, but in specific circumstances and particular conditions. New dramatic symbols come into being and pass away quickly. Others, such as the German swastika, break dramatically upon the world historical stage and remain charged for long periods with strong collective sentiments.

In their well-known study of the so-called 'Zoot-suit' riots in Los Angeles in 1943, Turner and Surace claim that most symbols, even those we call dramatic ones, are ambiguous; that is, they evoke

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

conflicting images.⁹ It is precisely such ambiguity which serves as an inhibiting feature in collective behaviour. It is as if the countervailing images act as a brake upon that behaviour which is not generally sanctioned by the community at large. It follows, therefore, that if the symbol's ambiguity is resolved, then an important restraining feature on extreme collective behaviour will have been removed. As the authors assert: '... symbols which are unambiguous in their connotations permit immoderate behaviour toward the object in question. In the absence of ambivalence toward an object there is no internal conflict to restrict action'.¹⁰

In our case-study of ethnic violence, the swastika became stripped of its ambiguity, in part by the collective action surrounding its appearance in public in the weeks preceding the outbreak of the riot at Christie Pits. As an alarmed Jewish community confronted the new and heightened significance assumed by the swastika as a dramatic symbol of Nazi antisemitic persecutions, it unmasked the weak cover adopted by members of a swastika-bearing organization who had claimed that the emblem was nothing more than a good-luck charm associated with Indian tribes who had once lived in the area.¹¹

In this paper, we first give a brief description of the prevailing antisemitism in Toronto which had alerted the Jewish community to be on guard against victimization. We then show how the city's English-language newspapers and the Yiddish daily published detailed reports about the plight of German Jews at the hands of Nazis, whose emblem was the swastika. We next describe how the establishment of Swastika Clubs in Toronto alarmed the city's Jews and how they attacked those who wore a swastika badge or sweat-shirts displaying the emblem. We then describe how the unfurling of a white large blanket displaying a black swastika at a baseball match (where one of the teams was predominantly Jewish) triggered off a riot and we conclude with an examination of the other factors which incited the rioters.

According to the Canadian Census of 1931, there were 45,305 Jews in Toronto in that year; they accounted for 7.2 per cent of the total population of the city, excluding the suburbs. In no area of Toronto did the Jews constitute a majority of the residents; but 30.5 of the inhabitants in Ward 4 were Jewish, as were 18.6 per cent of those who lived in Ward 5 (where Christie Pits was situated). On the other hand, the number of Jews in Ward 8 (which included the eastern beaches area) was very small, accounting for under one per cent (0.08 per cent) of the ward's residents. Only 18,612 of Toronto's total Jewish population of 45,305 were born in Canada. Most of the Jewish immigrants had come from Poland and Russia and Yiddish was the mother tongue of the overwhelming majority (95.54 per cent) of Jews in Canada in 1931. The majority of those gainfully occupied in Toronto

CYRIL LEVITT AND WILLIAM SHAFFIR

were wage-earners in small factories and shops producing and selling articles of clothing or furs while others were mainly retailers of dry goods or street hawkers.

Toronto Jews were often treated as undesirables. Stephen Speisman has shown that in contrast to earlier antisemitism in Toronto, which was typically expressed in actions against individuals, by 1933 a blanket condemnation of Jews had emerged.¹² There were restrictive covenants prohibiting the sale of some plots of land or houses to prospective Jewish buyers and the fact that the courts upheld such practices was ready confirmation for Canadian Jews that they could be discriminated against with impunity.¹³ They were also unwelcome in some summer resorts where hotels had signboards boldly stating: 'Patronage exclusively Gentile'.¹⁴ Indeed, a number of people we interviewed specifically recalled signs, located in various parts of Toronto and its outskirts, stating: 'No Jews or Dogs Allowed'. The effects of antisemitism were most severely felt in employment. It was practically impossible for Jews to get jobs as sales staff in any of the big department stores, and very few Jews were hired by the banks and financial institutions (it was standard practice in those days to ask for the applicant's religion on the employment form). Very few Jews worked for Ontario or Toronto Hydro or for government departments. One interviewee told us that a relative of his obtained a job in a company known for its discriminatory hiring practices by writing 'Protestant' in the space reserved for religion on the application form. Her boss discovered that she was Jewish (she was absent on the major Jewish holidays), and she was summarily dismissed. Another recounted that, after applying for a job at one of the major department stores in Toronto, he saw the personnel manager crumple his application form and throw it in the waste bin only moments after assuring the applicant that this application would be given 'careful attention'. The relative absence of Jews in specific professional and occupational groupings in Toronto has been explained in part by the restrictions placed upon Jewish applicants, candidates, students, and professionals. Speisman stated in his study of Toronto Jewry:¹⁵

From the 1930s through the Second World War, Jews found it difficult to enter certain professions . . . Jews could study law, medicine and dentistry only on a *numerus clausus* basis, and many a worthy Jewish student had to seek his livelihood in other pursuits. At the University of Toronto School of Dentistry, a dexterity requirement was a favourite ploy for keeping Jewish students out; the small number who made it into the program often found themselves subjected to open abuse by antisemitic professors. Graduates of the University of Toronto Medical School found that their prestigious diplomas could not obtain internships for them, so an entire generation of Jewish medical students emigrated to the United States seeking hospital posts to hone their craft. Canada did not want them.

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

The difficulties encountered by Jews in the professions were not confined to any particular region of Canada. In Regina, Saskatchewan, for instance, the General Hospital was informed in 1934 by the superintendent that a Jewish radiologist was unacceptable to the staff and to the public, and that physicians with Anglo-Saxon sounding names were preferable, even at a higher salary, to Drs Teitlebaum and Friedman. Indeed, any analysis of antisemitism in Canada during the early 1930s must emphasize both its scope and intensity. Although frequently camouflaged as nationalism, particularly in the Province of Quebec, and disguised and justified in terms of rising unemployment and economic uncertainties, the effects of the antisemitism for the Jews were unmistakably clear. Increasingly stereotyped as 'radical, disloyal, unbelieving, domineering, cosmopolitan, and otherwise as being a danger to Canadian society',¹⁶ Jews encountered growing prejudice and discrimination because of their religion or ethnicity. The consequences of this had their most serious impact during the 1930s, as officials in the highest reaches of Canadian government, succumbing to various internal pressures, pursued a systematic policy of barring Jewish refugees from entry into Canada, thus ensuring their deaths at the hands of the Nazis. More than ever, Jews had reason to believe that antisemitism was stitched into the very fabric of Canadian society.¹⁷

The summer of 1933 revealed to Toronto Jews that some of their Gentile fellow-inhabitants felt profound hatred and contempt for them when the swastika emblem was publicly displayed and those who sported it shouted 'Heil Hitler' along the eastern beaches and later in Willowvale Park. Although the swastika symbol was not unknown in the city (for example, Rudyard Kipling's books in the public library bore the swastika on the title-pages), by the middle of 1933 the hooked-cross emblem had acquired notoriety as the badge of the Nazis and sinister connotations for Jews.

The Newspapers: Toronto Learns about the Swastika in Germany

In 1933, the newspaper was the prime source of national and international news for the majority of people. News broadcasts on the radio consisted of little more than newspaper items read verbatim. There were four daily English-language newspapers in Toronto in 1933: two morning papers, *The Daily Mail and Empire* and *The Globe*, and two afternoon/evening papers, *The Toronto Daily Star* and *The Evening Telegram*. In addition to these mass circulation dailies, the Jewish community of Toronto had its own daily Yiddish paper, *Der Yiddisher Zhurnal*. Other Yiddish daily newspapers, published in New York and Montreal, were on sale in Toronto and reported on matters affecting Jews in Canada and other parts of the world. *The Toronto Daily Star* had the largest sale of all the English-language dailies in the city (its

circulation was about 215,000) and it was also the newspaper most frequently read by Jews. Together with the *Zhurnal*, it supplied Toronto Jews with horrifying reports of Nazi atrocities and frequent references to the swastika emblem which became invested with connotations of degradation, terror, and physical violence against Jews.

In a front-page story of its 13 February 1933 edition, the *Zhurnal* reported a speech by a Nazi deputy and stated: 'Kube, deputy in the Prussian parliament, says that Jews have polluted Germany like bedbugs. The only way to smoke them out is to drive them out'. No great leap of imagination was required to reach the conclusion that if Jews were 'like bedbugs' then the most efficient remedy was extermination. The editorial in that same issue stated that German Jews who believed Hitler's promise to punish those who insulted any recognized religion were naive and indulging in wishful thinking. It pointed out that on the very day that Hitler publicly proclaimed his determination to protect established religious groups, the Nazis were staging a pogrom against Jews in Gresfeld and it recommended:¹⁸

The Central Verein of German Jews should stand by its former resolution to deploy self-defence organizations over the whole country, wherever there are Jewish centres. This would be more effective than all the decrees which Hitler might publish taken together.

A few days later, on 24 February, the *Zhurnal* published a report from Germany under the headline: 'Jews Will Hang from Lampposts, Promises Nazi Leader if a Hair on Hitler's Head is Touched' and quoted the threat: 'If a hair is touched of any leader of the Nazi government, we will give a signal for a general massacre of Jews which will only be halted when not a single Jew is left alive'.¹⁹ The Jewish Telegraphic Agency and German Jews fleeing the Nazi terror and seeking refuge abroad provided further evidence of antisemitic outrages. The *Zhurnal* of 23 March reported harrowing details under a prominent headline which stated: 'Nazi Atrocities Beyond Human Imagination. Murderers, Torturers Unhindered. Jews Kidnapped and Beaten to Death. Every Night a Tortured Jew Abandoned in Berlin Cemeteries. Those Left Behind Alive Forced to Sign Statement that They Were Well-Treated'.²⁰

Reports of atrocities in the *Zhurnal* were not as numerous in April as they had been in February and March, largely owing to the newspaper's preoccupation with reports of protests against the Nazi terror and of the efforts of Toronto Jewry to aid their German-Jewish brethren. Nevertheless, some incidents of physical violence against Jews in Germany were reported throughout the month. On 7 April a *Zhurnal* headline stated: 'German Jew and His Wife Dead Fleeing Kidnappers'.²¹ Later that month the *Zhurnal* reported more cases of kidnapping as well as instances of German Jews who had abandoned

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

all hope and had committed suicide. It also revealed that German Nazis were organizing pogroms in Poland and Rumania while the violence was unabated in Germany. A man who sought refuge in Holland revealed that Nazis had entered a synagogue in Gelsenkirchen looking for any concealed weapons and arrested Jews whom they took to prison and severely tortured, according to a report in the *Zhurnal* of 20 April. Four days later, it published the account of a Jewish Telegraphic Agency correspondent who had witnessed the plight of the German Jews at first hand after secretly going to Berlin.²²

Not Berlin proper, not America, and not even the countries which border on Germany can have an exact notion and paint for themselves a complete picture of what is truly happening in Germany. The insults, the tortures, the awful hopelessness, the absolute helplessness of the Jews in Germany today are indescribable. I personally have found the Jewish situation far worse, infinitely more horrible than I imagined, far worse than even the worst reports, and I've just arrived here. Everything which was shocking in the very first days of Hitler's coup d'état remains absolutely true to this very day . . . Jews are continuing to disappear all the time and the whereabouts of their remains is unknown. Often they are found in the morgues.

There were further reports of violent attacks against Jews in Germany during the following months and on the first day of August the *Zhurnal* reported a 'bloody pogrom' in Berlin and quoted proclamations that described Jews as 'poisonous snakes'. The swastika was now the official emblem of the Nazi Party and a leaflet was distributed in Berlin stating:²³

. . . The swastika, the official government emblem . . . 'Kill the Jews. Free yourselves from them once and for all!' There are two kinds of antisemitism. One, of a higher kind, limits Jewish power through laws. The other, lower kind, kills Jews. The latter is perhaps a dreadful kind, but it brings the best results because it ends for all time the Jewish question by exterminating them.

Some months earlier, in March 1933, *The Toronto Daily Star* had already carried reports of the swastika's association with Nazi antisemitic actions. One of its correspondents in Germany described how he saw 'a parade of hundreds of children, between the ages of seven and 16, carrying the swastika and the old imperial colours, and shouting at intervals: "The Jews must be destroyed"'.²⁴ Two days later, the same newspaper had a front-page story under a headline which stated: 'Nazism Embodies Ideals Followed by Ku Klux Klan: Extreme Nationalism, Hatred of All Aliens Common to Both Orders: Nordics Superior'. Its reporter commented:²⁵

Curiously enough, the Swastika or Hooked Cross, Hakenkreuz, the Nazi symbol, was an emblem much in evidence in the Ku Klux Klan lodges and in the parades of the order in days gone by . . . A man without a program save hatred, ignorance and vulgarity is driving a great and disillusioned

CYRIL LEVITT AND WILLIAM SHAFFIR

people to perdition. This is a pessimistic prognosis, yet I am afraid, although I hope not, that history will bear me out in this assertion.

A few days later, and again on its front page, *The Toronto Daily Star* published a report from Germany which stated that Pastor Dr Mieneke of Soldin had declared to his congregation: 'Christ himself was a Hitlerite. The Christian cross and the swastika belong together'.²⁶ On 15 April the newspaper published a photograph of Nazi Brownshirts wearing swastika badges. On 28 April, the front page of the same daily claimed that Jews who had fainted under torture were 'revived for further torture' in Germany and that a Polish Jew, whose name was printed in full, 'was carried into a cellar by uniformed men and beaten. They pulled the hair of his beard out and shaved a swastika on his head. He was then beaten again in time to the music of a piano'.²⁷

There can be no doubt that by midsummer 1933 the swastika was seen by Toronto Jews as the symbol of infamous and inhuman Nazi antisemitism and it is not surprising that when it was publicly flaunted in the city, they were incensed. On the other hand, the members of Toronto's newly-formed Swastika Clubs were still claiming with pretended innocence that the emblem was merely a good-luck sign and that it was openly displayed on Rudyard Kipling's books which could not be said to be in any way associated with Nazism.

Swastikas at the Beaches

On the first two days of August 1933, headlines in Toronto's English-language newspapers announced the establishment of the Swastika Clubs in the city and reported that the members of this new association had organized their first parade up and down the boardwalk from Balmy Beach to Woodbine Avenue. *The Toronto Daily Star* did not hesitate to label the clubs as a Nazi organization and its issue of the first of August carried a headline which stated: 'Nazi Organization Seeking to Oust Non-Gentiles Off Beach'. On the following day, *The Evening Telegram* printed a similar headline: 'Hundreds Don Swastikas in Drive to Rid Beaches of Undesirable Persons' and the additional information that: 'Toronto "Swastikas" Arouse Jews'. 'On the same day, *The Globe* reported: 'Police Halt Possible "Swastika" Clash' while *The Daily Mail and Empire* stated: 'Balmy Beach Dance Hall Closed to Avert Swastika Row. Nazi Parade Tours Boardwalk Singing Anti-Jewish Doggerel'.

On the first of August, after signs had been posted in and around the Balmy Beach Canoe clubhouse announcing the formation of the Swastika Clubs, clubhouse officials and members expected Jews to demonstrate their anger. The appearance of a large contingent of young Jewish men on that day alarmed the club officials, especially since some of the members, anticipating a confrontation, had armed

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

themselves with broom handles and lacrosse sticks. The police officer on the beat notified No. 10 police station and an Inspector, accompanied by a sergeant and several officers, appeared shortly afterwards and cleared the grounds. The Swastika Clubs' sympathizers showed no resistance and dispersed in a more or less orderly manner; but they returned to the Balmy Beach clubhouse, where they gathered and stood in a circle for some time. On the Inspector's advice, the Commodore of the Balmy Beach Canoe Club halted the dance in progress in the ballroom and called upon those present to disperse and leave the clubhouse to avoid trouble. About four hundred people who were in the dance hall sang 'God Save the King' to the orchestra's accompaniment and left.

Der Yiddisher Zhurnal of 2 August announced: 'Nazi Organization Formed in Ward 8 to Drive Jews Away From Beaches'. According to *The Evening Telegram*, the Swastika Clubs were based 'on the line of the famous Hitler brown shirts in Germany and six local branches have already been established in Toronto's east end, boasting a membership of more than four hundred'.²⁸ On the evening of the first day of August, about a hundred members and sympathizers of the Swastika Clubs wearing swastika badges paraded down the boardwalk of the eastern beaches, chanting the following words to the tune of 'Home, home on the range':

O give me a home, where the Gentiles may roam,
Where the Jews are not rampant all day;
Where seldom is heard a loud Yiddish word
And the Gentiles are free all the day.

Tensions around the Beaches area originated in the south-eastern part of the city, a section miles from the Jewish residential area. Toronto's eastern beaches and parks were a favourite picnic area for thousands of Jewish immigrants who could not afford to buy or rent summer cottages and who did not have the means to travel to summer resorts (many of which, in any event, did not welcome Jews). The customs, food, and language of the weekend visitors were different from the prevailing norms in that area of the city, an area whose population was overwhelmingly of British descent. Its distance from the city centre, as well as its well-delineated boundaries, made it resemble a British village where the presence of outsiders was immediately noticeable. Residents of the Beaches were disturbed at the increasing presence of outsiders and their seeming disregard for 'proper' behaviour. 'You couldn't find a place to sit down on the bench or on the park land', one Beach resident recalled. 'And there were branches torn off these young trees . . . and half-eaten food, peels, candy wrappers strewn all over the place. And this was your area where you were living and you would come down here and see all that every Monday morning. No

wonder people were annoyed'. Each of the English-language daily newspapers quoted from conversations with area residents who complained that the beach and park were being transformed every weekend into a picnic ground. The local residents, they claimed, had difficulty keeping their lawns clear of these strangers and were inconvenienced by parked cars that blocked their driveways. They also considered that using these cars as dressing-rooms for bathers was indecent and intolerable. Though 'outsiders' visiting the beaches included members of the city's various ethnic minorities, resentment was focused entirely on the presence of Jews. A former Beach resident whom we interviewed remarked: 'There probably were other ethnic groups too. You couldn't pick out whether this person was Polish or that person was Jewish or what they were. But somehow or other the anger seemed to be aimed at the Jews'.

After that first march, the Swastika Clubs announced that they intended to stage a similar parade along the same boardwalk on the following Sunday. While the name 'Jew' was nowhere specifically mentioned in any of the organization's announcements or flyers, Toronto Jews were convinced of the Swastika Club's antisemitic character and objectives. They maintained that the epithet 'obnoxious visitors', which first appeared in a notice posted on the Balmy Beach Canoe Club's bulletin board, was aimed specifically at them. The Balmy Beach clubhouse, a private social club catering to the area's residents, had displayed a notice on its bulletin board headed 'Join the Swastika Club' and stating:²⁹

Residents . . . of the Beaches are not a little perturbed at the recent influx of obnoxious visitors to Kew Gardens and surrounding territory on Saturdays and Sundays. Have you the courage to outwardly indicate your disapproval? If so, join the Swastika Club . . . There are no fees. The club badge may be obtained on payment of twenty-five cents . . . PLEASE WEAR YOUR BADGE WHENEVER YOU ARE ON THE BOARDWALK . . .

The clubhouse had served as the 'storm centre of the campaign' of the Swastika Clubs, according to *The Toronto Daily Star* which reported that posted on the clubhouse were large signboards bearing the swastika emblem and the words 'Heil Hitler'.³⁰ Notices of the Swastika Clubs' objectives were also posted on a bulletin board in front of the clubhouse which was situated in the boardwalk area itself.³¹ According to *The Daily Mail and Empire* of 2 August, a large cardboard sign bearing the swastika and the words 'Heil Hitler' had been displayed on the door of the clubhouse but was removed by the club officials, who also removed the notices and signs that members of the Swastika Club had posted both on the clubhouse and in the immediate area on 1 August.

Convinced that the epithet 'obnoxious visitors' applied to them as Jews, some sixty to seventy 'sturdy Jews', as *The Toronto Daily Star* of the second of August described them, came to the beach en masse at about

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

9.30 p.m. Arriving by truck and car from the Spadina area of the city where they had congregated, they marched down Kew Beach Avenue and paced the boardwalk to the Balmy Beach clubhouse, where the swastika signs had been posted. Members of the Balmy Beach Canoe Club had learned of the proposed invasion of their clubhouse grounds, and the signs were removed before the Jewish contingent arrived. Reporting on the arrival of the Jewish group, *The Toronto Daily Star* quoted Al Kaufman who led them:³²

As soon as we got to the club grounds we mingled with those who appeared to be members of the club and at the same time looked for emblems of the Nazi organization. We couldn't find any. If we had we would have torn them off and if there had been any trouble I think we could have taken care of ourselves.

The Toronto Daily Star's item continued as follows: 'Kaufman and his "gang" paraded in small groups up and down five streets close to the clubhouse property, looking for Nazi emblems but reported that they couldn't find any trace of one'.

When leaders of the Swastika Clubs were interviewed, they claimed that their choice of emblem had no political significance, that it was selected '... as it symbolizes fraternity and good luck'. One of them added that the Balmy Beach area had once been a camping ground for the Iroquois Indians to whom the swastika was a good-luck sign and he pointed out that there once was a Swastika girls' basketball club in the area.³³

The mayor of Toronto, William Stewart, attempted to foster an atmosphere of calm and reason. In a statement issued on the first day of August, at midnight, he declared that alleged Hitlerism and reported demonstrations at the eastern beaches would be thoroughly investigated by the police. Toronto, the mayor insisted, would never tolerate any group that attempted to take the law into its own hands. His statement read in part:³⁴

Let it be understood with the utmost clearness that we administer our laws through police courts, and not through private groups, clubs or demonstrations. We have an abundance of British ideals which our people might emulate and follow: we need no inspiration from foreign sources and foreignisms, but simply a proper respect for law and order and British traditions... We must follow British tradition, the British idea, in Toronto: the organizations or the political organisms of foreign lands do not need to be adopted, used, or aped in this country.

He stated that he was always ready to meet various interest groups, in order to reduce tensions and solve any problems, including representatives of the League for the Defense of Jewish Rights (which officially represented the Jewish community), representatives of the Swastika Clubs, and residents of the Beaches area. He personally appealed to all

parties in the conflict for calm and reason and warned that those not heeding his considered advice should be prepared to accept the legal consequences of their actions. He added: 'We have gone through a long depression, and the sun is shining on the noon of a better day. Any demonstration that might cause ill-feeling would be regrettable. . .'.³⁵

The most serious confrontation on the beaches occurred on Sunday 6 August, when the Swastika Clubs staged their second parade along the boardwalk with the members sporting swastika badges made of nickel with a red swastika cross impressed on them; several of the young men wore sweatshirts with a black swastika emblem. The parade started in the late afternoon and by early evening the members had marched up and down the boardwalk from Kew Gardens to Balmy Beach. *The Toronto Daily Star* reported on the following day, under a headline stating: 'Beaches in Turmoil as Swastika Emblem Incites Near Riots':³⁶

Sullen clouds of tense racial feeling, brooding over the east end waterfront for days, burst during the weekend and enveloped, in a series of clashes and near riots, thousands of Torontonians who flocked to the beaches for pleasure . . . Trouble was in the air, and it required only the appearance of the Swastika sign to make it all too actively tangible. Throughout the turmoil, the small swastika badge, emblem of the rapidly growing club, bobbed and eddied as gangs of non-Gentiles, incensed by Hitlerism which they charged it symbolized, pounced on wearers. They tore sweat-shirts on which the sign was emblazoned from the backs of youths, and forced them to seek shelter in nearby houses.

A few days later, on 11 August, the same newspaper announced in a banner headline: 'Swastika Clubs Will Give Up Emblem'. Both the name and the badge of the clubs were to be abandoned and a new club was to be established with similar objectives under the title of 'The Beaches Protective Association'.

Clearly, the Swastika Clubs had been perceived by Toronto Jewry as an organization which aimed to foster virulent antisemitism in Canada and to promote Nazi principles. The clubs were short-lived — from the first to the eleventh of August — but their existence under the umbrella of the swastika for those few days caused very serious misgivings not only to the Jewish inhabitants but also to the authorities. Toronto's mayor had commented: 'It would not take long to start a conflagration in the city that you couldn't put out in a day'.³⁷ As we shall see below, his fears about the conflagration were justified on the evening of 16 August.

The Swastika at Christie Pits

The swastika, which had disappeared entirely from the eastern beaches district by 11 August, reappeared suddenly at Willowvale Park

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

(Christie Pits) on the evening of 14 August. During a junior softball quarter-final game, in which Harbord Playground (a predominantly Jewish team) met St Peter's (a predominantly Catholic team), a huge swastika sewn in white cloth on a black pullover was unfurled in the final innings. According to *The Daily Mail and Empire* of 15 August, only small sections of the emblem had been unfurled from time to time '... amid much wisecracking, cheering and yelling of pointed remarks'. But according to both that paper and *The Evening Telegram*, when the Harbord team tied the score in the ninth inning, St Peter's fans unfurled the whole pullover with the emblazoned swastika — hoping thereby to spur their team to victory. On the other hand, according to *The Toronto Daily Star* of the same day, those who hoisted the swastika flag to the accompaniment of 'Heil Hitler' were a local gang. Whether the wavers of the banner were or were not local hooligans, the appearance of the swastika was seen as a deliberate attempt to provoke the Jewish supporters of the Harbord team, by displaying the Nazi emblem. After the end of the game, which was won by Harbord Playground, those holding the swastika flag raised it high and members of the gang swarmed on to the field, chanting their 'club yell' again and surrounding the members of the Jewish team, according to the same newspaper. Though spectators expected that the situation on the playing field would result in fisticuffs, between supporters of the two teams, an uneasy calm prevailed.

At some time during the night of 14 August, a large swastika and the words 'Heil Hitler' were painted on the roof of the Willowvale Park clubhouse, after the attendants had left the grounds at ten o'clock — so that the vandals could not be identified. On the following morning, the Parks Commissioner announced that the swastika and the words 'Heil Hitler' would be obliterated and the matter turned over to the police. (*The Toronto Daily Star* of 15 August supplied more details of the incident and revealed that those guilty were a few members of the Pit gang, the gang that frequented Willowvale Park.)

On Wednesday evening, 16 August, Toronto experienced one of the worst non-labour riots in its history;³⁸ it was triggered off by the flaunting of the swastika, according to *The Daily Mail and Empire*.³⁹

Widespread disorder raged over the vast area of Toronto streets for hours last night when rioting broke out following the display of the swastika emblem on a white quilt at a baseball game in Willowvale Park.

The disturbance became largely racial in character, bands of Gentiles and of Jews apparently taking up opposing sides in the battle. As far as could be deemed, no arrests took place arising from the disorders, the police apparently devoting their major attention to breaking up the several serious mêlées which developed, in which hundreds appeared to be fighting at once.

Cries of "The Swastika! The Swastika!" rose in various parts of the park as soon as the taunting emblem made its appearance.

CYRIL LEVITT AND WILLIAM SHAFFIR

In one confused mass, in sections of the crowd, more than 3,000 surged across the park and over the hill toward the emblem. Fighting broke out as Jews recognized Gentiles.

The Toronto Daily Star reported:⁴⁰

While groups of Jewish and Gentile youths wielded fists and clubs in a series of violent scraps for possession of a white flag bearing a Swastika symbol at Willowvale Park last night, a crowd of more than 10,000 citizens, excited by cries of "Heil Hitler!" became suddenly a disorderly mob and surged wildly about the park and surrounding streets, trying to gain a view of the actual combats, which soon developed in violence and intensity of racial feeling into one of the worst free-for-alls ever seen in the city.

Scores were injured, many requiring medical and hospital attention . . . Heads were opened, eyes blackened and bodies thumped and battered as literally dozens of persons, young and old, many of them non-combatant spectators, were injured more or less seriously by a variety of ugly weapons in the hands of wild-eyed and irresponsible young hoodlums, both Jewish and Gentile.

Der Yiddisher Zhurnal's account was more moderate and put the blame for the violence squarely upon the swastika bearers, calling them Nazis:⁴¹

Greater police detachments were called upon last evening in Willowvale Park on account of a fight which erupted between young Nazis and young Jews, and which threatened to assume a serious character. It was expected that the same gang which on the previous Monday incensed the Jewish players by displaying a swastika along with shouts of "Heil Hitler" would once again attempt to cause trouble. And so it was . . .

All was quiet until the end of the game, which the Gentile team won. As the crowd was dispersing, a group of Gentile boys celebrated the victory by yelling insults at the Jews and they unfurled an old blanket, on which was painted a swastika.

After the Monday game, supporters of the Harbord Playground team had announced that they would be back in force for the return match on the following Wednesday. One Harbord fan reportedly told *The Toronto Daily Star*: 'We are not going to make trouble, but if anything happens we will be there to support our players'; the 'Willowvale Swastikas' (as that newspaper referred to the swastika bearers) were aware of that intention and they also mustered their supporters.⁴² The predicted trouble was not long in erupting. Even before the game began, one Gentile spectator was reported to have required medical attention. The 'Swastika supporters' claimed that while they were cheering for the St Peter's team, a crowd of Jewish youths arrived and ordered them to be silent. 'Whatever the cause', *The Toronto Daily Star* of 17 August reported, there followed

. . . a swiftly-ending free-for-all, with an unidentified swastika supporter requiring medical attention, the result, it is claimed, of a blow from a club,

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

while one of the Jewish leaders was thrown down the hill into a cage back of the batter's box.

In the second inning, a second fracas occurred. It started in a section where a Jewish group was seated on the rising ground above the north-west diamond on which the game was being played; about thirty 'Willowvale Swastikas' yelled in unison 'Heil Hitler' close to where about a thousand Jewish supporters of the Harbord Playground team were positioned on the elevated site. Infuriated, the latter rushed towards those who had provoked them and a fight ensued in the course of which a spectator was struck with a sawn-off piece of lead pipe. A newspaper report the following day stated: 'Batons, lead pipes and other weapons were swinging freely'.⁴³

The game was temporarily suspended while many of the spectators gathered around the battling groups. When play resumed, there were more yells of 'Heil Hitler' during the third inning and again violence erupted with supporters rushing to the assistance of both sets of combatants. The police restored order and the game proceeded without further serious unrest until the end, when the St Peter's team won by 6-5. It was almost dark by then and before the crowd had dispersed there suddenly appeared at the top of the hill a large white blanket bearing a startling black swastika. *The Toronto Daily Star* reported that when the emblem was flaunted, 'a mild form of pandemonium broke loose'⁴⁴ and *The Evening Telegram* stated: 'In a moment all was turmoil'⁴⁵ and added that 'the sign stood out visible to the entire crowd and acted like a red rag to a bull';⁴⁶ the Jewish supporters immediately raced towards the hill, intent on capturing the hated Nazi banner and 'the swastika, the swastika' could be heard 'for blocks away'.⁴⁷ The 'Willowvale Swastikas' tried to repel the attack and very quickly the battle intensified. *The Globe* reported:⁴⁸

The assault upon the swastika wielder was the signal for a general inrush of Gentile youths, who piled baseball bats and fists in a wild riot. By the time police reserves arrived the battle had gradually moved over to Bloor and Clinton Streets, where some serious casualties occurred, and where, it is alleged, bottles for the first time became legitimate weapons. From this battlefield, it is said, many injured limped away or were assisted to their various homes.

All four English-language newspapers and the Yiddish daily gave a great deal of space the next day (17 August) to their reports of the riot under alarming headlines. Those of *The Daily Mail and Empire* stated:

Scores Hurt as Swastika Mobs Riot at Willowvale
Mayor Promises Immediate Probe of Disturbance
Thousands Caught Up in Park M  l  c
Gang Wielding Lead Pipes and Bats Sweep Streets, Bludgeoning Victims

CYRIL LEVITT AND WILLIAM SHAFFIR

The Globe was more restrained:

Swastika Feud Battles in Toronto Injures 5
Fists, Boots, Piping Used in Bloor Street War
'Heil Hitler' Is Youth's Cry
City in Turmoil

The Toronto Daily Star claimed that Dennis Draper, Chief of the Toronto Police Department, had been advised earlier by the Parks Department that the baseball game would merit special police attention (but Mr Draper denied being warned that anything resembling a riot might occur):

Draper Admits Receiving Riot Warning
Six Hours of Rioting Follow Hitler Shout
Scores Hurt, Two Held

The Evening Telegram's headline stated:

Report Gunmen Here to Slay Swazis
Communists Incite Riot Police Authority States
Jewish Toughs Began Trouble Says Witness

while *Der Yiddisher Zurnal* stated:

Swastika Attacks Give Rise to Great Panic in the City
Mayor Stewart Agrees to Take Swift Steps Against Nazis
Draper Asked to Report

If the swastika had not been flaunted at Willowvale Park, the Christie Pits riots would probably not have occurred. The deliberate display of a Nazi symbol was an irresistible provocation to the Jewish contingent because it was the final straw which broke the comparative restraint of those who had been subjected to less strident forms of antisemitism.

Conclusion

In his article entitled 'Civil Disorder Participation: A Critical Examination of Recent Research', McPhail successfully argues that in focusing on the 'states' or attitudes of individuals as causal variables in collective disorder, insufficient emphasis is placed on the conditions in the immediate surroundings which may contribute to the violence of a confrontation. In the Christie Pits riot, there were several factors which contributed to the affray apart from the flaunting of the swastika. First, whereas the police were present in considerable numbers at the Beaches, and were thus able to keep the crowds moving, they were conspicuously absent at Willowvale Park when the riot started despite warnings that trouble was anticipated. Second, in the earlier disturbances at the Beaches, young Jews could not quickly summon reinforcements since the Jewish area of the town was at that time some

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

distance away; by contrast, Christie Pits was then on the edge of a Jewish enclave in Toronto. Third, as McPhail and Miller have noted,⁴⁹ an important condition for the initiation of civil disorder is the presence of a large number of people with a period of uncommitted time at their disposal;⁵⁰ the first baseball game drew large numbers of supporters of both the Jewish and Gentile teams. Fourth, after describing the violence at that game, the newspapers publicized the intention of the Jewish supporters to return in force for the second game in anticipation of trouble; that report must have spurred the leaders of the Gentile faction to muster their own reinforcements. Fifth, the attitudinal difference between the Jewish immigrant generation and their offspring in terms of reacting to the rising tide of antisemitism meant that the latter were less likely to be as accommodating as their parents to anti-Jewish sentiments and behaviour. Lacking their parents' memories and experiences of the antisemitism in eastern Europe, the young Jews who reacted physically to the swastika provocation considered their response to be entirely appropriate. By contrast, their parents' generation generally believed that the Gentile authorities, including elected officials and the police, could be entrusted to deal with the problems posed by the swastika and that they would responsibly fulfil their official duties. Negotiation with the Mayor's office as well as with representatives of the Swastika Clubs was the chosen route of Jewish officialdom, an approach which was judged decidedly unattractive by young Jewish men who relied instead on physical confrontation.

It was evident that the display of the swastika in Toronto in the summer of 1933 was a deliberate attempt by some young Gentiles to insult and provoke their Jewish contemporaries. Their pretence that the swastika was merely a good-luck symbol might have been more credible if its display had not been often accompanied with chants of 'Heil Hitler'. After the Christie Pits riot, Mayor Stewart banned the display of the swastika in public in the interest of 'peace, order and good government'.⁵¹ The riot provided ample evidence that the younger generation of Toronto's Jewry would not meekly tolerate excessive forms of antisemitic abuse without resorting to violence. David Rome has commented⁵² that a refugee from tsarist Russia, who was

accustomed to the hostile glance of the passerby and the official, is not as likely to be injured by a similar meeting in Montreal. But his son who was taught in school and by his juvenile reading the decent expectations of western European and American equality, whose life is less tightly limited even by the invisible ghetto walls — this generation is likely to be stunned even by a static measure of hostility, especially when sensitized by shocking happenings overseas which can be readily transposed to his country.

Mayor Stewart's ban on the public display of the Swastika in Toronto might have seemed an infringement of the civil liberties of the

individual but there is a Canadian tradition of taking quick and firm action to avert the likelihood of collective violence and Mayor Stewart's decision accorded with that tradition.⁵³

NOTES

¹ See, for example, Richard A. Berk, 'The Controversy Surrounding Analyses of Collective Violence: Some Methodological Notes' in James F. Short, Jr. and Marvin E. Wolfgang, eds., *Collective Violence*, Chicago, 1972, pp. 112-18; Nathan S. Caplan and Jeffrey M. Paige, 'A Study of Ghetto Rioters', *Scientific American*, vol. 219, no. 2, 1968, pp. 15-21; Kenneth B. Clark and James Barker, 'The Zoot Effect in Personality: A Race Riot Participant', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, vol. 40, no. 2, April 1945, pp. 143-48; L. Festinger, A. Pepitone, and T. Newcomb, 'Some Consequences of Deindividuation in a Group', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, vol. 47, no. 2, April 1952, pp. 382-89; Kerner Commission, *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder*, Washington, D.C., 1968; G. LeBon, *The Crowd*, London, 1952; Stanley Lieberson and Arnold R. Silverman, 'The Precipitants and Underlying Conditions of Race Riots', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 30, no. 6, December 1965, pp. 887-98; William R. Morgan and Terry Nichols Clark, 'The Causes of Racial Disorders: A Grievance Level Explanation', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 38, October 1973, pp. 611-24; A. Oberschall, *Social Conflict and Social Movements*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973; Jerome H. Skolnick, *The Politics of Protest*, New York, 1971; and Seymour Spilerman, 'The Causes of Racial Disturbances: Tests of an Explanation', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 36, June 1971, pp. 427-42.

² Herbert Blumer, 'Collective Behaviour' in Joseph B. Gitler, ed., *Review of Sociology: Analysis of a Decade*, New York, 1959, pp. 127-58.

³ See Herbert Blumer, 'Social Unrest and Collective Behavior', in Norman K. Denzin, ed., *Studies in Symbolic Interaction: An Annual Compilation of Research*, Greenwich, Conn., 1978, pp. 1-54; Carl Couch, 'Collective Behavior: An Examination of Some Stereotypes', *Social Problems*, vol. 15, no. 3, Winter 1971, pp. 310-22; Kurt Lang and Gladys Engel Lang, 'Collective Behavior Theory and the Escalated Riots of the Sixties', in Tamotsu Shibutani, ed., *Human Nature and Collective Behavior: Papers in Honor of Herbert Blumer*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970, pp. 94-110; Clark McPhail, 'Civil Disorder Participation: A Critical Examination of Recent Research', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 36, no. 6, December 1970, pp. 1058-73; Clark McPhail and David Miller, 'The Assembling Process: A Theoretical and Empirical Examination', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 38, December 1971, pp. 721-35; Enrico L. Quarantelli, 'Emergent Accommodation Groups: Beyond Current Collective Behavior Typologies', in Tamotsu Shibutani, ed., op. cit., pp. 111-23; Neil J. Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behavior*, New York, 1963; Ralph H. Turner and Lewis K. Killian, *Collective Behavior*, New York, 1972; Ralph H. Turner and Samuel J. Surace, 'Zoot-Suiters and Mexicans: Symbols in Crowd Behavior', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 62, 1956, pp. 14-20; and S. Wright, *Crowds and Riots: A Study in Social Organization*, Beverly Hills, 1978.

⁴ Blumer, op. cit., p. 17.

THE SWASTIKA AS DRAMATIC SYMBOL

⁵ Smelser, op. cit., p. 16.

⁶ This paper is based on research for a wider study which has been published in book form: Cyril Levitt and William Shaffir, *The Riot at Christie Pits*, Toronto, 1987.

⁷ Blumer, op. cit., p. 17.

⁸ Turner and Killian, op. cit., p. 48, come close to drawing this distinction in explaining the difference between cognitive and mystical symbols. In their view, 'the symbols most likely to gain currency in collective behavior are mystical rather than cognitive. They invest the object of the crowd action with an aura of infamy, of tragedy, or of nobility'.

⁹ See Turner and Surace, op. cit., p. 50.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ According to the 1988 edition of *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the 'swastika as a symbol of prosperity and good fortune is widely distributed throughout the ancient and modern world. The word is derived from the Sanskrit *svastika*, meaning "conducive to well-being". . . . In 1910 a poet and nationalist ideologist Guido von List had suggested the swastika as a symbol for all anti-Semitic organizations; and when the National Socialist Party was formed in 1919-20, it adopted it. On September 15, 1935, the black swastika on a white circle with a crimson background became the national flag of Germany'.

¹² See Stephen A. Speisman, *The Jews of Toronto: A History to 1937*, Toronto, 1979, pp. 318-19.

¹³ See Lita-Rose Betcherman, *The Little Band*, Ottawa, 1982, pp. 50-51.

¹⁴ See Arnold Ages, 'Antisemitism: The Uneasy Calm' in Morton Weinfeld, William Shaffir, and Irwin Cotler, eds., *The Canadian Jewish Mosaic*, Toronto, 1981, p. 387.

¹⁵ See Speisman, op. cit., pp. 318-19.

¹⁶ See Yaacov Glickman, 'Anti-Semitism and Jewish Social Cohesion in Canada, in Rita M. Bienvenue and Jay E. Goldstein, eds., *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada: A Book of Readings*, 2nd edn., Toronto, 1985, p. 267.

¹⁷ For an extensive discussion of antisemitism in Canada during the 1930s, consult the following sources: Irving Abella and Harold Troper, *None is Too Many*, Toronto, 1933; Ages, op. cit. in Note 14 above, pp. 383-95; Lita-Rose Betcherman, *The Swastika and the Maple Leaf*, Toronto, 1975, and *The Little Band*, op. cit.; Glickman, op. cit. in Note 16 above, pp. 263-84; David Rome, *Clouds in the Thirties: Antisemitism in Canada 1929-1939*, sections 1-13, Montreal, 1977; and Speisman, op. cit.

¹⁸ *Der Yiddisher Zhurnal*, 13 February 1933, p. 1.

¹⁹ Ibid., 24 February 1933, p. 1.

²⁰ Ibid., 3 March 1933, p. 1.

²¹ Ibid., 7 April 1933, p. 1.

²² Ibid., 24 April 1933, p. 1.

²³ Ibid., 1 August 1933, p. 1.

²⁴ *The Toronto Daily Star*, 27 March 1933, p. 1.

²⁵ Ibid., 29 March 1933, p. 1.

²⁶ Ibid., 5 April 1933, p. 1.

²⁷ Ibid., 28 April 1933, p. 1.

²⁸ *The Evening Telegram*, 1 August 1933, p. 1.

CYRIL LEVITT AND WILLIAM SHAFFIR

²⁹ *The Daily Mail and Empire*, 2 August 1933, p. 1.

³⁰ *The Toronto Daily Star*, 2 August 1933, p. 1.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *The Daily Mail and Empire*, 2 August 1933, p. 1.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *The Evening Telegram*, 2 August 1933, pp. 1–2.

³⁶ *The Toronto Daily Star*, 7 August 1933, p. 1.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 9 August 1933, p. 1.

³⁸ Estimates of the size of the crowd in the Pits that evening ranged from 600–15,000 as reported by *Der Yiddisher Zhurnal* of 18 August; *The Toronto Daily Star* of 17 August reported that 10,000 people were in the park on the night of the riot, while *The Daily Mail and Empire* placed the figure at 'more than 8,000' in its 17 August edition. Realistically, it is likely that at least 2,000 to 3,000 were in the park when the riot broke out. Of these, probably no more than several hundred actively participated in the physical violence, although many others undoubtedly shouted encouragement to one side or the other.

³⁹ *The Daily Mail and Empire*, 17 August 1933, p. 1.

⁴⁰ *The Toronto Daily Star*, 17 August 1933, p. 1.

⁴¹ *Der Yiddisher Zhurnal*, 17 August 1933, p. 1.

⁴² *The Toronto Daily Star*, 17 August 1933, p. 1.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁴⁵ *The Evening Telegram*, 17 August 1933, p. 1.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *The Globe*, 17 August 1933, p. 1.

⁴⁹ Clark McPhail and David Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 725.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 726.

⁵¹ See *The Daily Mail and Empire*, 17 August 1933, p. 1. This resulted in some embarrassment for a number of the city's organizations. In a story entitled 'Must Not Flaunt Swastika Is Warning Of Boy Scouts', *The Toronto Daily Star* reported on 18 August, on its front page, that Toronto Boy Scouts' headquarters warned all recipients of the Scouts 'Thank You Badge', a swastika cross surmounted by the fleur-de-lys, given to friends of scouting for some exceptional deed '... against flaunting the badge in public until the current feeling against the Hitler symbol has died down'. The Toronto Library Board had to decide what to do about the swastika emblems decorating the thousands of Kipling volumes in their public libraries. It was decided not to remove the emblem. Toronto motor-cycle police unwittingly defied the Mayor's ban on the emblem since they were unaware that the swastika was stamped on the keys to the lockers at the police motor-cycle depot.

⁵² See David Rome, *op. cit.*, Section 3, p. 10.

⁵³ See Kenneth McNaught, 'Violence in Canadian History' in John S. Moir, ed., *Character and Circumstance*, Toronto, 1970, pp. 66–84.

NAMING PATTERNS AMONG JEWS OF IRAQI ORIGIN IN SYDNEY

Myer Samra

JEWES have traditionally shown great concern about the names they choose for their children. That concern is evident in the Midrash which recommends that a parent should consider the matter carefully in order 'to give his son a name worthy for him to become a righteous man'.¹ As we shall see, this admonition has particular relevance for Jews of Iraqi origin in Australia, who also place great store on the use of names to reflect kinship ties and family continuity.

There are some 2,000 Jews of Iraqi origin in Sydney, a city with a population of about 3,000,000 inhabitants, of whom 30,000 are Jews.² Those of Iraqi origin are the largest 'Sephardi' group in Sydney and there is also a substantial number of Egyptian Jews who settled in the city, mainly after the Suez crisis of 1956.

Appreciable numbers of Iraqi Jews first settled in Australia at the end of the Second World War. The majority of the immigrants were born, or at least previously resided, in the British colonies in Asia or in the Dutch East Indies where they were known as 'Baghdadian' Jews. For more than a hundred years, they had been active in the trading centres of the British Empire (mainly in Bombay, Calcutta, Rangoon, Hong Kong, and Singapore) as well as in Shanghai, Surabaya in Java, and other cities. These scattered communities were regularly augmented by newcomers from Iraq until the Second World War, while people born in one centre might later settle or marry in another. None of these communities was particularly large. That in Calcutta was probably the most numerous, but even in its heyday in the Second World War, its population did not exceed 5,000.³ After the war, as the colonies achieved their independence and began a process of indigenization, business opportunities for the Iraqi Jews declined. Many chose to emigrate to Great Britain, Israel, the United States, Canada, or Australia.

A second stream of Iraqi Jews came to Australia via Israel; most of them had been living in Iraq until the mass emigration of the community in 1950-51 and resettlement in the newly-established

Jewish state. A number of other families came to Sydney direct from Iraq, or via Britain, Iran, or some other route. These Jews have become known in Australia as 'Sephardim' and Iraqi Jewish customs have been generally identified as 'Sephardi'. Along with many Jews from Egypt, Jews of Iraqi origin are affiliated to Sydney's Sephardi Synagogue, which was consecrated in 1962. A second 'Sephardi' congregation in Sydney, the Eastern Jewish Association (whose members are mainly former Iraqi residents of Israel, Burma, India, and Singapore) organizes services for the High Holy Days (Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur). The services are held in rented premises and are conducted by the members, without a rabbi or any other paid minister. Hardly any Egyptian Jews have joined this association.

The Hebrew word 'Sephardi' means 'Spanish' or pertaining to the Jews of Spain. Although few Iraqi Jews are of Spanish origin, they follow a Judaeo-Spanish liturgical tradition, in common with most Middle Eastern and Mediterranean Jews. Thus, they are 'Sephardi' in terms of their ritual, though not by ancestry.⁴ In practice, the distinction between these different uses is often blurred so that communities regarded as Sephardi on account of their liturgy may be mistakenly presumed to have originated in Spain. Such a confusion can sometimes be put to good use. When Iraqi Jews wished to settle in Australia between the 1940s and 1960s, the 'White Australia' policy excluded non-European immigration. In order to overcome the obstacle, some Iraqi Jews used their designation as Sephardim to assert that they were descendants of the Jews expelled from Spain in 1492 who had settled in the Ottoman empire. Such a background implied that they were of European descent and could therefore be accepted as immigrants by Australia.⁵

In Sydney, Iraqi Jews tend to be concentrated residentially in the eastern suburbs, particularly in Bondi where most of the facilities necessary for a Jewish way of life, such as synagogues, Jewish schools, *mikvot* (ritual baths), several shops selling Jewish books and religious objects, kosher restaurants and kosher butchers' shops, are located. About half the members of the Sephardi Synagogue and of the Eastern Jewish Association live in Bondi, a suburb of modest middle-class status, surrounded by more affluent quarters. While Bondi is the centre of Jewish life in Sydney, Iraqi Jews are even more concentrated in Bondi than are other segments of the Jewish community, making them a visible group.

A small survey which I carried out on the occupational distribution of male Jews of Iraqi origin in Sydney in the 1980s revealed that 58 per cent are self-employed or employers, mainly running small businesses. This represents a considerably greater proportion of that category than is found in Australia as a whole (under 16 per cent were employers or self-employed in 1983 and 1988).⁶ However, my findings show an

NAMING PATTERNS AMONG IRAQI JEWS

occupational distribution closer to that of other Jews in Australia; one survey in Melbourne reported 68 per cent of the Jewish men in that city were either employers or self-employed.⁷ Many Iraqi Jews are engaged in the clothing trade, in all its facets, while others are to be found in the import-export business, often dealing with traders in their former countries of residence. There has been a significant move towards higher education and professional employment among the generation raised in Australia.

This paper is based primarily on interviews conducted in 1975 and 1976. Fifty householders were seen in their own homes and I obtained from my informants details about their own first names and about the names of their parents, their spouses and siblings, as well as information on how they chose the names of their own children. Most of my informants had been immigrants to Australia, coming from every corner of the Iraqi diaspora; the oldest was born in 1895 and the youngest in 1953, providing an age range which spanned several generations. Almost half my informants had married relatives. I continued to have informal meetings and discussions with members of the community until 1985 and often my informants' naming practices were discussed, proving to be an interesting and popular topic of our conversations. After I presented a paper on the subject at the Sephardi Synagogue in 1981, I was approached by several members of the audience who related to me how names were selected in their own families.

Naming practices clearly are of special interest and of considerable importance for Jews of Iraqi origin. Many of them believe that when a child is given a name of a relative from a previous generation, this reflects not only the physical continuity of the generations but also the spiritual continuity of the family: the souls of ancestors are rekindled in the lives of descendants upon whom their names have been bestowed.

It is customary among some Jewish communities to name children after older members of the family and the practice appeared to be seen almost as a religious duty, although there is no biblical sanction for it.⁸ However, there are considerable variations, even between those communities which are today referred to as 'Sephardi'.⁹ Indeed, the custom of one group may be considered curious or even offensive by another. Ashkenazi Jews traditionally named their children after deceased ancestors¹⁰ whereas Sephardi communities in countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea gave children the names of grandparents, regardless of whether or not the latter were living at the time of the child's birth.¹¹ It was a source of pride for individuals to live to see a grandchild named after them. The custom of Jews from Yemen differed again: a father often gave his own first name to one of his sons, so that there would be a virtual dynasty of members of one family who all bore the same name.¹²

Jews of Iraqi origin in Sydney give conflicting descriptions of their tradition. Some state that they never use the names of living relatives, while others maintain that they name children after their grandparents, whether or not the latter are alive. Moreover, one cannot always predict from the country or town of birth of informants which custom they regard as appropriate. Most natives of Iraq frown upon the practice of naming a child after a living relative, but there is a minority of them who support the practice. Informants born in India are divided on the subject: those who lived in Calcutta believe it to be quite in order to name after grandparents while they are alive;¹³ but those who come from Bombay hold the opposite view.

It is interesting to note that a significant proportion of those who state that one should not name children after living relatives in fact know of instances where this has occurred in their own families. Many equate the two contrasting practices with fear and bravery, prudence and recklessness: they see the bestowal of a living person's name upon a newly-born child as the transference of the older person's soul to the baby with the consequent danger that when the soul departs, the body will perish. Thus one informant blamed her sister for precipitating their mother's death because she had named her baby daughter after her. On the other hand, individuals are anxious that their names will not be forgotten after they themselves cease to exist: the perpetuation of their names in the younger generation is a way of ensuring some sort of survival beyond the grave.

Since most families nowadays tend to have a limited number of children, some grandparents fear that there may be none born to be given their names after their death and request that their names be used during their lifetime. Such persons are considered brave by so tempting Providence and relatives and friends take particular note of the length of time they survive after a grandchild has been named after them. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that it is considered unethical or offensive to use the name of a living relative for one's new-born child without first having obtained the former's consent to do so. Indeed if this protocol is not observed, the older person may well feel resentful and suspect that the parents of the child wished the relative in question dead. In one case with which I was familiar, an interesting situation arose. A couple had a baby daughter during the lifetime of the child's maternal and paternal grandmothers, and she was the first granddaughter of both of them. Normally, the paternal grandparent is given precedence in matters of naming, but the paternal grandmother was born in Bombay and she declined the honour while the other grandmother (born in Calcutta) was happy to have the little girl called after her.

In the matter of naming children, Iraqi Jews traditionally applied the following order of precedence. When both grandfathers are

NAMING PATTERNS AMONG IRAQI JEWS

deceased, parents give their first son the name of his father's father and the second son is named after his mother's father. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same applies in the case of grandmothers and granddaughters.¹⁴ Where one grandparent is dead and the other alive, the name of the dead one should be given to perpetuate the memory of the deceased. If some other relative has died recently, that person's name would be conferred before the name of the living grandparent.

If the child's grandparents were still alive and a great-grandparent's name had not otherwise been passed on in the family, Iraqi Jews traditionally considered it proper to name the child after the great-grandparent. The names of other deceased relatives might also be used, particularly where the latter had died without issue and would otherwise have left no trace of their existence on earth. Although it is considered praiseworthy to use such names, many Iraqi Jews feel they have an obligation only to their own parents when choosing their child's name. If their parents are still living and have not expressed a wish that their names be given to their grandchildren during their lifetime, the parents of the child may decide that they are at liberty to select any name which appeals to them, whether that name comes from the Bible or from some other source. The father of one informant had hopes of naming his sons after the patriarchs and called his two eldest children Abraham and Isaac; but thereafter his wife gave birth only to daughters. Another informant's father had similar hopes about using the names of all the sons of Jacob and accordingly his first three sons were named Reuben, Simon, and Joseph. However, after the birth of a couple of daughters, and accepting that what children he should have was up to the will of God, he chose not to continue this pattern when his fourth and fifth sons were born.

Jews of Iraqi origin in Sydney still tend to adhere to traditional naming patterns and many of the younger members of the community have commemorative names. However, whereas in the past a child might have generally been expected to have only one name which honoured an ancestor, nowadays some of these family first names are not considered pleasing. Consequently, a second name is added and the child is usually called by that name in informal situations. That second name is sometimes quite distinct from the child's commemorative name but it is more usual for it to bear some resemblance to the commemorative name, being an anglicization of it or perhaps beginning with the same initial letter or syllable.¹⁵ A currency of name equivalences has developed; for example the Arabic name *Saleh* is usually rendered in English as Charles, *Gurji* becomes George, *Mazzal-tob* is rendered Mozelle, *Rahamim* becomes Raymond and *Khatoon* becomes Kathleen.

A number of cousins often have the same name. One informant observed proudly that he and four of his cousins were named after their

MYER SAMRA

common, deceased, grandfather. This situation is acceptable as cousins are not named after one another but after their common ancestor and therefore the fact that a child is given the same name as an older cousin should not affect the life of the latter. In certain circumstances, some people might give a child the name of a living relative, not in the direct line of descent, who is healthy and prosperous in the hope that the child would emulate that person — but permission should first be obtained. One woman whose previous children had died in infancy approached several kinswomen asking if she might use their name for her new baby daughter so that the child might also survive to adulthood. Her sister-in-law was outraged at the suggestion and categorically refused but her own sister consented.

As I have previously noted, there is a belief that a close connection exists between a name and the soul of the previous bearer of that name.¹⁶ When an expectant mother or a relative dreams of a deceased kinsman during the pregnancy, it is considered that the child should be given the name of the person who appeared in the dream. It is frequently assumed that the soul of that person has materialized in the dream in order to make an implicit request that the expected child bear the name of the deceased. Indeed, some informants reported cases where the person appearing in a dream specifically asked that his or her name be given to the child which was to be born.¹⁷

One woman said that when she was pregnant, her father-in-law came to see her to tell her that his father had appeared to him in a dream, asking that the baby should be named after him. In due course a boy was born and he was given his great-grandfather's name, *Nissim*. However, as that name was considered somewhat old-fashioned, the parents gave the child a second name, *Ilan*, which they considered to be more 'modern' and pleasing but which bore no resemblance whatever to the first.¹⁸ They always called the boy by that second name and the ancestral forename was ignored. Such a situation must have proved to be a severe disappointment for the spirit of the dead great-grandfather for he appeared once more, seven years later, when the daughter of his second son was pregnant. This time he manifested himself directly to the expectant mother (his granddaughter) and he specifically requested that the new-born should be given no name other than his own. This further request was complied with.

Another informant told me that, a year after her father's death, she was expecting a child, and night after night her father would appear to her in her dreams so that she felt obliged to give his name to her baby son. A similar case concerned a woman whose husband had been in Australia for two years; she had remained in India with her two children while he was trying to secure permanent rights of residence in Australia for himself and his family. He eventually succeeded in his efforts and the night before she was to leave India with her children she

NAMING PATTERNS AMONG IRAQI JEWS

was startled to see her late father in a dream, and in the dream he told her 'I am coming back to live with you'. Nine months later, a son was born and he was unhesitatingly given the name of his maternal grandfather.

Among several of my informants, dreams in which someone other than a dead relative has appeared have also provided the basis for the bestowal of a particular name upon a child. One informant had been given the name *Meir* (now Meyer in English) because his father had dreamt of the sage Rabbi Meir Ba'al Ha-Ness when his wife was expecting my informant.¹⁹ A woman called her son Solomon because she had dreamt of a dead friend of that name, a man for whom she had a very high regard. Another woman surprisingly gave her son the name of her cousin who was alive and well in Israel because she had dreamt of him before her son was born.

Dreams thus provide a mechanism whereby the dreamer can sometimes circumvent the traditional rules for naming a child. Moreover, they may be used to confirm one's own preferences; one informant revealed that his mother had dreamt of the actress Katharine Hepburn whom she greatly admired when she was expecting a baby. When the girl was born she called her Katharine and was happy to let the rest of the family believe that the child had been named after a deceased aunt called *Khatoon*. Thus she achieved the coup of calling her child after a modern gifted actress, of following the tradition of using the name of a person who appeared in her dream when she was pregnant, and of finally appearing to have a pious reverence for her departed aunt.

On the other hand, dreams may be held responsible for tragic consequences. One elderly informant told me: 'A child should be given the name of someone who has lived a long life, not someone who has died young. I gave the name of a young person, and my son died a boy, poor thing. I had dreamt of my husband's brother and named the child after him. I knew I would have a boy because I had dreamt of him. I was told I had to give his name. Even if I did not want to, it was no use. It was in fact his father's brother coming to complete his life span. And so it was. My child died young, at four years of age.'

Another woman had a similar experience. She stated: 'My late mother-in-law came to me in a dream, whispering to me to give her name to my baby. When the child was born, I was wondering what to name her when I recalled the dream. I gave my daughter my mother-in-law's name, but didn't tell anyone about the dream. She died five years old so I didn't tell. It was my mother-in-law wanting to live in this world'. She added, however, that her son gave the same name to one of his daughters, naming her after his late sister. Fortunately, his girl survived, unharmed.²⁰

Clearly, there is a belief that there might be some danger in giving to children the name of a dead relative. To avert such a danger, a second

name may be given in order to distinguish the new bearer from the older one. Frequently, the words *Hai* ('alive') or *Hayyim* ('life') are used as second names for this purpose, as also in some cases are *Shalom* ('peace') or *Siyyon* (Zion).²¹ In effect, these particular names function as talismans to preserve the life of the child.

Similar considerations apply when the name of a living relative is given to a child. One informant said that when she had a daughter, her grandmother (the girl's great-grandmother) requested that the child be named after her. The parents were uneasy about this request and therefore gave the little girl, in addition to her great-grandmother's name, another completely different second name and they called her exclusively by that second name. I was told that the great-grandmother survived for another eight years, suggesting that in this case the fear had been that the life of the great-grandmother might be abruptly shortened. Awkwardness may also arise when a child is given the name of a deceased ancestor and another older relative from a different side of the family bearing the same name is alive. A similar sort of subterfuge may then be considered necessary, that is, the use of a completely different second name so long as the child's namesake is alive.²²

Iraqi Jews are generally in agreement about the importance of having one's name endure after one's demise. Whether one should take action during one's lifetime to secure this degree of immortality, or whether one should have faith in one's descendants to bestow the honour after one's death, is essentially a matter of strategy. In the modern world, you cannot be certain that your name will be revived after your passing and you may therefore be inclined to take risks in order to secure the perpetuation of your name before taking leave of this world. The problem is more acute for the very old who are further removed from the generation which might eventually honour their name after death. Moreover, since the number of children in the nuclear family has declined, fewer ancestors will have their memory perpetuated in this way.

The Iraqi tradition, which accommodates two divergent norms rather than a plain universal rule, allows for some latitude. There may be repugnance about naming a child after a living person for fear of harmful consequences; but if circumstances are sufficiently compelling to dictate such a course of action, there is the consolation that the decision can be justified in accordance with notions available to Iraqi Jews and consistent with the Mediterranean Sephardi tradition. The Ashkenazi and Mediterranean Sephardi practices — of naming children respectively only after deceased ancestors, and naming children after grandparents, whether or not they were alive at the time — should be regarded as positions on a continuum, rather than as mutually exclusive stances, with the Iraqi tradition spanning the gap between them. Since both sets of practices have been followed for

NAMING PATTERNS AMONG IRAQI JEWS

generations by communities of observant Jews, neither can be regarded as doctrinally prescribed.²³ Nevertheless, the number of rabbis who have written on the subject indicates the extent to which the selection of names is imbued with religious significance.

So far, even the members of the younger generation of Iraqi Jews, born or brought up in Australia, have tended to follow tradition by giving their children the names of grandparents or other relatives, although some have chosen to add a second name for common use, thus paying lip service to the general usage of commemorative naming while in practice using the appellation of their choice. It will be interesting to see if a future generation will continue to respect the tradition or will largely abandon it, as Abramovitch and Bilu indicate has been the case among the present-day secular Jews in the State of Israel.²⁴

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this paper was delivered at the Fifteenth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions, held at Sydney University in August 1985. The research for the thesis on which this paper is based was undertaken with support from the Carlyle Greenwell Bequest, Department of Anthropology at the University of Sydney. This assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

NOTES

¹ *Midrash Tanhuma*, Jerusalem, 1972, Sefer Parashath HaAzinu, paragraph 7. See also Isaac Palachi's *Yafeh Laleb*, vol. 3, Izmir, 1880, folio 88, column three, citing a work by Rabbi Eliczer Papu concerning the importance of choosing a good name to help a child to develop along the right path in life. Papu says: 'It is well for a man to give his children a good name and not to be concerned to call them by his father's name'. Evidently Papu was less concerned with the maintenance of traditions described in this paper than with the intrinsic worth of particular names.

² See W. D. Rubinstein, *The Demography of the Australian Jewish Community 1981*, Melbourne, 1986, p. 2. This work provides an extended discussion of Jewish demography in Australia based on the 1981 Census.

³ The figure of 5,000 is recorded by Ezekiel N. Musleah, *On the Banks of the Ganga, the Sojourn of Jews in Calcutta*, North Quincy, Mass., 1975, pp. 14 and 442; by Flower Elias and Judith Elias Cooper, *The Jews of Calcutta*, Calcutta, 1974, p. 21; Isaac S. Abraham, *Origin and History of the Jews of Calcutta*, Calcutta, 1969, p. iv.; and Joan G. Roland, 'The Jews of India: communal survival or the end of a sojourn?', in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 42, part 1, 1980, pp. 75-90, at p. 85. This figure for the population during the Second World War includes a substantial number of Jews from Burma who came to Calcutta as refugees. Esmond David Ezra, in *Turning Back the Pages. A Chronicle of Calcutta Jewry Vol. I*, London, 1986, Chapter 13, pp. 431-63, argues strongly

that even after the arrival of the Jewish refugees from Burma, the population did not exceed 3,800.

⁴ José Faur 'The Sephardim: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow' in *The Sephardic World*, vol. 1, no. 1, Summer 1972, pp. 5–8, describes the Sephardic tradition as 'a system of values and institutions that constituted the basic bond between the Jewish communities in the Mediterranean basin'. He points out that even in the Middle Ages scholars from Kairawan and Egypt were referred to as Sephardim. The tradition followed in Iraq, North Africa, and Spain was known as Sephardic 'because it matured in Spain and was championed by the exiles from Spain and Portugal; not because it was the exclusive patrimony of the Iberian Peninsula'.

⁵ On the application of the White Australia Policy to Sephardi immigrants, see Myer Samra, *Yisrael Rhammana; Constructions of Identity among Iraqi Jews in Sydney, Australia*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1987, cap 5, and Suzanne D. Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora, Two Centuries of Jewish Settlement in Australia*, Sydney, 1988, pp. 242–43.

⁶ See Samra, *op. cit.*, p. 160. For Australia as a whole, see Ian Castles, *The Labour Force, Australia. Historical Summary, 1966 to 1984*, Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), Canberra, 1987, table 31, pp. 253–55 and *The Labour Force, Australia, August 1988*, ABS, Canberra, 1988, table 23, p. 30.

⁷ Walter M. Lippmann, 'Melbourne Jewry; a Profile', in P. Y. Medding, ed., *Jews in Australian Society*, Melbourne, 1973, p. 19.

⁸ See the opus classicum on Jewish naming practices in the Bible and in rabbinic literature, Jacob Z. Lauterbach, 'The Naming of Children in Jewish Folklore, Ritual and Practice' in B. J. Bamberger, ed., *Studies in Jewish Law, Custom and Folklore*, New York, 1970, pp. 30–74. (Lauterbach's article appeared originally in the *Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook*, vol. XLII, 1932.) Ben Zion C. Kaganoff in 'Jewish First Names through the Ages', *Commentary*, no. 20, 1955, pp. 447–52, also examines the practice prevalent in Biblical times.

⁹ See Herbert Colman Dobrinsky, *Selected Laws and Customs of Sephardic Jewry* (2 vols.), Ed.D. Thesis, Yeshiva University, New York, 1980, vol. 1, for an outline of the customs followed by Syrian Jews pp. 50–51, Moroccan Jews, pp. 63–64, Judaco-Spanish (Ladino-speaking Jews from the Levant and the Balkans) pp. 70–72, and the Spanish and Portuguese Jews (Jews who after their expulsion from the Iberian Peninsula, founded colonies in the Netherlands, Britain, and the Americas) pp. 77–78. See also Yona Sabar, 'First Names, Nicknames and Family Names among the Jews of Kurdistan', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. LXV, no. 1, 1974, pp. 43–51, for an interesting analysis of names used by Jews from Kurdistan.

¹⁰ See Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog, *Life is with People: the Culture of the Shtetl*, New York, 1952, p. 321, and Lauterbach, *op. cit.*, p. 51. Kaganoff, *op. cit.*, p. 449, appears to presume that the Ashkenazi custom was universal for he interprets 'the alternation of the names of Onias and Simon in the High Priestly family from 332 to 165 BCE' as evidence that 'the custom of naming a child after a deceased relative seems to have begun in the time of the Hasmoneans'. For this to be correct, one would have to assume that no High Priest during that period lived to see his grandson. The evidence seems instead to support the view of Lauterbach (*op. cit.*, p. 46) and of Dobrinsky (*op. cit.*, p. 50) that up until the Middle Ages children were named after living relatives.

NAMING PATTERNS AMONG IRAQI JEWS

¹¹ See Dobrinsky, op. cit., pp. 50, 63, 70 and Lauterbach, op. cit., p. 49.

¹² See Lauterbach, op. cit., p. 50. Among my informants were members of a family whose father was from Yemen. He and his own father both bore the name Joseph. He gave the name Joseph to one of his sons with *Şiyyon* as a second name, perhaps in deference to the sensitivity of his Iraqi wife. His other sons each received 'Joseph' and his daughters 'Josephine' as a second name.

¹³ The statements of my informants from Calcutta accord with the literature on the Jews who had settled in that city. Musleah (op. cit., p. 82), stated that children 'were named for their grandparents, great-grandparents or near relations . . . For the most part no religious scruples prevented naming for living relatives. In fact it was considered good fortune for a grandfather to be present for the naming of his grandson'. According to Elias and Cooper (op. cit., p. 36), 'carrying on one's parents' names was a custom rigidly adhered to by many of the Jews of Calcutta. If a couple had a son, he was named after the husband's father, whether alive or dead. The second son was named after the wife's father . . . Often it was possible to place a person in his family tree by his name, knowing at once whether he was the first son, second son and so on, of his parents'. It is possible that Calcuttan practice follows Syrian rather than Iraqi traditions since for over fifty years the community was headed by Jews from Aleppo. Musleah (op. cit., pp. 214-15) observes that public worship in Calcutta had indeed undergone 'Syrianization', but presumably he would consider the community's naming customs to be purely Iraqi since he asserts that 'in other religious practices, however, the Baghdadi Jews retained in large measure their own customs and ritual' (p. 215). Unfortunately there is no literature on naming practices in the other colonies apart from the observation of Eze Nathan in *The History of Jews in Singapore 1830-1945* (Singapore, 1986, p. 9), that in Singapore 'it was customary to include the father's name as a middle name'.

¹⁴ Commenting on the Fifth Commandment to honour one's father and one's mother, the most highly respected and influential Iraqi rabbi of recent generations, Yoseph Hayyim, advises in *Ben Ish Hai*, Jerusalem, 1952, p. 300 (paragraph 27) that a man should name his first-born son after his own father, and the second son after the wife's father — even where his wife entreats him to name the first-born after her father. Where a child is to be given the names of both his grandfathers, the father's father's name should be placed first, the mother's father's name being used as a second name. Explaining the need to do this, Hayyim cites the fate of Nadab and Abihu in the Bible, who, he claims, named their first sons after the wife's father. How Hayyim draws this lesson from the story of Nadab and Abihu (Leviticus 10:1, 2) is unclear. Hayyim David Levy, in *Meqor Hayyim (part 5)*, Jerusalem (n.d.) p. 144, presents Hayyim's statement about the order of naming as if it were an obligatory law.

¹⁵ Joseph Witriol, in 'Naming names', London's *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 January 1986, in effect proposes the reversal of the process depicted here, namely that (among Ashkenazi Jews) a secular or Gentile name might sometimes 'be converted to a Jewish biblical one by a process of association. For example, Loewe in German . . . meaning "lion" would find himself being called Ychuda, with reference to "Judah is a lion's whelp" (Gen. 49:9)'.

¹⁶ See Lauterbach's article, op. cit., for a detailed treatment of the relationship, as it emerges from the literature, between a name and the 'soul' with

which it is associated. For Lauterbach, the 'soul' is 'the very being of a person', p. 53. Dobrinsky (op. cit., p. 72) records a custom among the Judaeo-Spanish which indicates a belief that a person's soul and name are intertwined.

¹⁷ See Heskell M. Haddad, *Flight From Babylon*, New York, 1986, p. 35, for an example of this belief and practice, recounted by someone who had experienced such a dream.

¹⁸ This child was born in Israel. The more fashionable name chosen, *Ilan* (sapling), is derived from nature and conforms with the observations of Henry Abramovitch and Yorum Bilu, 'Visitational Dreams and Naming Practices among Moroccan Jews in Israel', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 27, no. 1, June 1985, pp. 13-21, concerning the popularity of secular names in Israel. (As the family are now living in Australia, it should come as no surprise that *Ilan* is now known as 'Alan'.)

¹⁹ This was the only dream recounted to me which conforms with the visitational dreams that Abramovitch and Bilu, op. cit., show to be very significant in influencing naming practices among Moroccan Jews in Israel, in which a revered Jewish sage manifests himself in the dream.

²⁰ In view of the extensive references to dreams by my informants and the Moroccan Jews in Israel studied by Abramovitch and Bilu, op. cit., to explain the choice of their children's names, it seems remarkable that Lauterbach, op. cit., does not mention this phenomenon. One would presume that there is no reference to the phenomenon in the more familiar rabbinic literature. The influence of dreams in the selection of names is apparently also known among Syrian Jews, as the following account, related to me by an informant of Syrian background, shows:

My son was named after my uncle [*'ammi* — father's brother], Moshe. After the birth of our daughters, my wife would not fall pregnant for seven years. She was very worried and went to all the specialists for help. And people said to her that I wanted a son, that I would have to divorce her because she hadn't borne one for me. Then one day, just a year after he had passed away, my uncle came to her in a dream and told her she would have a son. She fell pregnant soon afterwards and when the boy was born, she named him for my uncle, rather than for my father (Jacob). I was happy to go along with her decision. My father had died when I was eight months old and his brother had taken me in and raised me like his own son. He was even better to me than to his own children, and he was like a father to me. Besides, my father had died on *Rosh Hodesh Raḥamim* [the new moon of the Hebrew month Ellul]. One of my father's brothers named his son Jacob and he also died on *Rosh Hodesh Raḥamim*, exactly twenty years after my father. So, as 'Jacobs' in my family did not live long, my wife did not want to apply the name to our son. I was happy to go along with her decision to name the boy after my uncle who had appeared to her in a dream and told her she would give birth to a son — even though he had not specifically asked her to give his name to the child.

²¹ Concerning the prophylactic value of *Ben-Ṣiyyon* (rather than the name *Ṣiyyon*, used by Iraqi Jews), Palachi, op. cit. (f. 88 col. 3), recommends: 'He whose children do not live should call the name of his son *Ben-Ṣiyyon* [that is, son of Zion] and he will live'. This is indicated, Palachi asserts, in Psalm 125 which declares that those who trust in the Lord shall be 'as mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever' and in Psalm 133 which proclaims: 'upon the mountains of Zion: for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore'.

NAMING PATTERNS AMONG IRAQI JEWS

²² Recently a young man, the first-born of his family, began to use his paternal grandfather's name after the grandfather's death. Although until then he had been known by a different Hebrew forename, he maintained that his proper name had always been the same as his grandfather's.

²³ Lauterbach (op. cit., p. 66) suggests that it should be no surprise to find that customs might vary 'from time to time and from place to place since these customs are governed by certain ideas and beliefs which not all people share in the same degree'. He suggests that both the Ashkenazi and the (Mediterranean) Sephardi naming traditions are based on superstitions, relating to the Angel of Death. Apparently the Sephardim sought to confuse the heavenly agent who would 'refrain from taking the life of the person sentenced to death by mistaking him for another person by the same name against whom no decree of death was issued' (p. 51), whereas the Ashkenazim were not prepared to take such risks. 'They would not rely on the hope that the Angel of Death would make a mistake in favour of the living' (p. 51). Although some of my informants who were prepared to name after the living described those who were not prepared to do so as 'superstitious', no one interviewed, whatever their stated practice, made any reference to angels to explain the dangers that a choice of name could entail.

²⁴ Abramovitch and Bilu, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

HOLOCAUST, ANTISEMITISM, AND THE JEWS OF FRANCE

Jonathan Webber
(Review Article)

RICHARD I. COHEN, *The Burden of Conscience: French Jewish Leadership during the Holocaust*, xii + 237 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1987, \$27.50.

HENRY H. WEINBERG, *The Myth of the Jew in France 1967-1982*, with a Preface by Robert Wistrich, xvi + 165 pp., Mosaic Press, Oakville, New York, and London, 1987, \$12.95 (\$19.95 hardback).

EARLY in 1939, on the eve of the 150th anniversary of the French Revolution, there was much patriotic talk in France amongst members of the Jewish leadership of the 'historic symbiosis' that the Jewish community had achieved. And yet, as Richard Cohen's important study of this leadership during the Holocaust period clearly demonstrates, there was in reality not one community but two: native French Jews, committed to the Revolutionary definition of Jewishness (enshrined in the Law of Emancipation of 1791) as a matter of private, religious identification, and the much more sizeable body of immigrant Jews, largely remote from the optimistic belief in the eternal goodness of France and preferring rather to concentrate their cultural energies on retaining the organizational value-systems and group identities they had brought with them, principally from Eastern Europe. The leadership, then, relied on a discourse and a perception of reality that did not properly comprehend the true scope of the Jewish society that it was supposedly directing, with fateful consequences as regards the adequacy of its response to the enforced marginalization and ghettoization of the Jews during the war, and the murder of some 78,000 of them. The existence of pluralism in Jewish identity has become a characteristic feature of modern Jewish life; and yet it was tragically and ironically mocked by the events. Pressures came not only from the outside — by antisemites relying on unitary stereotypes, as well as by the Nazis who wanted to see a single Jewish organization embracing all of France's Jews, so as better to control and deport them to Auschwitz — but also from the inside, by the Jewish leadership, whose obsessive need constantly to re-state the importance of the boundary separating

native from immigrant Jew may in some sense have been well founded but constituted nevertheless a totally inappropriate ethic in the circumstances of the Holocaust.

In 1989, on the eve of the 200th anniversary of the Revolution, the prospects do not look good for the survival in France of an uncritical application of the traditional emancipation ideal or of a leadership of notables (symbolized by the Rothschild hegemony in communal affairs) still identified, or thought to be identified, with that ideal. It is not only that a new interest in the French Jewish experience of the Holocaust has shown up the apparent conceptual and moral poverty of the 'legalistic' view of Jewish rights and Jewish identity that the leaders of the time relied upon in dealing with the German and Vichy authorities. Such a view, Cohen argues, was the product of generations of emancipation; and from the first moment of the wartime crisis, it turned out to be a social and political dead-end. But the difficulty goes much further, if we are to believe Henry Weinberg's survey, *The Myth of the Jew in France 1967-1982*. According to Weinberg, French Jewry during the past two decades has come under enormous pressure from anti-Zionism and violent antisemitism, and to an extent that is without parallel in Jewish communities in other Western countries.

In introducing his material, Weinberg cites a report of the Institute of Jewish Affairs in London that between 1980 and 1985 there were 154 anti-Jewish acts of violence in 16 countries in Europe, of which 62 per cent occurred in France. Thus it is that the Revolutionary promise now lies deeply buried in a Jewish consciousness now quite differently preoccupied — or so Weinberg would maintain. The French Jewish community today, as in 1939, is by no means homogeneous sociologically, given the massive immigrations from North Africa from the early 1960s; but this time the immigrants knew something of French culture before their arrival, and moreover possessed an assertively religious and traditional understanding of their identity as Jews. Little wonder, then, that the considerable shock caused in particular by the bomb in rue Copernic in 1980, and the attack on Goldenberg's restaurant in the rue des Rosiers in 1982, has brought writers such as Shmuel Trigano and Bernard-Henri Lévy to propose a rethinking of emancipation as a Jewish socio-political objective. Judaism, they say, is not some sort of echo of the Western, Christian ethic; on the contrary, that is a distortion generated by emancipation, which has in effect brought about the alienation of Jews from their true identity. And that, they believe, can be sought only within the traditional Jewish sources, which possess a political ethic perfectly relevant to the modern world. Indeed, the remarkable surge in the past few years of university courses in Jewish studies, of lectures and debates at Jewish community centres, of a revival of interest in Yiddish and Sephardic traditions, and of a return to religious Judaism (particularly through the influence of the

ANTISEMITISM IN FRANCE

Lubavitch Hasidim), together attest to a considerable transformation of mentality which will eventually dislodge the values if not also the personnel of the old leadership.

Weinberg's theory is to link these recent developments in the ethnic self-awareness of French Jews to a combination of two factors: the 'liberating spirit' brought on by Israel's remarkable military victory during the Six-Day War of 1967, and the appalling antisemitic pressures in the French environment that grew up from that time. Rue Copernic may have been a turning-point for many; but it did not come out of the blue. Since 1967, a hostile government policy towards Israel, often expressing itself in the language of classical antisemitism, has enabled anti-Jewish prejudice to thrive and even appear as intellectually fashionable; hence the quasi-Messianic optimism of those Jews who had long believed in their being 'truly French' has been severely shaken. What is emerging in its stead is a new Jewish sense of particularism, even militancy, culturally self-confident in the *droit à la différence*, versions of which are to be found today elsewhere in France also — amongst the regionalist philosophies of Bretons, Occitans, and the like.

Implicit in all this, of course, is a new understanding of what it means to be a 'native' in France, and a re-specification of the relevance of being labelled as an 'immigrant'. Part of antisemitic discourse is to think xenophobically of all Jews as foreigners, and indeed one of the principal elements of the *Statut des Juifs* enacted by the Vichy government in October 1940 in order to deprive Jews of their ordinary civil rights was to nullify any difference between native and immigrant Jews — much to the chagrin of the native Jews, imbued with their own sense of 'Frenchness' — though by another law, published on the same day, foreign Jews were specifically singled out as being subject to internment. The contradiction, and especially its simultaneity, is instructive. The criterion of antisemitism, as reflected in Weinberg's case-material for the contemporary period, yields innumerable contradictions and lacks formal coherence: it is simultaneously both overt and covert, both actual and latent, a product of both the left wing and the right wing; it derives from the outside but has its echoes inside the Jewish community also (for example, the Jewish radical left). Weinberg in effect suggests that a good part of the contemporary Jewish response to this antisemitism that he sees as so widespread in France is thus to withdraw from traditional liberalism and seek Jewish pride and self-expression elsewhere. Given the complexity of antisemitism as a phenomenon, it is perhaps not surprising that he does not actually argue a sociological case that would explain quite how the dynamics of Jewish social or cultural change should be specifically connected with the existence of antisemitism; all he does is to note their temporal coincidence and assume a connection.

Cohen, however, avoids the question altogether, by simply declaring that his study of the wartime leadership excludes primary attention to the Jewish resistance (albeit 'clearly worthy of a separate study with different premises', as he says), and by ignoring the subject of Jewish religious or cultural life during the war. His account of the leadership's response to Nazi and collaborationist French pressure merely reveals how committed the leaders usually were to direct, 'legalistic' argumentation with the authorities over the justice of the measures taken, appealing to such notions as the provisions of the armistice agreement, the traditions of French public order, and of course the tenets of the French Revolution. At that time (just as in our own day) it was the immigrant Jews who found it hard to grasp the ideological or cultural necessity, let alone the practicality, of 'negotiating', and on such terms; the reality, as in many other occupied countries during the war, was that foreign Jews were often rounded up for deportation before the local Jewish citizens were.

Cohen's book is a meticulously researched and annotated history of the wartime leadership, formally organized in November 1941 as the *Union Générale des Israélites de France*. Its principal role was to oversee Jewish welfare needs (especially at Drancy); it never became a resistance organization, though it neither sanctioned nor condemned resistance activities undertaken by its members. Cohen takes issue with some of the main criticisms that have been levelled against it in the past, and argues that the *Union* was more opportunistic than callous in its attitude to immigrant Jews, that it contained within itself contrasting currents of opinion and diverse activities that make it difficult to generalize about its overall role (particularly with respect to the very different experience of the war in the north and south of France), and that although it often appeared to lack vision or political acumen it did succeed in negotiating the release of Jews from internment on some occasions and never served the Germans in the sense of becoming an arm of the Gestapo.

Cohen's main preoccupation throughout is to describe the day-to-day details of the *Union's* decision-making, which he says was characterized by 'extensive soul-searching', and he certainly has tried here to avoid being judgemental in any simplistic way. But his references to its 'moral precepts' are left largely unexplained, and the sarcasm embedded in his view of the *Union's* 'legalistic mentality' leads one eventually to wonder whether — even if the overall approach was misguided — there might not have been, after all, some fundamental human dignity, some reassertion of normalcy within the murderous chaos of the time, that these leaders were trying to grasp at. Surely the very notion of welfare, even within Drancy, implies the attempt to restore a semblance of normal values. Cohen does correctly raise certain *ad hoc* problems of interpretation, for instance whether the

ANTISEMITISM IN FRANCE

'timidity' of leaders during a particular crisis implied compliance, lack of interest in the case at hand, or just simply fatigue from overwork; but his narrative is in general so closely tied to the archival linearities on which it is based (and often too uncritically read by him) that he occasionally fails to notice changes in committee policy recorded in the minutes because of his broader reluctance to stand back from the material. The reader seeking to cross-check issues of this kind is not aided by the index provided, which is exceptionally austere.

Weinberg's review of the current position of the Jews in France is quite differently arranged. He offers a substantial range of evidence (excellently indexed), culled from newspapers and the writings of prominent intellectuals, in support of his thesis that the antisemitic myth of the Jew — a 'constant of French passions', in Theodor Zeldin's phrase — is still today a central obsession in France. The key events here include not only remarks by politicians: for example, De Gaulle's pronouncement after the Six-Day War that the Jews (*sic*) were an 'elite', 'domineering', and 'self-assured' people; or the remark by the then Prime Minister, Raymond Barre, after the attack in rue Copernic that the terrorists 'intended to kill Jews but wound up killing innocent Frenchmen (*sic*)' instead. Weinberg also reports the consistent anti-Jewish policy of *Le Monde*, and he describes how the screening of the American television series 'Holocaust' gave rise not to reactions sympathetic to Jews, but the reverse: that it was Jewish propaganda, that it indicated that Jews were still seeking revenge, that Jews must have been partly responsible, that Jews were not assimilating to French life, and that the presentation of the Holocaust as unique drew attention away from other genocidal horrors, notably that inflicted on the Palestinians. Weinberg concludes, with regard to the 'Holocaust' episode, that such reactions 'confirmed the persistence of a malicious, endemic ill-will towards Jews in France'.

The difficulty with all this is its one-sidedness. France is not an antisemitic state; and despite the undoubted influence in that country of the intelligentsia, and the importance of *Le Monde* in setting certain moral and cultural standards amongst them, it is not clear that popular feeling can be adequately measured by such criteria alone. Indeed, Weinberg himself notes (on p. 31 and p. 45) that De Gaulle was aware of a general sympathy for Israel amongst the French, though he supplies no evidence indicating how such a conclusion was reached. Although he cites with approval the reservations which Theodor Adorno and Gunnar Myrdal have expressed about the value of opinion polls — a criticism particularly relevant for anyone seeking to measure something as elusive as antisemitic prejudice among the general population — Weinberg calmly goes on to quote the results of opinion polls in at least four places later on in his book when they support the existence of antisemitism or some other line of his argument. He does

nöt, in other words, give fair attention to any alternative view. Nor does he offer the reader any other insight into his research method. The horizon is scanned for antisemitism — in the writings of the New Right, for example, even where, as he concedes, overt antisemitism is difficult to detect; hence his recourse to latent antisemitism, so as to fill out the picture. Were the 62 per cent of anti-Jewish acts of violence in France committed by Frenchmen? This we are not told (thus the guilt on this point is by association, hardly an acceptable scholarly procedure). Given Weinberg's mono-thematic account, and his emphasis on the extensive literary legacy of the antisemitic theorists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, some readers might begin to find it difficult to understand how it could have been at all possible that the old Revolutionary ideal was ever taken seriously by the ordinary native Jews of France, let alone exercised such a grip on them.

At stake here is a tighter formulation of the concept of leadership, and an indication of the integrated relationship it may have with ordinary daily realities and values. Raymond Aron wrote that De Gaulle lifted the post-Holocaust taboo on the expression of antisemitism, and made it *salonfähig*. Quite so; *salonfähig*, not necessarily part of popular culture. Jewish Marxists, for example, are often particularly zealous to display their 'liberal' credentials by supporting the Palestinian cause (the left has long been one of the shortest routes for Jews to gain what they regard as social acceptance), but the point is that they probably lack any profound understanding of the Jewish ethos, by definition. Despite their articulateness and visibility in the salon world of the intelligentsia, in what sense can they properly be held up as 'typical', let alone as leaders? The case has to be made, rather than merely let the facts — important and fascinating as they may be — speak for themselves. The notion of leadership in the Jewish world is treated in much of the literature as diffusely as many other quasi-sociological concepts that are used to specify Jewish realities — antisemitism, for example, or assimilation, or (for the Holocaust period) 'legalism'. These concepts are far too broad, as well as being ill-defined, to account for the considerable diversity in modern Jewish life, or to convey a suitable sense of the ethnographic complexities, subtleties, and, indeed, internal contradictions. Who, in wartime France, was an 'immigrant' Jew? Was it a matter of citizenship, or date of naturalization? Or was it simply an 'antisemitic' category (that is, with shifting criteria)? Cohen never explicitly tackles the general issue, and his wavering — also left largely unexplained — between 'Jewish community' and 'Jewish communities' equally points to the problematic nature of the social unit whose leadership he is examining. The very notion of community, in the post-Emancipation context, is by no means self-evident; and in the case of the Jews of France, as is clear both from the wartime period and the present day, the racial, the ethnic, the

ANTISEMITISM IN FRANCE

religious, or the political definitions all have competing respective resonances around which many different loyalties — and social cleavages — have come into existence. 'Jesus was a Palestinian refugee', according to a French Catholic weekly cited by Weinberg. How many echoes can be detected in that one?

PATTERNS OF PREJUDICE

A journal devoted to the study of causes and manifestations of racial, religious and ethnic discrimination and prejudice with particular reference to antisemitism.

Articles in recent issues include:

- Leonard Dinnerstein** Antisemitism in the USA Today
Werner Bergmann Attitudes towards Jews in West Germany
Michael Banton Optimism and Pessimism about Racial Relations
Margaret Brearley Hitler and Wagner
Bryan Cheyette H. G. Wells and the Jews
Michael Billig The Rhetoric of Conspiracy Theory
Brian Klug Black-Jewish Tensions in Chicago
plus Reports, Legal Developments, Reviews, Bibliography

TO: THE INSTITUTE OF JEWISH AFFAIRS, 11 Hertford Street,
London W1Y 7DX OR WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS, 501 Madison
Avenue, New York, NY 10022, USA

Annual subscription: individuals £18/\$30, institutions £25/\$40

I wish to subscribe to PATTERNS OF PREJUDICE for one year

I enclose cheque/money order for _____

Please bill me

Name _____

Address _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Subscriptions run from January to December of each year. Subscribers in USA,
Canada and other overseas countries receive their journals by bulk airmail (ASP).

THE POLITICS OF STATELESSNESS: JEWISH REFUGEES IN AUSTRIA AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Aviel Roshwald

(*Review Article*)

THOMAS ALBRICH, *Exodus durch Oesterreich — Die Juedischen Fluechtlinge, 1945-1948* (Exodus through Austria — The Jewish Refugees, 1945-1948), vol. 1 in *Innsbrucker Forschungen zur Zeitgeschichte* (General editor, Rolf Steininger), 265 pp. + 32 pages of photographs, Haymon Verlag, Innsbruck, 1987, 295 Austrian Schillings.

AT a time of considerable strain between Austria and world Jewry over the related issues of Austrian co-responsibility for German crimes in the Second World War, and the continued legacy of antisemitism in that country, Thomas Albrich's book sounds an unusual note of critical self-appraisal on the part of an Austrian historian.

The focus of Albrich's study can be termed the politics of statelessness. The book examines the plight of the Jewish Displaced Persons (DPs) and refugees who passed through Austria in the years between the end of the war and the establishment in 1948 of the State of Israel. Coming as it did during the period when Britain's confrontation with the Zionist movement over Palestine reached its climax, the problem of Jewish refugees in war-ravaged Europe was politicized from the very beginning. Nowhere was this more the case than in Austria, which was a major transit point for tens of thousands of Jews desperately seeking to make their way illegally from eastern and central Europe to Italy, and on by sea to Palestine.

At the end of the war, Austria — like Germany — had been partitioned into four occupation zones by the main Allied powers (France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States). Each of these countries had very different approaches to the DP problem in Europe; of particular interest to Albrich is the Anglo-American divergence over the issue of the emigration of Holocaust survivors to

Palestine. This controversy clearly manifested itself in the contrasting policies pursued by the American and British occupation authorities towards Jewish refugees in Austria.

In August 1945, a report was issued by Earl Harrison, the U.S. representative on the Vienna-based Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees (IGCR), which called for two measures which the British found highly unpalatable. One was the recognition of Jewish refugees as an ethnically distinct group who should be housed in separate camps and given a large degree of autonomy in administering their affairs. The second proposal was that 100,000 DPs be permitted to emigrate to Palestine forthwith. The latter recommendation was publicly endorsed by President Truman himself, and reiterated in the 1946 report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry which had investigated the problem of the Jewish refugees in connection with the issue of Palestine.

In the wake of the British rejection of the Harrison Report's proposals and of the Committee of Inquiry's recommendations, the American and British occupation authorities in Austria proceeded to pursue contradictory policies in their respective zones. Although, in practice, the British found it convenient to house Jewish DPs in separate camps for the most part, they granted very little self-rule to the residents. Jewish relief organizations — such as the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and Britain's Jewish Committee for Relief Abroad (JCRA) — were not given the opportunity to provide refugees in the British zone with aid until the end of 1945, and were never allowed to play an active role in the social organization of the camps, as they did in the American zone.

Albrich describes the camps in the American zone as resembling prototype kibbutzim. By organizing agricultural cultivation and vocational training, the Jewish relief agencies helped the inhabitants to develop a sense of focus in their lives and a feeling that their efforts were preparing them for their future in Palestine. By contrast, in the British zone, the efforts of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) to organize similar activities failed because of the distrust of the refugees, who suspected the projects of being little more than devices aimed at integrating Jewish labour into the Austrian economic reconstruction effort. (By mid-1946, the Jewish refugees in the British zone had been concentrated in one camp at Admont, where a much greater degree of self-rule was finally allowed to develop.)

The gap between American and British perspectives on the problem of the Jewish refugees manifested itself most clearly in their differing emigration policies. The United States authorities tended to turn a blind eye to the efforts of the *Haganah's* underground immigration organization, the *Brichah*, to smuggle Jews out of Austria and on to Palestine. Indeed, active co-operation in this effort was offered at times by the American authorities, if only in order to speed the evacuation of

JEWISH REFUGEES IN POST-WAR AUSTRIA

Jews from an already overcrowded network of DP camps. The British, of course, employed all available methods to block illegal immigration.

The DP problem was compounded in 1946 by the flight of tens of thousands of Jews from resurgent antisemitic violence in Poland and, to a lesser extent, Hungary. While illegal passage through the British occupation zone in Austria had been reduced to a minimum by improved frontier controls, the movement through the other zones continued unimpeded during most of 1946. The British therefore resorted to diplomatic pressure and propaganda in their efforts to stem the tide of illegal migration. The Jews, London argued, were fleeing their eastern European homelands in response to Zionist propaganda, and this movement of population was being facilitated by the Communist authorities as a means of smuggling agents into the Middle East in order further to disrupt political stability in that region. Indeed, at one point the British even considered the possibility of deporting Jewish refugees back to the countries they were fleeing from. (The idea was dropped for fear of the likely public outcry it would provoke, and on account of the unco-operativeness of the Soviets and their client regimes in Poland and Hungary.) The British continued publicly to deny that legitimate fear of antisemitic violence lay at the root of the Jewish flight from Poland even after the Kielce pogrom of July 1946, in which 42 of the town's 200 Holocaust survivors were massacred by their Christian neighbours. Indeed, Albrich argues that the British authorities' own attitude towards the problems of the Jewish refugees rapidly became coloured by antisemitic prejudices.

Tensions between Jewish refugees and the British authorities reached a climax in the summer and autumn of 1947, when the *Irgun* set off several bombs at British military installations in Austria (with no serious casualties resulting). The British responded with regular, unannounced searches of the main Jewish refugee camp at Admont, including one ordeal during which residents were confined to their rooms for 12 uninterrupted hours. Although *Irgun* cells did exist within the camp, none of its residents was implicated in the bombings; but the relations between the British and the Jewish refugees now resembled those between an occupying army and a hostile, subject population.

Not many objective observers were swayed by Britain's arguments regarding the groundlessness of Jewish disquiet over conditions in eastern Europe. Practical sanctions proved much more successful in convincing other countries to help block Jewish passage to the Holy Land. Particularly effective was a change of policy in mid-1946 regarding the disposition of would-be Jewish immigrants intercepted off the coast of Palestine. Whereas previously these hapless refugees had been consigned to British concentration camps in Cyprus, the new policy was to return as many of them as possible to the countries from which their boats had originated.

The impact of this innovation became immediately apparent in the case of Italy. Before the summer of 1946, the Italian authorities had seen no reason to prevent the *Brichah* from smuggling Jews across the Austro-Italian frontier and then placing them on ships bound for Palestine; but when shiploads of refugees began to return to Italian harbours under British naval escort, Italy's frontier controls were tightened.

This increased the population pressure on the French occupation zone in the Tyrol. Earlier, the French had been only too glad to vent their outrage over British connivance at their ouster from Syria and Lebanon, by facilitating the passage of Jews through their occupation zone in Austria and on to the Middle East. But from mid-1946 on, they felt obliged to take active measures to block the transit of Jewish refugees from the American occupation zone into the Tyrol.

This, in turn, placed the Americans in a very tight spot, with 1,000 Jews a day pouring into their zone (largely from the Soviet sector) at the height of the population movement. Although the U.S. authorities never closed their borders to refugees, they did join the British in pressing the Soviets to impose some controls. Whether in response to Western pressure, or owing to some Machiavellian considerations of their own, the Communist regimes did begin restricting Jewish emigration in late 1946 (although one more major wave was to issue forth from Rumania in 1947).

In this context, it should be pointed out that the inclusion in Albrich's book of an overall map of Austria, delineating the various post-war occupation zones, would have gone a long way towards clarifying the fundamental geopolitics of the refugee problem in that country.

The picture Albrich paints of British policy towards the problem of the Jewish refugees is one of a cynical, manipulative attitude compounded by an undercurrent of antisemitism. The policies of the other countries involved were narrow-minded at best (France and Italy) and ruthless at worst (as in the case of Poland's Communist regime, which is presented as having allowed the Kielce pogrom to be carried out as a pretext for cracking down on the anti-Communist opposition elements which had planned it).

As indicated at the beginning of this review, Austria itself is not spared Albrich's scathing criticism. He makes it clear that antisemitic sentiment never lay far beneath the surface of public pronouncements and popular recrimination. To some extent, this was a predictable reaction of a war-ravaged people towards refugees enjoying a higher than average daily calorie intake (owing in part to the efforts of the Jewish relief organizations). But Albrich points out that Jews became the main target of local resentment against refugees even though they never actually constituted more than 10 per cent of the total number of

JEWISH REFUGEES IN POST-WAR AUSTRIA

DPs, refugees, and other foreigners in post-war Austria. (It might be pointed out, however, that the aid provided by Jewish relief organizations did ensure that Jewish refugees on the whole suffered from a slightly less miserable standard of living than their non-Jewish counterparts.)

The rise in antisemitic sentiment in areas with high concentrations of refugees manifested itself most clearly in the case of the demonstration at Bad Ischl in the American zone. Organized by local Communists as a protest against stringent food-rationing policies, the gathering rapidly degenerated into an antisemitic riot outside a hostel used to house Jewish refugees. Slogans such as 'Out with the "tourists"!' and 'The Jews are getting fat!' were chanted by the crowd, and the Austrian police had to intervene when stones were hurled at the building's windows.

Albrich bluntly argues that what lay at the root of such manifestations was the preconceived anti-Jewish prejudice with which Austrian popular culture was suffused. Moreover, in the aftermath of Germany's defeat in the war, the Austrians tended to present themselves piously as victims of, rather than participants in, Nazi crimes. Such self-distancing from Germany was at least indirectly encouraged by the Allied authorities in their eagerness to forestall any future resurgence of pan-German nationalism, and it was naturally cultivated by the local political leadership. Of course, such a self-image served to free the Austrian population from any sense of moral responsibility towards the survivors of the Holocaust.

Tragically, the leaders of the country's various political parties acquiesced in, and even encouraged, antisemitic sentiment rather than seeking to combat it. Thus, the Communist Party saw antisemitism as a convenient means of rallying opinion against the Western occupation powers which had allowed the refugees to enter Austria in the first place; the leaders of the conservative Austrian People's Party were only too glad to play on popular prejudices by making veiled references to Jewish refugees as black-marketeers who were exploiting Austria's occupied status by fattening themselves at the country's expense; even the Socialists were careful to withhold all comment when the ring-leaders of the Bad Ischl riot were brought to trial by the American authorities, while all other parties openly sided with the defendants.

Drawing on a fairly wide array of sources from the archives of Jewish relief organizations and Britain's Public Record Office, Albrich has written a meticulously detailed account of a complex topic. What is missing is the broader picture. The reader would like to gain a better sense of how the situation in Austria was related to the wider problems of refugee policy in Europe, particularly in Germany — where much larger numbers of DPs found themselves under the control of the same four powers which occupied Austria. While the policy of the British

AVIEL ROSHWALD

military administration in Austria is closely examined, the analysis of the decision-making process in Whitehall remains sketchy. And no serious attempt is made even to guess at what may have lain behind the Soviet Union's seemingly erratic policy towards the refugee problem.

As a final point, it might be noted that Albrich's references to political factionalism within the Jewish refugee camps (especially in the wake of the *Irgun's* brief 1947 anti-British bombing campaign in Austria) suggest an interesting possible topic for further research: the sociology and politics of the DP camps.

BOOK REVIEWS

RICHARD COCKETT, *Twilight of Truth: Chamberlain, Appeasement and the Manipulation of the Press*, x + 229 pp., Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1989, £18.95.

The role of the British press in the 'appeasement' period is not a new topic; F. R. Gannon examined it in his *The British Press and Germany, 1936-1939* (Oxford, 1971) in respect of attitudes towards Nazi Germany. In respect of *The Times*, the most important newspaper from the point of view of the ruling elites in Britain and abroad (though not from that of circulation), much inside information has been given in the fourth and fifth volumes of that paper's own official history.

Dr Cockett's book, which is based on a London University doctoral thesis, has a different focus. He examines the relations between ministers and Whitehall departments deriving from the 'lobby' system as well as the activities of press departments, in particular those of the powerful Downing Street press officer George Steward. Steward was originally appointed under the 1929-31 Labour government but he served Chamberlain with undiminished zeal and even engaged in clandestine relations with the German Embassy, pursuing some appeasement trails of his own. Dr Cockett shows how these existing mechanisms were reinforced by direct ministerial relations with editors and, in Chamberlain's case, above all with newspaper proprietors. The result was that material likely to harm Chamberlain's policies — such as despatches from foreign correspondents unfavourable to Hitler or Mussolini — was kept out of the papers. After the contrary voice of the Foreign Office press department (then under the direction of Robert Vansittart) was silenced, there appeared to be almost complete unanimity in the press in favour of Neville Chamberlain and his policy. Only Arthur Mann of *The Yorkshire Post*, an essentially regional newspaper with a small circulation, opposed 'appeasement' against his proprietor's wishes and in the end paid for his resistance with his job.

Dr Cockett challenges the view that the willingness of the proprietors to go along with Chamberlain derived from their fears about commercial advertisement revenue if a blacker outlook was offered their readers. He maintains that such financial considerations affected only the weaker papers, such as the *Daily Herald* and the *News Chronicle*, where the Cadbury interest was anyhow faithful to the pacifism and the hostility to armaments of the British Liberal tradition. It was this ideological element that also explains the fidelity to 'appeasement' of the *Manchester Guardian* editor, W. P. Crozier. The press lords

themselves (Rothermere, Kemsley, Beaverbrook and, with occasional doubts, Camrose and Lord Astor) supported the Prime Minister out of a mixture of party loyalty and an unwillingness to allow the country to seem divided. Dr Cockett rightly points out that Beaverbrook's predominant role in denying that dangers existed was subsequently covered up because he was spared in the wartime polemic, *Guilty Men*, which set the tone of much subsequent writing, and was in fact the work of two journalists later employed by Beaverbrook himself, Michael Foot and the late Frank Owen — and by that time, Beaverbrook's cardinal role in Churchill's government made such criticism untimely in any event.

Dr Cockett's main object is to show that this manipulation of the press prevented Chamberlain and his inner cabinet (Halifax and Hoare in particular) from knowing what the country really thought about their policies; there was in his view a closed circuit: ministers told the press what to say (or not to say) and reading what they themselves inspired, believed it to be *vox populi*. The difficulty is to know what genuine public opinion was about Chamberlain's policy; opinion polls were in their infancy and their evidence cannot be pressed too far. By-elections give a mixed answer — Oxford one way, Bridgewater another. And if in the press itself contrary currents can sometimes be traced they arise, as the author admits, from the attempts at counter-manipulation by Churchill and Vansittart, the latter acting for part of the time through the Foreign Office's own press department. There is one source which Dr Cockett does not call to aid — nor can one blame him, given the limitations of time for a Ph.D. thesis — and that is the activities of local parties, primarily Conservative, which were made such good use of by Mr S. Ball in his *Baldwin and the Conservative Party, 1929-1931* (London, 1988).

A secondary theme which is of some interest is that of the activities of Chamberlain's friend, Sir Joseph Ball, who has for some time flitted in and out of histories of the period. It is now evident that one thing he did was to take control of an old-established weekly, *Truth*, which discredited Chamberlain's opponents, notably Churchill, and which did not hesitate to use more or less overt antisemitic arguments against opponents of 'appeasement' as well as against Hore-Belisha, when Chamberlain decided to get rid of him at the beginning of 1940. After Churchill took office, *Truth* made itself notorious for its defence of the pro-Nazi individuals subject to detention under the wartime security regulations. Although we have no evidence that Chamberlain was directly involved with this part of Ball's activities, only that he appreciated what appeared in *Truth*, one must agree with Dr Cockett that it is 'impossible to escape the conclusion that Chamberlain was fully aware of the paper's policy even if he did not directly orchestrate it himself' (p. 11). Because Léon Blum was a Jew and because overt

BOOK REVIEWS

antisemitism was much more part of the French political debate, the role of antisemitism in French 'appeasement' is much easier to appreciate. Antisemitism as a factor in British 'appeasement', or rather in respect of its supporters outside government, would be a subject worth pursuing.

MAX BELOFF

MOSHE DAVIS, ed., *With Eyes Toward Zion — Volume II. Themes and Sources in the Archives of the United States, Great Britain, Turkey and Israel. Second International Scholars Colloquium on America-Holy Land Studies*, xxvi + 410 pp., Praeger Publishers, New York, Westport (Ct.), and London, 1986, n.p.

The second volume of *With Eyes Toward Zion* is ably edited by Professor Moshe Davis, who is also the author of an introductory contribution in which he states (p. xxii):

The overarching purpose of America-Holy Land Studies is to engage contemporary scholars, students, and the wider public in the rediscovery of the Holy Land. On a substantive level, this research and teaching project is designed to study the nature and continuity of the relationship between the American people and the Holy Land in historical context, from colonial times to the birth of the State of Israel in 1948. Methodologically, the subject of America and the Holy Land is emerging as a unified field in which American history meets the Jewish and Christian traditions.

The first chapter of the present volume is by David S. Landes who writes about visitors to the Holy Land in the nineteenth century. It is followed by Vivian D. Lipman's scholarly report on 'America-Holy Land Material in British Archives, 1820-1930'; he tells us that the 'first substantive presence by Americans in the Holy Land began with the missionaries' and that references to them 'abound in the records of British organizations active in the area' (p. 26). They were followed by American colonists and then by surveyors and archaeologists. In 1914, the Standard Oil Company began negotiations to acquire from an Arab syndicate oil concessions in the Jordan valley and succeeded in spite of attempts by the British government to persuade a British company to make a more attractive offer. Three years later, President Wilson and leaders of American Jewry were consulted about the proposed Balfour Declaration and when Britain became the mandatory power in Palestine, the United States government claimed that American citizens were still entitled to the status which foreign nationals had in the Ottoman Empire under the Capitulations.

The next chapter, by Israel Finestein, is entitled 'Early and Middle 19th-Century British Opinion on the Restoration of the Jews: Contrasts with America' and is followed by Lionel E. Kochan's 'Jewish

BOOK REVIEWS

Restoration to Zion: Christian Attitudes in Britain in the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries — Comparative Approach'. Ruth Kark then writes about 'Annual Reports of United States Consuls in the Holy Land as a Source for the Study of 19th-Century Eretz Israel'; a report of the Jerusalem consul in October 1891 is of special interest because it gives details (with what is claimed to be 'approximate exactness') about the numbers of Jews in the cities and towns of Palestine as well as in 'eleven agricultural colonies', and concludes 'that 42,000 to 43,000 represents pretty nearly the number of Jews in Palestine' (p. 171); and because it states categorically that 'Turkey has a right to say who shall settle upon her soil' and that people should not be 'ignorant of two great facts, 1. that Palestine is not ready for the Jews and 2. that the Jews are not ready for Palestine' (p. 173).

Yehoshua Ben-Arieh then reports on 'Nineteenth-Century Hebrew Periodicals as a Source for America-Holy Land Studies'. He notes that 'Hebrew periodicals began in Europe long before they appeared in Palestine' and that *Ha-Meassef* was 'the first modern Hebrew journal to appear in a number of German towns between 1783 and 1811' (p. 181). It was only in 1863 that the first issue of *Ha-Levanon*, a monthly, appeared in Jerusalem, followed five months later by *Havatzelet*; by 1882 a further three Hebrew periodicals were printed in the city. It is fascinating to learn that a century ago a controversy arose about whether Russian Jewish immigrants should be encouraged to settle in the Holy Land or should be helped to go to America. The *Alliance Israélite Universelle* argued that several colonization attempts had failed in Palestine and that a further failure would only serve to swell the ranks of the large numbers of destitute Jews in the Holy Land dependent on charity. Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, however, forcefully disagreed in the first Hebrew article he published after he came to Jerusalem; it was entitled 'Eretz Israel or America' and appeared in *Havatzelet* in October 1881. In an impassioned appeal in favour of the Holy Land, he said (pp. 203-04):

Why should Jews settle in a strange land very far from their place of birth, when the land of their fathers waits that they come to partake of its goodness? True, the land is not fertile at present, because no one is there to cultivate it . . . if the land was barren and desolate until now, it does not mean that if cultivated it will not provide its workers with a livelihood . . . It is as good as America, because, like Eretz Israel, the soil of America will not bear fruit unless farmed through great labor and effort.

The next chapter is by Menahem Kaufman and reports on America-Holy Land source material in Israeli archives; it is followed by Michael Brown's contribution which is entitled 'Some Early 19th-Century Holy Land "Travelers" to America: Sources and Contexts' but which curiously says little about the early nineteenth century. Indeed, the author states on p. 235 that his 'paper examines

BOOK REVIEWS

the experiences of a select group of such Holy Land "travelers" at an unusual time: the Zionist leaders expelled from the Holy Land by the Turks — as well as some who fled on their own — during World War I, who spent the years of their exile in the United States. The period is an unusual one, because it marks the beginning of a high-profile American presence in the Holy Land'.

The next three sections are entitled 'The Ottoman Dimension', 'The Meaning of the Holy Land in American Religious Life and Thought', and 'The Pedagogical Dimension'; and finally Robert T. Handy provides the 'Afterword' and makes several constructive suggestions for further research. This is an instructive and stimulating collection of papers for both the scholar and the general reader.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

DANIEL ELAZAR and CHAIM KALCHHEIM, eds., *Local Government in Israel*, xxxiv + 426 pp., University Press of America in association with the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs/Center for Jewish Community Studies, Lanham, New York, and London, 1988, \$23.75 (library binding, \$37.50).

While Israel's unusual political system has called forth a large volume of writing both inside and outside the country, interest in its local government has been confined to specialists. In point of fact, Israel in common with many other countries has found it increasingly difficult to attain the right balance between the need for services to be provided locally and the fact that central government increasingly intervenes to set standards, and uses its financial muscle to effect its will. The Israeli establishment itself has recognized the importance of the problem; there were two official commissions of inquiry, in 1961–64 and in 1975, both concentrating on finance. The Sandor Commission in 1976–80 had a more general remit; its conclusions are summarized as Appendix 1 of the present volume.

The intention of the editors has been to bring up to date (the book went to press in July 1987) what can be known and documented about both the structure and the functioning of local government in Israel, and to highlight its problems. The authors of the various contributions are either experienced in the issues or academics, or both. They have gone about their task with care and patience and with the necessary assistance from the authorities, particularly the Interior Ministry, the lead ministry in relations between central and local government. Whenever possible, they have produced statistical tables to enable their arguments to be checked. Unfortunately, the index is very poor.

How to organize such a daunting subject with so many overlapping elements has obviously been a difficult problem, and we have to rely upon Professor Elazar's introductory chapter in Part 1, 'The Local

BOOK REVIEWS

Dimension in Israeli Government and Politics', for pointers as to what is significant in what follows. There are fairly obvious lines of demarcation in the individual chapters. Dr Kalchheim deals with the division of functions between central government and the local authorities and their inter-relationships while Professor Efraim Torgovnik's concern is with 'Urban Policy' — a specific feature of the Israeli scene in view of the dominant role of urbanization in respect both of the three cities existing at the time of the founding of the State in 1948 (Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv, and Haifa) and of the new towns designed to provide for the immigration that subsequently took place and to contribute to the country's security.

More specialized topics are dealt with in Part II; local elections by Dr Giora Goldberg, the legal structure from which the powers of local authorities emanate by Dr Israel Peled, and administrative issues by Dr Jacob Reveny. Part III consists of the longest single chapter, that by Dr Arye Hecht on the financing of local authorities; it throws light incidentally on the reasons why though Arab towns and villages can make use of the same structure of local government — and proper attention is given to their role throughout — their very different sociological make-up and cultural traditions cause them to be less active in using public machinery for development or welfare purposes. Much local government legislation is inevitably of an enabling rather than a mandatory character.

It is obvious that the authors have done their best to be not merely politically impartial but as impersonal as possible. The result is that the book's utility may be limited to those already in some respect involved in the matter in Israel itself. For what is omitted is any sense of what it feels like to be a part of the local government structure, whether rural or urban, and what kind of people and with what motivation the structure recruits either as permanent officials or as elected mayors and councillors. Obviously, there are difficulties in dealing with individuals still actively engaged in public affairs but one suspects that a first-rate journalist or even a writer of interpretative fiction — for example, Amos Oz — might have given this ponderous tome a life it does not possess. By trying to be 'scientific', social science is often its own worst enemy. However, it must be admitted that those with the time and determination to get through this volume will have their interest and curiosity awakened from time to time and that quite significant conclusions emerge.

The institutions of the State of Israel derive in general from those set up within the mandatory framework and clearly reflect British (and, in some instances, Turkish) practice, but there are others which derive from the structure of the Zionist movement. Of the latter, the party system and the election of the Knesset by the fatal device of proportional representation are the most obvious. Local government is

BOOK REVIEWS

the best example of the former. Indeed, much legislation dealing with local government has involved only modifications of a basic structure inherited by the State on its foundation.

What has happened in the intervening decades has partially reinforced, but also substantially altered, the functioning of local government. The different departments at the centre — Interior, Education, Labour and Social Welfare, and Health — are not only difficult to co-ordinate but often the fiefs of particular parties which makes the task of co-ordination even harder. On the other hand, local government on the British model was originally given general responsibilities resting on the councils as a whole.

From the administrative point of view, the main change has been the adoption in 1975 from other models of local government of the device of a directly elected mayor as chief executive, and not merely — as in Britain — the formal and symbolic embodiment of municipal status. Individual councillors have become specialized executives. The political consequences of this change have been even more important than the administrative ones and perhaps go in the opposite direction. It has weakened the position of the main national parties where local government is concerned and given greater voice to locally-based parties and groups. It has also begun to be an alternative path to promotion at the national level, particularly where the new development towns and their largely Sephardi populations are concerned. None of the founding fathers of the State or others in the first generation of national leadership made their way through work in local government. Teddy Kollek is perhaps the only leading Israeli whose reputation depends upon his work in that field, and Jerusalem is always a special case. But with time bringing the inevitable change of guard, the next generation of leaders may have a different outlook, particularly if the menace to the nation's security is somehow lifted and if therefore social issues become more prominent. Changes of this kind would also increase the influence of urban elements and diminish that of kibbutz members whose leading role has been a function of their relationship to the armed forces.

A second change has been the widening of functions from those assigned in respect of services to more general concern with development and hence with investment and employment. No doubt, mayors who go down this path are responding to local demands upon them, and to political pressures. The governors of American states now actively canvass the world for investments in their own states, which it was certainly not the intention of the Constitution that they should. And with local revenues a declining proportion of the money Israeli councils have to spend, this has produced some problems.

On the financial balance, it is worth noting that Israel took the step — at which successive British governments have balked — of relieving

BOOK REVIEWS

local authorities of one heavy element in their expenditure, the salaries of teachers, by making them employees of central government. Nevertheless, as Dr Hecht points out, 'the financing of local authorities appears to be an issue in constant crisis' (p. 359). It is perhaps comforting to know that Israel, unique in almost every respect, here shares the common experience of almost every country, large or small, capitalist or socialist, developed or developing.

MAX BELOFF

YEHOSEFAT HARKABI, *Israel's Fateful Decisions*, xvi + 246 pp., I. B. Tauris, 110 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8JA, 1988, £14.95.

To read in March 1989 a book published in July 1988 and presumably completed earlier in that year, before the full extent of the *Intifada* (the uprising in the occupied territories) was clear, is to be impressed by the prescience as well as the depth of understanding of the author where Israel's current dilemmas are concerned. To have been head of military intelligence and subsequently a professor of International Relations has made for an unusual combination of sensitivity and learning. Too much polemic about the Arab-Israeli conflict, whether in Israel or in the Diaspora, has been rendered shallow by the too abstract picture the speakers entertain of the Arab enemies. Professor Harkabi, familiar with the language and culture of the 'other side', can view the conflict as one in which the uncertainties are present there also. He can place the Palestinian issue within the wider context of the Arab national movement and its frustrations and examine the extent to which something less than total victory can now be accepted by the current Arab leadership. He can also distinguish, as is proper in a professional student of international relations, between ideal objectives and a working programme. What the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) ultimately hopes to achieve may in his view be less relevant than what is likely to be possible here and now.

But the lack of an ability to distinguish between the attainable and the visionary, which was so conspicuous an element in Arab politics, especially in Palestine from the beginning of the British Mandate onwards, now seems to have been transferred to the Israelis, as represented by the Shamir government. The main burden of Professor Harkabi's book is to examine why that government appears so immune to considerations of Israel's long-term survival as a Jewish State by ignoring the demographic aspect, as is implied in holding on to the West Bank and Gaza. To annex these territories is to ensure an Arab majority in an enlarged Israel. To continue to occupy the territories without annexing them is to face obloquy both at home and abroad, as the cost becomes ever more apparent; to annex and expel the Arab

BOOK REVIEWS

population would lose Israel international support without which its survival is impossible.

Others have put forward this position as starkly. But Professor Harkabi goes further and investigates how the domination of the theory that only will-power matters — what he calls the Jabotinsky-Begin tradition — set in after the Six-Day War of 1967, with the defeat of the more pragmatic down-to-earth Ben-Gurion style. Although the catastrophe in terms of national cohesiveness of the war in Lebanon should have shown the vanity of such notions, they have persisted to the country's detriment. Although it is true that the Sephardi element in the population has been an important source of electoral strength for the Likud, the author attaches more importance to the newly-militant fundamentalism which in its religious manifestations fills him, as a believing Jew, with something akin to revulsion and this religious input — also a barrier to good relations with the Diaspora and the Gentile world — is fortified by the misrepresentation of the history of the founding of the State with the relics of the Irgun and Lehi taking credit for the winning of independence, though their true record suggests something very different.

How opinion in Israel is moving, how far it will have moved before this review appears, no one can say. But it seems unlikely that Professor Harkabi's main contention will have been disproved. Time is not, as Mr Shamir seems to think, on Israel's side. There is no way in which its external or internal position can improve — economically or spiritually — while the burden of occupation is sustained by a bewildered army of young conscripts. One does not need to be an Arabophile to wish the occupation at an end. It is Israel itself that suffers meanwhile. To write a book of this kind in Jerusalem cannot have been easy. Rarely have the fruits of scholarship been set out with the same mixture of restrained passion and intellectual elegance. It is a remarkable achievement.

MAX BELOFF

MEIR HOVAV, compiler, *Index to Series 1-13 of the Publications of the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry in the Home of the President of Israel* (in Hebrew), xl + 153 pp. Series edited by Moshe Davis, The Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1987, n.p.

Since 1963, the successive presidents of Israel have been participants in, and hosts to, the Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry. The Study Circle was established and conducted by the indefatigable Professor Moshe Davis of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University, an Institute which he founded. That Institute has published 81 Hebrew brochures which constitute a treasury of reflection and

BOOK REVIEWS

information on the contemporary Jewish world. It is only necessary to note the names of such scholars as Shlomo Avineri, Roberto Bachi, Hayyim Cohen, Shmuel Ettinger, Aharon Lichtenstein, Nathan Rotenstreich, and Ephraim Urbach to appreciate the value of the contributions.

The compiler of the Index gives a penetrating analysis of the intellectual trends revealed by the titles of the lectures while Professor Davis looks back to the origins of the Study Circle. Interesting excerpts are presented from the remarks of Presidents Shazar, Katzir, Navon, and Herzog. The volume puts before readers and librarians the record of a whole whose 81 parts might be neglected individually.

This well-wrought, useful Index also constitutes a tribute to the good judgement and devotion of Professor Moshe Davis and his colleagues at the Institute of Contemporary Jewry.

LLOYD P. GARTNER

ALISON KAHN, *Listen While I Tell You: A Story of the Jews of St John's, Newfoundland* (no. 35 of the 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.

Newfoundland has had a small Jewish community, of eastern European origin, for nearly a century; but a community so small that it is virtually unnoticed in works of reference. It was studied for two years in the 1980s by Alison Kahn, then a graduate student in folklore. Her account is not historiography but owes more to the methods of sociology or of social anthropology. There is a fair amount of personal details: how she came to interview people and her reactions to what they told her. The major part of the book, some 160 pages, consists of what appears to be verbatim tape-recording of interviews. The author states that she 'took editorial liberties to eliminate the vagaries of speech inappropriate to the printed medium and clarify where necessary' (p. 12). The book, however, contains many passages such as this: 'And the big city is not like here. They get up like six in the morning. By time he showers and irons his pants every morning, everything else, you know?' (p. 37). So one wonders what must have been eliminated as not up to this standard. On the other hand, it must be admitted that there are advantages in having a verbatim record of conversations, as in the case of a married man who began peddling with an imperfect knowledge of the English language. He knocked on a door in a remote outpost to ask if he could lodge for the night and when a young girl opened it, he said: 'Can I sleep with you?' He was surprised when she slammed the door in his face. 'And then an older lady came around, and he said the same thing. "Oh", she said, "yes, come in, my

BOOK REVIEWS

son". 'Cause an old lady had more sense'. Thus, the method does succeed in reproducing atmosphere and presenting authentic testimony but this reviewer thinks the length excessive; 160 pages of it tend to overwhelm the reader and make it difficult to disentangle the essential features of the story. While there is a chapter of conclusions (called 'Coda'), it is too brief and imprecise to give an adequate summing up.

The first recorded Jewish immigrant came from Russia in the 1890s via England and New York and opened a dry goods store in Water Street, the main shopping street of downtown St John's, the island's capital. He was followed by a number of others who peddled through the rural area in the manner reminiscent of eighteenth-century England or nineteenth-century America. The first recorded settler, Israel Perlin, ran a wholesale store which supplied the peddlers — just as Zender Falmouth did in the Cornish port of Falmouth in the mid-eighteenth century. From peddling the immigrants rose, again as in provincial England, to open shops; they did so in St John's or the outports until 'every other store on Water Street was a Jewish name' (p. 171). The community grew but never to any considerable size: estimates were 64 in St John's in 1921, 140 in 1934, with another 75 outside St John's. The Second World War brought servicemen on temporary assignments, some of whom stayed on, and there were also some refugees from Europe, and migrants from the Maritime Provinces of Canada and from Montreal. The community grew in wealth and replaced its synagogue in the business area with a modern building in the suburbs in 1959; but it then began to erode. Young people sought education or professional training and wider career opportunities outside Newfoundland, always economically a poor environment. Or they were encouraged by the older generation to go elsewhere in the hope that they would find Jewish spouses; if they remained they were likely to marry out, because of the free mixing with the non-Jewish neighbours and the lack of choice of Jewish partners. While other Jews came in, they tended to be professionals or business people on temporary appointments who left Newfoundland after a few years; so the prognosis is virtual disappearance of the community within a generation or so.

The quality of Jewish life emerges from the interviews. The older generation came from an orthodox eastern European background but found Sabbath observance impracticable for storekeepers where Saturday was the principal shopping day; and kashrut likewise, although there were at least intermittent arrangements for kosher meat. With one or two exceptions, they did not know enough to be able to provide more than the most routine religious functions; nor could they afford to import religious leadership for more than short terms. The result was what was described as 'unobservant orthodoxy' in the

BOOK REVIEWS

synagogue. 'What beliefs they held were often grounded in fear and fundamentalism. These they "taught" to their children and, when successful, instilled in them the reflexes but not the reasons' (p. 171). The author describes the nostalgia with which a sense of Jewish togetherness and community in the past is looked back to; stress is put on attendance at the synagogue on Friday nights as the one way of keeping the community going. The main principle is to belong to a community and support it. Those who did this are praised while those who opt out are condemned. One might identify this as an example of Jewish survivalism in the Western world: it seems little more.

With the inadequacy of records, the method of oral history may have been the only effective way to reconstruct the history of the Jews of Newfoundland; and Alison Kahn has certainly been untiring in carrying out interviews not only in Newfoundland but also in the United States and Canada, where members of the Newfoundland community have moved. But one wonders whether the method selected could not have been more concisely used with abbreviation of the interviews and more historical background; and, indeed, whether a community of such modest size and character would have merited an article rather than a book.

V. D. LIPMAN

IRVING M. ZEITLIN, *Jesus and the Judaism of His Time*, ix + 204 pp., Polity Press, Oxford, 1988, £25.00.

There must be times when Jews wish they had been less influential. Certainly, if I were a Jew I would contemplate the three major offshoots of Judaism — Christianity, Islam, and Communism — with at best bemused ambivalence. All three have at one time or another sought the destruction of the Jewish people. So far as Christianity is concerned, it appears to a Jew both as very familiar and very strange, only marginally different and yet light years away. This makes interpretations of Christianity by Jews both penetrating and perilous, at one moment illuminating what is hidden by familiarity, the next moment mistranslating wildly.

What is interesting about this new book by Irving Zeitlin is the surplus of illumination rather than mistranslation. It has a clearly apologetic purpose and yet is conspicuously irenic and fair. Indeed, a Christian used to the destructive scepticism of Christian scholars would encounter here a living and consistent 'historical Jesus' such as is conspicuously absent from much Christian scholarship. Professor Zeitlin rejects the manner in which 'form criticism' fragments the Sermon on the Mount. He also agrees with those, like John Robinson, who respect the historicity of much of John's Gospel, in spite of the

BOOK REVIEWS

misleading and hostile way it refers in a blanket manner to 'the people of the Jews'.

Where Zeitlin most obviously sticks his neck out is in embracing the argument in favour of the priority of Matthew rather than Mark, as advanced, for example, by William R. Farmer. The usual and dominant view sees Matthew as 'rejudaising', whereas Zeitlin sees Matthew as being correctly Jewish and close to source. For Zeitlin, Mark is a later *digression* towards the Gentile world and Matthew in no way a *regression* to Jewishness. This is an area where it is almost impossible to avoid apologetic. For Pauline Christians, Matthew is embarrassingly legalistic, whereas for Irving Zeitlin he is like Jesus: a pious and proper Jew.

Of course, the apologetic motives of contemporary scholars are all mixed up with the rival apologetics in the original Jewish-Christian movement, and their varying attitudes towards the Romans, which entered into the editing and presentation of the original documents themselves. The chief rivalry turned around the Paulines and the group that formed in Jerusalem around Peter and James the brother of Jesus. The chief issue concerned the law, and how far Gentiles were to be expected to obey it, especially in dietary matters. Zeitlin believes that the more conservative Jerusalem group was closer to the viewpoint of Jesus himself, until Peter had his vision concerning the cleanliness of every kind of food. Indeed, Peter need not have had any such vision had he already known of Jesus' abrogation of the law as recounted by Mark.

Zeitlin gives a judicious account of Jesus' positive relation to the law on such matters as divorce and the Sabbath, and argues that his emphases were consonant with the Judaism of his time, even though quite distinctive. Jesus sought to probe to the ground and intention of the law, and to the inner intention of the heart, rather than to rest in details and externals. He also spoke with personal authority. But in Zeitlin's view he did not intend to set up a new law or abrogate the old, and his twin 'summary of the law' was precisely a summary, not a reduction. One of the ways in which he diverged from most of his contemporaries was in seeking the 'lost' sheep of Israel, meaning by that the ignorant and the 'sinners'. This is a point also emphasized by E. Sanders in his recent work on Jesus and Judaism.

It seems to me that Zeitlin is entirely correct in his demolition of S. G. F. Brandon's representation of Jesus as a zealot, whose zealotry was suppressed in favour of apolitical peaceableness to avoid Roman suspicion and persecution. Brandon's account is surely one of those which turn large theses on small slivers of evidence at the expense of the whole tenor of the gospels. Almost certainly, Jesus felt with those who had had more than enough of the spiral of violence. On the other hand, his triumphal entry into Jerusalem and cleansing of the Temple were sufficiently reminiscent of the ambitions associated with political

BOOK REVIEWS

messiahs for suspicion of trouble-making and sedition to enter into his trial and execution.

The issue of just how Jesus interpreted his mission and 'the Kingdom' leads to the question of his own self-understanding. Clearly he both identified with the role of Messiah and yet reinterpreted it in a way contrary to popular expectation. Here I find Zeitlin's discussion of the crucial moment when Peter 'confessed' his recognition of Jesus' identity rather unsatisfactory. I do not think Jesus' question, 'Whom do ye say that I am?', implies his own uncertainty. C. G. Montefiore, for example, provides the kind of wide-ranging discussion which this topic really requires. On the other hand, Zeitlin faithfully and sympathetically renders an account of Jesus' 'familiarity' with his 'heavenly father' and is cautiously willing to use the Johannine evidence of how the intimacy and confidence of that relationship provoked his hearers.

Of course, the parting of the ways comes with Paul's understanding of Jesus. Zeitlin argues that Paul was thoroughly Jewish in his view of the world, and in his moral demands. He goes on to say that Paul broke not only with Judaism but with monotheism in his understanding of 'the Christ', and irretrievably damaged the 'fence of the law' by his emphasis on faith. The difference between a Jew and a Christian is thus framed once again in terms of the legitimacy and rightness of the Pauline understanding of the person and work of Jesus.

The object of Zeitlin's book is to eliminate any notion that the teachings of Judaism and of Jesus were antithetical. In that object he seems to me to have succeeded, and to have presented his case with scholarly circumspection and exemplary fairness of mind. However, I do not think such a rapprochement logically excludes the core of the Pauline understanding: that all depends, to use the American expression, on your 'faith position'.

DAVID MARTIN

CHRONICLE

There were nearly 19,000 (18,965) Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union in 1988, more than double the number (8,155) in 1987. Only 2,166 of those who emigrated in 1988 went to Israel; most of the others chose the United States. About 40 per cent of those who went to America settled in New York. In January 1989, 2,796 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union; only 205 went to Israel. In the following month, out of a total of 2,425, 308 went to Israel.

Last January, the Jewish Agency announced a \$100 million programme to improve the conditions for the absorption of immigrants in Israel and planned to build 2,000 new homes in the following 18 months. The cost of absorbing Soviet Jews in America in 1988 has been estimated at \$48 million, of which some \$14 million was provided by refugee relief funds of the United States government.

*

It was reported last January that the newly-established Joint Committee for the Preservation of the Jewish Heritage in the Soviet Union has signed an agreement with the Soviet authorities to allow Jews from abroad to take part in the revival of Jewish life in the U.S.S.R., to encourage large-scale religious tourism, and to restore Jewish cemeteries. The main Jewish organizations involved are Agudath Israel of America; the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada; and the Belz, Bobov, Lubavitch, Satmar, and Vishnitz Hassidic groups.

*

The chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs of the Soviet Union agreed to allow the baking of strictly-kasher matzot for the 1989 Passover in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and Minsk, with the flour to be imported and baked under the supervision of the Chief Rabbi of Moscow and of members of the Hassidic Lubavitch small synagogue in a Moscow suburb.

*

A Centre for Judaic Studies has been established in Moscow; it is part of the Academy of World Civilization at the Soviet Academy of Sciences. The ceremonial opening of the Centre was shown on Soviet television. In Leningrad, a Jewish religious and cultural centre will be established on the premises of the Leningrad synagogue.

*

The Shlomo Mikhoels Jewish Cultural Centre was officially opened last February in Moscow. (Shlomo Mikhoels was a famous Jewish actor who was killed in 1948 during a Stalinist purge.) It is planned that the Centre will have

CHRONICLE

a library of Jewish books, films on Jewish history and culture, and an art gallery. Seminars, lectures, Hebrew classes, and concerts will also be held in the building. Mr Isi Leibler, vice-president of the World Jewish Congress and chairman of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, affixed a mezuzah to the doorpost of the Centre at the opening ceremony. Messages of congratulations were received from the Prime Minister of Israel, the British Prime Minister, and the Secretary of State of the United States.

*

The monthly Yiddish publication, *Sovietish Heimland*, which is printed in Moscow, announced that after an interval of about 50 years, several state schools in Moscow, the Ukraine, Latvia, and Moldavia, will teach Yiddish. Yiddish is already being taught in Lithuanian state schools in the present academic year. The head of the Chief Directorate of Education and his deputy are reported to have stated to *Sovietish Heimland* that if there is sufficient demand, Yiddish courses for adults would also be provided and that since there was a shortage of Yiddish teachers, some would be recruited from among the graduates of the Teachers' Pedagogical Institute and the teachers' training college in Birobidjan, the 'Jewish Autonomous Region'.

*

A symposium on the topic: 'German-Jewish Symbiosis? Fiction and Reality' was held last March in Munich, under the auspices of the Council of Europe; the European Foundation for the Sciences, Arts and Culture; B'nai B'rith; the European Jewish Congress; and the city of Munich. About a hundred scholars from Europe, Israel, and the United States attended the meeting.

*

In 1984, the city council of Darmstadt, in West Germany, decided to build a new synagogue and community centre for its Jewish citizens, who were using an old villa as a prayer house. Five Jewish architects were asked to submit designs for the building, which was to be erected in the city centre, and after one of the designs was chosen, it was decided to inaugurate the building on the fiftieth anniversary of *Kristallnacht*, on 9 November 1988. The new synagogue has twelve stained glass windows, subscribed for by the citizens of Darmstadt.

*

The 1989 Council of Europe Museum Prize has been awarded to Amsterdam's Jewish Historical Museum. The museum was reopened in 1987 in the reconstructed Ashkenazi synagogue complex, in a part of the city which used to be the centre of the Jewish district.

*

A major exhibition on the 'Jews in Yugoslavia' was mounted in 1988 in Zagreb. It then was shown in Sarajevo and later in Belgrade, where it was opened last February by the mayor of Belgrade and by the president of the Federation of Yugoslav Jewish communities. The organizers of the exhibition hope to bring it to Jerusalem, London, and New York. The exhibition is in

CHRONICLE

23 sections and depicts the history of the Jews in Yugoslavia from the earliest archaeological evidence, portrays their ceremonies, festivals, and architecture, and their contribution to the arts. Jews lived in the country since Roman times; the community numbered 75,000 before the Nazi invasion in 1941 but only 15,000 survived the Holocaust. More than half of the survivors emigrated to Israel.

*

The Second International Seminar on Jewish Art was held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem last year. It was attended by a large number of curators, scholars, collectors, and art dealers from 22 countries. The director of the University's Center for Jewish Art stated that there are about 300 Jewish museums in the world; that figure does not include many small museums and exhibits on Jewish themes which can be found in some synagogues and community centres. He hoped that all Jewish museums would send detailed information to his Center in Jerusalem about their exhibits in order to computerize the data and to publish a comprehensive directory.

*

A three-day conference on 'The Economic History of the Jews of Hungary' was held at the Hebrew University last year. It was attended by the president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the director of the Institute of Historical Sciences of that Academy, and by the chief rabbi of Budapest.

*

An international conference on the history and culture of Polish Jews was held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. It was organized by that university's Center for Research on Polish Jewry and the Institute for Polish Jewish Studies of Oxford. About 80 Polish scholars attended the conference and others came from Canada, France, Great Britain, West Germany, and the United States.

*

The Sixth International Congress of Quantum Chemistry was held at the Hebrew University last year. The congress takes place every three years and in 1988 it was sponsored by the International Academy of Quantum Molecular Sciences and the Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, with the support of the Baron Edmond de Rothschild Foundation of Paris. About 200 scientists from 15 countries attended the congress; several of them came from eastern European countries and six from the People's Republic of China.

*

The Second World Dental Conference was held at the Hebrew University last year. The Autumn 1988 issue of *Hebrew University News* states '... over 800 dentists and dental scientists from universities, research institutes and clinical settings in 17 countries gathered for the week-long event ... The main subjects of the scientific sessions included: aesthetics in dentistry, the use of lasers in dentistry, dental implants, caries and periodontal disease, traumatology, and

CHRONICLE

the treatment of handicapped children. A pre-conference symposium dealt with oral rehabilitation'.

*

The Winter 1989 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that the Tenth International Free Electron Laser Conference was held last year at Tel Aviv University. The five-day meeting was attended by some 120 scientists from 10 countries who discussed recent developments in the field of free electron lasers. One of the scientists was the president of the University of Electronic Sciences and Technology of China, in Szechwan; another was a professor at the Polish Academy of Sciences Laboratory, in Warsaw. *Tel Aviv University News* comments that the very high-powered free electron lasers 'are expected to have numerous applications in medicine, industry, and scientific research'.

*

The October 1988 Report of the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization states that six workshops were organized by the Center at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in July 1988. They were attended 'by some 120 scholars from abroad, in addition to about 50 from Israel. They came from Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Hungary, Italy, Mexico, Poland, South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Venezuela'. The Report lists the six workshops as follows: 'Contemporary Jewish Civilization, on Teaching the Holocaust: Concept and Resources'; 'Hebrew Language, on the Study of Hebrew Texts from the Sources: Bible, Midrash and Agada'; 'Jewish History: Sephardic and Oriental Studies, on North African Jewry and Eretz Israel'; 'Jewish Philosophy, From Modernity to Contemporaneity'; 'Jewish Political Studies, on The Influence of the Jewish Political Tradition on the State of Israel'; and 'Modern Hebrew Literature in Translation, on Contemporary Israeli Fiction: Seeing Itself and Others'.

The Report of the International Center also states that a Judaic Studies Centre has been established in Shanghai and that a 'Free Chair on Israeli Thought and Culture' was inaugurated in August 1988 at the National University of La Plata, in Argentina.

*

The Yad Vashem Charitable Trust (Woburn House, London WC1 0EP) published in 1988 a booklet entitled *The Holocaust in History and Today. Three Public Lectures*. It is introduced by Martin Gilbert. The three lectures are 'The Holocaust in Jewish Theology' by Jonathan Sacks, 'The Impact of the Holocaust on the Diaspora' by Steven Zipperstein, and 'What Happened to Emancipation?' by Israel Finestein. The chairman of the Yad Vashem Committee of the UK states in a Preface that his Committee's 'main aim is to advance the study and awareness in the United Kingdom of the roots of antisemitism and the origins and history of the Holocaust, in order to help transmit the records and the lessons to future generations'.

*

The Autumn 1988 issue of *Patterns of Prejudice*, a quarterly published in London by the Institute of Jewish Affairs, reports that an anti-discrimination

CHRONICLE

law came into force in August 1988 in the Republic of Argentina. The first Article of that law states: 'Whoever arbitrarily prevents, obstructs, restrains or in any way undermines the full exercise on an equal basis of the fundamental rights and prerogatives recognized by the National Constitution, will be obliged, at the request of the injured party, to desist from the discriminatory act or to cease carrying it out and to pay damages for the moral and material prejudice caused. This article is considered particularly to apply to discriminatory acts or omissions carried out for such reasons as race, religion, nationality, conviction, political or trade-union opinion, sex, economic position, social status or physical characteristics'.

Articles 2 and 3 specify the penalties what will be incurred. Article 2 states: 'Any offence punishable under the Penal Code or its by-laws will be increased by a minimum of one third and a maximum of half the penal scale applicable to such offence if it is committed for the persecution or because of the hatred of a race, religion or nationality, or for the purpose of destroying in whole or in part any national, ethnic, racial or religious group. In no case may the legal maximum for the type of punishment in question be exceeded'. Article 3 warns offenders: 'Those who participate in an organisation or spread propaganda based on ideas or theories of superiority of one race or of a group of persons of a particular religion, ethnic origin or colour for the purpose of justifying or promoting racial or religious discrimination in any form will be punished by a prison term of one month to three years. The same punishment will be incurred by anyone who in whatever way encourages or incites to persecution or hatred of a person or group of persons for reasons of their race, religion, nationality or political views.'

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Chevalier, Yves, *L'Antisémitisme. Le Juif comme bouc émissaire*, with a preface by François Bourricaud, 464 pp., Les éditions du cerf, Paris, 1988, n.p.
- Cowen, Anne and Roger, *Victorian Jews Through British Eyes*, xxviii + 196 pp., published for The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization by Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986, £25.00.
- Elazar, Daniel J., ed., *The New Jewish Politics* (American Jewish Policy Agenda Resource Book No. 1), vii + 76 pp., University Press of America for The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs/Center for Jewish Community Studies, Lanham, New York, and London, 1988, \$8.25 (hardback, \$17.50).
- Kimmerling, Baruch, ed., *The Israeli State and Society: Boundaries and Frontiers* (SUNY Series in Israeli Studies), a publication of the Center for Study and Documentation of Israeli Society of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, ix + 301 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 1989, \$49.50 (paperback, \$15.95).
- Kraemer, David, ed., *The Jewish Family: Metaphor and Memory*, xi + 248 pp., Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, 1989, \$19.50.
- Kushner, Tony, *The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society During the Second World War*, ix + 257 pp., Manchester University Press (distributed in the U.S.A. and Canada by St Martin's Press), Manchester and New York, 1989, £29.95.
- Rapoport, Louis, *Confrontations: Israeli Life in the Year of the Uprising*, xi + 240 pp., Quinlan Press, Boston, 1988 (distributed in Great Britain by Gazelle Book Services, Queen Square, Lancaster), \$16.95 or £12.50.
- Samuel, Rinna, *A History of Israel. The birth, growth and development of today's Jewish state*, 192 pp., Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1989, £18.95.
- Stanislawski, Michael, *For Whom Do I Toll? Judah Leib Gordon and the Crisis of Russian Jewry*, ix + 263 pp., Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1988, £26.00.
- Wegner, Judith Romney, *Chattel or Person? The Status of Women in the Mishnah*, xii + 267 pp., Oxford University Press, 1988, New York and Oxford, 1988, £19.50.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

- LEVITT, Cyril; Ph.D. Professor of Sociology, McMaster University. Chief Publications: *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties*, 1984 and co-author of *The Riot at Christie Pits*, 1987.
- ROSHWALD, Aviel; Ph.D. Visiting lecturer at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. Author of 'The Spears Mission in the Levant: 1941-44' in *The Historical Journal*, vol. 29, no. 4, 1986.
- SAMRA, Myer; Ph.D. Assistant Senior Legal Officer with the Department of Family and Community Services in New South Wales. Chief Publications: 'Yisrael Rhammana: Kinship and Community Among Jews of Iraqi Origin in Sydney, Australia' in *Menorah. Australian Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, June 1988 and 'The Early History of the New South Wales Association of Sephardim with Particular Reference to the Role Played by Rabbi Dr Israel Porush' in Raymond Apple, ed., *Yismach Yisrael. Historical Essays to Honour Rabbi Dr Israel Porush OBE on his Eightieth Birthday*, 1988.
- SHAFFIR, William; Ph.D. Professor of Sociology, McMaster University. Chief Publications: *Life in a Religious Community: The Lubavitcher Chassidim in Montreal*, 1974; co-editor, *Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research*, 1980; co-editor, *The Canadian Jewish Mosaic*, 1981; co-author, 'The Professionalization of Medical Students: Developing Competence and a Cloak of Competence', *Symbolic Interaction*, vol. 1, no. 1, Fall, 1977; and 'Ritual Evaluation of Competence: The Hidden Curriculum of Professionalization in an Innovative Medical School Program', *Work and Occupations*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1982.
- 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 Newsletter)*, 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.



*The
Middle East
Journal*

**The oldest and most influential American journal
dealing with the contemporary Middle East**

Each issue includes

- Trenchant articles on the history and politics of the Middle East
- A unique chronology of events by subject and country that has been maintained continuously since 1947
- The most comprehensive and up-to-date reviews of Middle East books available anywhere
- A bibliography of periodical literature that is a standard resource for scholars around the world

Subscription rates

Individuals, **\$25.00**, Institutions, **\$35.00**
Foreign surface post, **\$9.50**

Available from

**INDIANA
UNIVERSITY PRESS**

10th & Morton Streets, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

new community

A journal of research and policy on ethnic relations

Editor: Malcolm Cross

Published for the Commission for Racial Equality, *New Community* is a quarterly academic journal on the research and policy related aspects of race and ethnic relations, racial inequality, racism, ethnicity, migration and related topics. While mainly British in its orientation, the journal also carries comparative material on the US and other European countries. As well as issues of general interest, the forthcoming volume will include theme issues on *Race and inner city policy* and on *Race and the Health Services*.

New Community publishes biannual reports on the latest developments in the fields of law, politics, social services, employment, education and housing and urban policy. The journal also includes an extensive book review section.

Subscriptions to Volume 15, the issues of which are published in October 1988 and January, February and July 1989, are available for:

Institutions £16.00
Individuals £12.00

New Community Subscriptions
Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations
University of Warwick
Coventry
CV4 7AL



published by the Commission for Racial Equality

SOVIET JEWISH AFFAIRS

The only scholarly journal in English on the position of Jews in the USSR and Eastern Europe.

SOVIET JEWISH AFFAIRS is important for everyone concerned with: Soviet studies, international relations, human rights, Jewish affairs.

SJA is published 3 times a year with 104 pages. Articles and documents in issues published in 1988 include:

Mordechai Altshuler 'Who Are the "Refuseniks?" A Statistical and Demographic Analysis'

R. O. Freedman 'Relations Between the USSR and Israel Since the Accession of Gorbachev'

Zvi Gitelman 'Gorbachev's Reforms and the Future of Soviet Jewry'

Sidney Heitman 'The Third Soviet Emigration'

Documents ' "Pamyat": An Appeal to the Russian People'

'Birobidzhan: Behind the Facade'

Josephine Woll 'Rybakov's *Children of the Arbat*'

Also book reviews and annotations and a Chronicle of Events in each issue.

TO: THE INSTITUTE OF JEWISH AFFAIRS, 11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX OR c/o WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS, 501 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA

Annual subscription: (from January 1989):

individuals £18/\$30, institutions £25/\$40

I wish to subscribe to SOVIET JEWISH AFFAIRS for one year

I enclose cheque/money order for _____

Please bill me

Name _____

Address _____

Signature _____ Date _____