

**TWO JEWISH COMMUNITIES (MIGRANTS AND NATIVE-BORN) IN THREE EUROPEAN
CITIES: ETHNIC IDENTITY, INTEGRATION AND ACCULTURATION**

Summary Report¹

By Lilach Lev Ari²³

Introduction

The present study focused on Jews residing in Europe in three cities: Paris, Brussels and Antwerp – native-born and immigrants. The estimated number of European Jews is about 1.4 million, of which 27% are immigrants (Graham, 2018). The largest Jewish population in Europe resides in France (the third in the world); the number of Jews in France is 460,000. Paris was chosen as the metropolis for this study since more than half of the Jews in France, 277,000 reside there (DellaPergola, 2017). Another state included in this study is Belgium, with 30,000 people; it constitutes the 16th largest Jewish population in the world: About half live in Antwerp, and the rest – in Brussels. A very small number of Jews reside in other cities in Belgium. The size of Belgian Jews is relatively stable, due to the growth of the ultra-orthodox community in Antwerp and the location of the European Union center in Brussels, which attracts Jews from other states (Ben Rafael, 2017; DellaPrergola, 2017).

¹This research was supported by Kantor Center for the study of contemporary European Jewry at Tel Aviv university and Oranim College of Education

² Lilach Lev Ari is an associate professor at Oranim College of Education and research fellow at Kantor Center, Tel Aviv University

³ I would like to thank Dr. Haim Fireberg and by Mr. Adrian Gruszniewski (both from the Kantor Center at theTel Aviv University) for thier help and advice in the intial stages of this research.

The three cities in Western Europe were chosen for study since they are geographically adjacent and are characterized by their ethnically diverse Jewish communities: Secular, religious, ultra orthodox, Ashkenazi, Sephardi, native-born and migrants. In addition, Paris is a metropolis and a 'world city', Brussels is the center of the European Union and Antwerp is unique due to its changing variety of Jewish population, including the growing ultra orthodox population. The three cities are somewhat similar in their culture, (the usage of French is common, particularly in two of them), but also unique, as they belong to different nation states. The three cities are characterized by long standing Jewish history of dynamic interactions with local non-Jewish populations, both native-born and migrant, until the present day.

While migration has always played an integral role in the structuration of the Jewish people, over the past several decades Jewish migration has evolved and become even more comprehensive and dynamic. The history of the Jewish people in the modern era abounds in significant migration processes that have resulted in radical changes in its demographic and cultural centers. Most Jews in the world today (76%) dwell in fifteen to seventeen metropolitan regions and large cities (Rebhun and Lev Ari, 2011; DellaPergola, 2017).

More specifically, around 54% of the world's Jews assemble in five metropolises and their satellite towns: Tel Aviv, New York, Jerusalem, Los Angeles and Haifa. More than two-thirds of the rest of the Jews in the world live in another six metropolitan centers, all in the United States. Once Paris was among them, but its ranking has dropped due to Jewish emigration from the city. Paris is included in the third circle, in which 76% of the world's Jews dwell in 17 metropolitan centers, each with at least 100,000 Jewish residents (DellaPergola, 2017). These metropolises are also known as "world cities" or "global

cities." World cities are global centers of business, politics, culture and technology. They are the product of global post-industrial economy and constitute the core of post-industrial society (Kipnis, 2009).

Jews constitute an ethnic minority group, i.e., a group whose culture and religion is differentiated from that of the majority and that is liable to experience relative discrimination (Macionis, 1999; Yiftachel, 2001). For this reason Jews, both native-born and migrants, prefer to live in large cities that provide opportunities for economic, social and cultural development. Within these cities Jews tend to dwell in neighborhoods that are appropriate to their socioeconomic status, provide nearby employment opportunities, facilitate social mobility and offer religious services and Jewish organizations (DellaPergola, 2011; DellaPergola and Sheskin, 2015).

In contrast to the many studies focusing on the Jews of the United States, both native-born residents and migrants (e.g., Cohen and Kelman, 2010; Cohen and Gold, 1997; DellaPergola, 2000; Lev Ari, 2008; Rebhun and Lev Ari, 2011), very few studies have examined assimilation, culture and Jewish-ethnic identity among the Jews of Europe. This is the focus of my research.

The need for research on the Jews of Western and Central Europe has become even more urgent today in view of the current wave of anti-Semitism accompanied by numerous violent incidents, including barbaric murders. Jews in France, Belgium and other European countries are expressing increasing interest in immigrating to Israel or to other destinations. The database of the Kantor Center for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry and its many studies of anti-Semitism supply evidence of the state of anti-Semitism

as well as reports of hundreds of cases of violence, mostly in France and Britain, but also in other urban centers located in Germany and Belgium (Kantor Center, 2018). Another important reason for conducting a study among contemporary European Jews is that unlike in Israel and the United States, where the largest, most organized and strongest Jewish communities reside, characterized by more homogeneity, ethnic identity and identification as well as integration in the larger society, in Europe Jewish communities are scattered in various nation states. In a recent study conducted among Jews in Europe from eight countries, including France and Belgium (as well as Britain, Italy, Germany, Hungary, Latvia and Sweden), it has been reported that Jewish identity was more diverse than common among them (Graham, 2018). Each group of Jews live in a nation country with different culture, language and policy towards minorities and immigrants. Thus, a profound study in two geographically adjacent nation states that mostly speak the same language (French) might enlarge the scope regarding similarity and difference between Jewish communities and sub-ethnicities among them.

The research described in this summary report examines and explains patterns of integration, acculturation, ethnic identity and identification among Jewish communities, both migrant and native-born Jewish in three different cities: Greater Paris, Brussels and Antwerp.

Research Objectives and Questions

The objective of this research was to examine patterns of identity and ethnic identification as well as economic-social assimilation and acculturation strategies among Jews, both

native-born and immigrants (including Israelis), living in Greater Paris, Brussels and Antwerp.

All the questions outlined here are examined mainly by comparing between two Jewish communities—native-born residents and immigrants from Israel and other places—and between three different cities.

The research questions are:

1. How do the respondents perceive their economic, social and cultural integration among native-born local Jewish residents, local non-Jewish residents and Jewish migrants in the city?
2. What integration and acculturation strategies (Berry, 2001; 2005) characterize the respondents? Do they tend toward integration, separation, life within an environmental bubble, assimilation or marginality?
3. What is the structure of the respondents' social networks? Are they transnational, diasporic or local and non-Jewish?
4. What are the characteristics of identity and ethnic identification among the respondents in the Jewish context, in the context of the role of Israel and in the local, civic, non-Jewish context?
5. What are the factors that explain integration and acculturation patterns and identity and ethnic identification among all the respondents?

Research Methods and Procedure

The research integrated two methods: the correlational quantitative method and the qualitative one. Correlational quantitative research examines correlations between variables based on data collected by means of questionnaires containing closed questions to which participants respond regarding their viewpoints, emotions and opinions in the context of the research questions. The questionnaires also included three open questions that asked respondents about their reciprocal relations with the Jewish communities in the city (native-born and immigrants), their relations with the majority non-Jewish society and their view of the importance of Israel. The survey questionnaires were distributed by means of telephone interviews, face-to-face encounters or via the internet. Four hundred and fifty seven people completed the questionnaires; of these, 111 were submitted via the internet (22 in Hebrew, 54 in French and 35 in English).

The qualitative method consisted of semi-structured interviews with 22 interviewees. These interviews were conducted by the main investigator and by research assistants in three languages: Hebrew, English and French.

The sample

Of the 457 respondents, more than half live in Paris and its environs. The rest live in two Belgian cities, and mainly in Brussels. Around two-thirds of the respondents are locally born "native-born" while the remaining respondents are migrants. Hence, most of the respondents have local citizenship. Sixty percent are women with an average age of 44 years. Two-thirds were born in Europe. Half of the respondents define themselves as Sephardim and the rest as Ashkenazim. Most of the respondents are married and employed

in a broad range of professions (except for 14% who are retired). Half are salaried employees and one-fourth are self-employed, with more than a third holding advanced academic degrees (master's degree or doctorate).

A comparison between the locally born group and the immigrant group shows that those born locally are younger, one-fourth are single and most of their parents were born in Europe or North Africa. In contrast, most of the migrants were born in North Africa or in Israel. The native-born group has more education than the immigrant group, while the percentage of retired persons is much higher in the immigrant group.

A comparison between the cities of residence reveals that the oldest respondents live in Antwerp and the youngest live in Brussels. The countries of origin among the residents of Paris are mainly in Europe and North Africa. The residents of the two Belgian cities are primarily from European countries, but the second most prevalent country of origin is Israel. Correspondingly, the Parisian residents mainly define themselves as Sephardim, while the Belgian residents define themselves as Ashkenazim. The residents of Antwerp and Paris are usually married and have more children than the residents of Brussels. In contrast, the residents of Brussels have more academic degrees. The highest level of home ownership is among the Antwerp residents. The residents of Brussels follow, with the Paris residents in last place. In contrast, almost all the residents of Paris hold French citizenship. With respect to type of employment, the residents of Antwerp resemble those in Paris, while Brussels has a greater percentage of housewives.

Almost all the participants (95%) indicated they were born Jewish. They come primarily from Jewish origins and for the most part marry Jewish spouses. Very few participants

reported on intermarriage or assimilation. Nevertheless, it should be noted that on questions regarding Judaism 6% abstained from answering questions about their Judaism or that of their parents, so it is impossible to know about their background in this context.

A comparison between the native-born and the migrants does not reveal any significant differences with respect to the respondents' Judaism or that of their mothers. Among the native-born, nine percent reported that their fathers had converted or were affiliated with another religion, compared to only five percent among the migrants. The comparison between these groups revealed no differences in Jewishness of the spouses. Two significant differences in Judaism emerged in the comparison by city. Brussels had the lowest percentage of participants whose mothers were Jewish compared to Antwerp and Paris (84%, 95% and 96%, respectively). The other difference was in spouses' Jewishness. Among the residents of Brussels, 71% noted that their spouse was born Jewish, compared to 89% among the residents of Paris and 96% among the residents of Antwerp. Thus the sample is primarily Jewish and marked by endogenic marriage. Nevertheless a small group among the native-born reports having a father that was not born Jewish, while a small group among the Brussels residents reports having a non-Jewish mother or a non-Jewish spouse.

Findings

Integration and acculturation into different communities in city of residence

The respondents were asked to describe the community structure in their place of residence. According to a high percent of the respondents, each of the three cities has a longstanding Jewish community. Jewish communities comprising migrants from Israel or

from other countries are much less common, with only half the respondents reporting on the existence of such communities. One-fifth of the respondents did not know how to answer the question of whether there was a community of Jewish migrants from Israel in their current city of residence, while more than a third could not answer this question regarding Jewish migrants from other places. A comparison between native-born residents and migrants revealed one significant difference: 65% of the migrants compared to 49% of the old-timers noted the existence of a Jewish-Israeli community in their city. According to the respondents' reports, the compositions of the Jewish communities in the three cities differ somewhat. Each of the three cities has a longstanding Jewish community. In Paris, however, the presence of an Israeli community is limited, and most were unaware of its existence, while in both of the Belgian cities the Israeli community is highly visible. Communities of Jewish migrants from other countries can be found to some extent in all three cities, and primarily in Paris and Antwerp, at least according to half the respondents. The remaining respondents either answered this question in the negative or did not know how to answer.

The respondents were asked to describe their relations with the *local native-born Jewish residents* from a variety of perspectives. Their descriptions reflect their perceptions of somewhat lukewarm personal relations with the local Jewish community, even though some of the respondents were born locally, that is, were among the native-born. The research participants reported on an average level of activities at Jewish educational institutions, mutual assistance, social relations, community cohesion and marital ties. The respondents believed that the level of joint cultural and leisure time activities was even

lower. Moreover, donations to Jewish institutions and close economic ties are average or less.

Jews born locally described their social relations with their peers (other native-born residents) as extremely meaningful, while the migrants described these relations as average. Moreover, the native-born respondents described their economic relations with the native-born Jewish residents as average, while the migrants described economic relations with the native-born Jewish community in the city as low average. With respect to joint cultural activities with the longstanding Jewish residents in the city (non-migrants), those born locally evaluated these activities as more frequent and of average strength, compared to the migrants who found these activities to be less frequent.

Correspondingly, leisure time activities with locally born Jews were more characteristic of the native-born than of the migrants.

The residents of Antwerp and Brussels describe inter-community ties with the native-born Jewish community as quite strong, similar to the Paris community. Yet the Paris residents reported on more extensive marital relations with local Jews compared to the residents of the Belgian cities, and mainly Antwerp.

In the interviews, the migrants described their relations with the local Jews as quite estranged, as is evident in the interview with D, an immigrant from Israel. D felt that the Jewish community in Paris was foreign to him and that he was not connected to its members, to the point of perceiving them as part of a different people:

When we fly, I often see them on the plane, but I have the feeling that while we may be flying to the same destination we are flying to two different places. After that, when I

arrive and run into them at my destination, they are merely adjacent to me. We are not in the same country. We pass each other by We live in France but not in the same country.

The respondents also do not appear to have many ties with *other Jewish migrants* from their country of origin or from other countries. They report on only an average level of mutual assistance, joint communities, social relations and joint education for their children. With respect to marital ties, cultural and leisure activities and economic relations, the connections are even fewer. A comparison of the three cities regarding the integration and acculturation of Jewish migrants reveals that respondents in Antwerp and Paris report the highest level of economic relations, though this level is only average. Cultural ties were found mainly among the residents of Antwerp, while marital ties characterized the residents of Paris.

The participants from all three cities described their relations with the longstanding *non-Jewish community* as being much less important than their relations with the Jewish community. Most of their relations with the non-Jewish community are economic: the use of services of one kind or another and business matters. Social relations are scanty at best. Respondents reported that other aspects of relations, such as mutual assistance, cultural and leisure activities, marital ties, joint education of children, community cohesion and contributions to non-Jewish institutions, were quite limited. The findings also show that the Jews born locally have stronger ties to the non-Jews in the city than do the migrants. While among all the respondents intermarriages with the local non-Jews are not prevalent, the rate of intermarriage is much higher in Brussels compared to the other two cities. Furthermore, Brussels is also characterized by more joint education for children, more

mutual assistance, more contributions to non-Jewish institutions and more joint community activities than the other two cities. Indeed, the Jewish residents of Brussels appear to engage in a variety of reciprocal relations with non-Jews in the city (social, economic, cultural, marital and communal), as opposed to reports by respondents from Paris and Antwerp, where Jewish residents demonstrate similar patterns of separation from the non-Jewish majority.

In answering the open questions, many of the residents of Paris and Brussels indicated that relations were usually good, mainly from the economic perspective. Most used one or two words to describe these relations ("good," "average," "correct"). Many of the comments pointed to a lack of acquaintance with non-Jews, with relations described as "lukewarm," "polite" or "businesslike"—in particular in Paris. There were almost no negative comments regarding relations with the non-Jewish communities. For example, a male respondent who was born in Europe and lives in Paris noted that he has practically no relations with non-Jews, only professional contacts. A female immigrant from Israel who lives in Brussels noted "a sense of involvement. Somewhat of a different mentality that at times creates a distance."

In summary, examination of the mutual relations of the respondents with the communities in their city of residence reveals the following order: Ties with the local Jewish community are the strongest, though they are ranked as average only. These are followed by relations with the immigrant Jewish communities in the city. Relations with the non-Jewish community are in third place and are mainly economic.

Factors affecting integration and acculturation

After examining the two main independent variables—migrants vs. native-born residents and city of residence—I examined the impact of these two variables together with additional background variables (e.g., gender and ethnic origin had no impact whatsoever). In addition, integration and acculturation variables were also examined for their influence on identity and ethnic identification variables.

Respondents' feelings of being integrated and acculturated within the group of *native-born Jewish residents* were influenced by one background variable—whether the respondents were native-born or migrants—with the first group feeling more integrated than the second did. Many variables of identity and ethnic identification were found to have an impact. Respondents who have a strong sense of national identity with their country of residence, are active in Jewish organizations and the Jewish community, and practice Jewish customs yet do not identify with their country of origin feel more integrated within the group of native-born Jewish residents. Integration within the group of *non-Jewish local residents* is explained by several background and identity variables. The residents of Brussels feel more integrated than the residents of Paris, the native-born residents feel more integrated than the migrants, and those with higher education feel more integrated than those who are less educated. Moreover, those who report having a stronger sense of national identity with their country of residence and ascribe major importance to general, non-Jewish ethnic identity feel more integrated. Finally, respondents' feelings of being integrated within the group of *Jewish migrants* in their city of residence is influenced by their age, with older respondents feeling less integrated with the migrants. In

contrast, those reporting on a large extent of Jewish organizational and communal activities feel more integrated with the Jewish migrants in the city.

Hence, feelings of integration and acculturation are influenced first and foremost by a sense of ethnic-religious Jewish identity and identification, but also by identity and identification with country of origin and mainly by national identification with their current country of residence. Background attributes have a lesser impact on integration and acculturation. Degree of ethno-Jewish identity and identification and belonging to the native-born Jewish group in the city influence acculturation and integration within the local Jewish community. Integration within the Jewish immigrant community in the city of residence is more typical of young people and those engaged in Jewish organizational and community activities. Integration within the local non-Jewish community is influenced by strong civil and local identity and identification, which is typical primarily of the residents of Brussels, the native-born residents and those with higher education.

Social networks

The research participants were asked to describe their social networks. More than half the respondents (55%) noted that almost all of their closest friends are local native-born Jewish residents. Among the other groups, clearly the non-Jewish migrants were the most distant, with only 7% of the respondents indicating that members of this group were among their good friends. Moreover, the respondents reported on very few friendships with native-born non-Jewish residents, with other Jewish migrants or with migrants from Israel. Nonetheless, the native-born Jewish residents have many more friends among the local native-born Jewish residents than do the migrants. In contrast, the migrants have

more close friends who are migrants from Israel and more close friends among Jews who live in Israel. A comparison according to city of residence reveals that the residents of Paris tend more toward ethno-social seclusion among the native-born Jewish residents, the residents of Brussels tend more toward assimilation within the non-Jews in the city, and the residents of Antwerp, many of them migrants, tend toward ties with migrants from the same country of origin (mainly Israelis). The interviews reveal a somewhat more complex picture. Y, for example, immigrated from Libya to Israel with her parents when she was a young girl and after her marriage moved to Antwerp. She noted that most of her close friends are:

Jews and non-Jews as well. Of course Jews, but those who are more or less observant, they observe the dietary laws and the Sabbath to some extent. I also have very good friends who are not Jewish. I have a Protestant girlfriend who has been my friend since the day I arrived here. We are very close friends. We raised our children together.

Thus, while the social networks of the respondents can be characterized at the micro level based on the quantitative findings, the interviews reveal the existence of relations with other groups such as native-born non-Jewish residents, which from the statistical analysis emerged as very weak.

Ethnic identification: Observing Jewish customs and engaging in Jewish communal activities

Ethnic identification involves external actions that individuals consciously and willingly adopt. The components of ethnic identification are manifested by expressing opinions and viewpoints and even by actual behavior that links an individual to a particular ethnic

group. Ethnic identification can be defined as the expression of a practical connection to an ethnic or religious group (DellaPergola, 2011).

In the context of ethnic identity, the respondents were asked to describe to what extent they practice Jewish customs in their everyday lives. In general the respondents reported on practicing Jewish customs to a large extent, in particular attending a Passover Seder, celebrating Rosh Hashanah and fasting on Yom Kippur. Synagogue membership was less prevalent among the respondents, and the same was true for lighting Shabbat candles and eating kosher meat. No significant differences emerged between the native-born residents and the migrants in their observance of Jewish customs. In contrast, a comparison between the cities reveals the greatest degree of observance of most of the Jewish customs among the residents of Paris, followed by Antwerp, primarily with respect to eating kosher meat. Among the three cities, the lowest extent of Jewish practice emerged in Brussels, testifying to a middling level of observance of Jewish customs in that city.

Language is a major component of ethnic identity. The respondents usually converse in their mother tongue, which in most cases was the local language: French (17%), Hebrew speakers (16%), English speakers (4%), with the rest (3%) speakers of other languages. The mother tongue of the native-born residents is usually the local language and they tend to use this language in all areas of life. In contrast, the migrants must use a larger number of languages in different aspects of their lives.

The use of language also differs among the residents of the three cities. The Jewish residents of Paris mainly use their mother tongue, which is usually the local language, while the residents of Brussels must have at least one other language and those in Antwerp

often need two additional languages. Thus the acculturation patterns in the context of language are more integrative in Paris, while in Antwerp they are transnational and a bit segregating in nature. With respect to using the local language, D, an immigrant from Israel living in Paris, described the significance of his accent in identifying him as a stranger in the country and indeed his ambivalence toward his ethnic identity:

It's obvious that I have an accent. People who hear me speak a bit think I am Swiss, because I speak somewhat slowly. Or they think I'm Belgian. But after I speak a bit more, they see I'm not from here. So they think I'm from Eastern Europe. I tell people that I'm not European and let them guess. No one knows where I'm from. In this way I cross boundaries and I don't rush to tell where I'm from. I feel very comfortable in my anonymity.

In addition, as part of exploring the respondents' ethnic identification, we asked them to relate to their Jewish institutional and communal activities that are not religious. Most of the respondents reported on an intermediate or even low level of participation in Jewish communal and educational activities and support for Israel. The highest reported level of Jewish activities involved sending their children to formal and informal Jewish educational settings. With respect to other activities such as support for Israel and belonging to Jewish community organizations, the respondents reported on a middling level of involvement. Volunteering in the Jewish community was even less. Hence, respondents generally reported a middling degree of participation in Jewish institutional and communal activities, with participation a bit higher among the native-born Jewish residents than among the migrants, particularly with respect to sending their children to Jewish-Zionist youth movements.

In a comparison between the cities of residence with respect to Jewish institutional and communal activities, Antwerp and Brussels emerged as leaders, with a lower level of participation in Jewish institutional and communal activities in Paris. For example, the level of participation in Jewish youth movements is high among children and adolescents in Brussels, while in Antwerp and Paris the level is quite average. Volunteering and belonging to Jewish organizations is more characteristic of the residents of Antwerp and less so of those living in Paris and Brussels.

Patterns of ethnic identity

As opposed to ethnic identification, ethnic identity comprises feelings, emotions and viewpoints that people express but are not necessarily manifested in their external behavior (see, e.g., DellaPergola, 2011). Aspects of ethnic identity were examined in the context of country of origin, current country of residence, attitude toward Israel and belonging to the Jewish religion. The variables were divided into sub-measures. The highest measure of emotional identity is related to Judaism and Israel, followed by identity connected to country of origin and current country of residence. Finally, sense of identity as a minority or as being different due to being Jewish was in last place among the ethnic identities. Jewishness in all senses of the word is strong among the respondents, and they are proud of being Jewish. They also assign Israel an important role as the spiritual center of the Jewish people. A large portion of the respondents are proud of where they came, feel comfortable there and identify it as their country of origin. Yet their feelings of pride in their country of origin are much weaker. The respondents feel at home in their current country of residence, though this feeling is weaker than their Jewish emotional identity and their feelings for Israel. Their sense of national identity as French or Belgian citizens

is quite average, as are their feelings of being a minority and of being different. Thus, Judaism and the State of Israel constitute the most significant components of the respondents' feelings of ethnic identity, followed by their country of origin and their current country of residence.

A comparison between the native-born residents and the migrants shows that the native-born have stronger feelings of being Jewish (though these feelings are high in both groups) and also have a clearer sense of the meaning of being Jewish. They also identify more with their country of origin than the migrants, though this measure is middling in both groups. Accordingly, the native-born residents feel more French or Belgian (depending on where they live) than the migrants, and they are also more emotionally tied to their country of residence.

For example, Y, a military rabbi of Moroccan origins who now lives in Paris and who immigrated several times in the past, expresses a transnational identity anchored in several countries:

So they ask what are you, or when they talk about ... they say 'in your country,' so I look at them and say, what is my country, which country? They say 'Israel.' So I tell them that for the time being my country is here. I am in the army, you see the uniform I wear. How can you say I'm from Israel? And if you look at my passport you'll see where I was born, so say that I'm Moroccan as well.

M, another rabbi who lives in Paris after emigrating from Israel with his wife, describes his feelings of being "at home" that are divided between France and Israel:

I've learned to love the culture, the people, very much. And also my family. My children were born here, my wife is here, so there is some sense of home here. In any case I know that the real home of the people of Israel is the land of Israel, of course I feel best there. I am very happy that I grew up in Israel, that I spent my childhood in Israel, of course I'm happy. That's it. I'm sure this is our home, but I also feel that my home is there as well, it's been like this for years, they are two very different homes.

The native-born residents feel more atypical in the society in which they now live because they are Jews. On the general measure of feelings of being a minority they also expressed an average level of feelings, while the migrants feel this less. Thus the native-born residents are more connected to their country of origin and to their current country of residence than the migrants, yet they are also more sensitive to belonging to a Jewish minority in the city.

On all the measures, the feelings of the residents of the three cities differ. Among the residents of Paris, feelings of Jewish identity and identity with Israel are particularly high, as is their national identity as French citizens. The Jewish Parisians also expressed strong feelings of being a minority in their city. The residents of the Belgian cities have a strong sense of connection to their countries of origin, alongside national and Jewish feelings that are lower than those of the Parisians. In contrast, they have a lesser sense of being a minority, particularly in Antwerp, despite the presence of a highly visible ultra-Orthodox community.

A, who was born in Belgium and lives in Brussels, does not feel he is a member of a minority group and has difficulty noting attributes for identifying a Jew living in his city (he was interviewed in English):

Visually, no [identify someone as a Jew, L.L.]. I don't think so [...] not like in Antwerp or something, where you have a big block of religious people, which hardly exists here. We see through names obviously [...] you may think it's potentially a Jewish guy, surnames not first names. It's not like Yossi and ... Tal [...] Because first names are usually local names or mainstream [...] sometimes there is this little special contact that you feel this guy, he could be Jewish. Again, if the name isn't, you would think there's always a bit of a special aspect that you may recognize here or anywhere in the world [...] but otherwise, not much really, except if there is a part of the community.

The research participants were asked to express their views regarding those aspects of ethnic identity in their lives to which they *ascribe importance*. The respondents evaluated their connections to their country of origin (not Israel) and to Israel as having the highest, and equal, importance. Next in importance were Jewish education for their children, Jewish identity (highest consensus), the Jewish religion and observing Jewish customs, all of which the respondents noted as being of major importance. Less important (average level of importance) were ties with Jewish friends and living in a Jewish environment. Aspects related to non-Jewish friends, learning the local culture and being part of the community in their current city of residence were rated as least important by the research participants.

Israel is of major importance, as expressed in some of the interviews. For example, S from Antwerp who was born in Brussels stated: Israel [...] haven't been there for a year [...] but there was a time when I was there once a month for work, and I have a brother living in Israel [...] in Israel, Israel is something extraordinary." Rabbi M from the main synagogue in Paris, who moved away from Israel many times, apparently for work, expressed his general opinion on Israel and immigration from Israel and is convinced that Israel is the place for the Jewish people: "Yes, there was something in that, something deep to come here. It was not a matter of immigration. We have nowhere to immigrate. We have only one country. We have nowhere to immigrate."

A comparison between the native-born residents and the migrants shows that the native-born attribute more importance to the Jewish religion and to maintaining social ties predominantly with Jews. Nonetheless, the native-born residents also ascribe major importance to developing social ties with non-Jews as well.

Comparison between the three cities indicates that Parisians attribute more importance to the Jewish religion, to practicing Jewish customs, to Jewish identity, and to ties with Israel and to their country of origin. Residents of the two Belgian cities ascribe major importance to these aspects, but less than among the Jews of Paris. With respect to identity and ties with those in the broader community, not necessarily Jews, the opposite picture emerges. The residents of the Belgian cities are more similar with respect to these attributes and ascribe them greater importance, while the residents of Paris see ties and identification with the broader community as of middling importance only. It is interesting to note that even when asked about their attitude toward the importance of developing ties with Jews only, the pattern remained identical: Those in both Belgian Jewish communities felt this

was quite important (more important than regarding ties with the non-Jewish communities), while the Parisian residents attributed only an average degree of importance to this.

In a group of additional questions, respondents were asked to rank the degree to which they identify themselves as citizens of the country in which they live, citizens of their country of origin (not Israel), Israelis, Jews, and citizens of the world. The respondents' sense of civic identity was generally average, but was weaker among the migrants. The native-born residents felt comfortable as citizens of the world, compared to the migrants who were perhaps more interested in a sense of civic belonging in the country to which they immigrated. As we previously noted, feelings of being Israeli among the former Israelis are apparently below average, yet are stronger than the feelings of the native-born residents in this regard.

Comparison of the three cities showed that Jewish identity is the most important identity for all the respondents, and primarily among the residents of Paris and Antwerp. The residents of Brussels, in contrast, identify most strongly as citizens of their country of origin and citizens of the world. The residents of Antwerp have feelings similar to those of the Paris and Brussels residents, both as citizens of their country of origin and as citizens of the world.

Factors influencing ethnic identity and identification

As in the case of factors influencing integration and acculturation, the factors influencing ethnic identity and identification were similarly examined. Many factors comprising ethnic identity and identification were included in the research questionnaire. Seven summary

measures represent all the questions included in the questionnaire, as described in brief in the previous sub-section. Ethnic identity and identification are influenced by a number of background variables in addition to the variables of seniority (native-born residents/migrants) and current city of residence, and mainly by ethnic group identity. Jews defining themselves as Sephardim are more identified with and identify themselves more with Judaism and Israel compared to Ashkenazim. City of residence, primarily Paris, also explains patterns of ethnic identity and identification, as opposed to Brussels. Thus, on the one hand Parisians identify emotionally with Judaism and Israel while on the other hand they feel they are Parisian. In contrast, the residents of Paris do not engage in widespread Jewish organizational activities, as opposed to the residents of Brussels, who report on a broad range of such activities. Moreover, the Parisians tend to ascribe less importance to identification with the non-Jewish majority in their country than do the residents of Brussels.

In this study, integration and acculturation were examined as independent variables and they explain a substantial part of the identity and identification variables. Those research participants who report a high level of integration and acculturation among the native-born Jewish residents of the city also identify as Jews and with Israel. At the same time they also report national identity with their country of residence. In contrast, those reporting a high level of integration and acculturation among the local non-Jewish residents also have a low sense of identity and identification with Judaism and Israel on almost all the variables. Nevertheless they feel a sense of identity and identification with the non-Jewish majority and with their country of residence. That is, they tend toward a pattern of assimilation. Strong integration and acculturation among the Jewish migrants in the city

explain very few of the identity and identification variables, though the trend is toward a positive influence on Jewish-ethnic identity and identification, mainly with Israel.

It is important to note that background variables such as ethnic group also influence degree of observing Jewish customs, emotional identification with Israel and Judaism, and the attribution of major importance to Jewish-religious aspects and to Israel. This is seen mainly among those defining themselves as Sephardim (see also Lev Ari, 2005). The residents of the Belgian cities tend to be more involved in Jewish community activities in their city than those living in Paris. In contrast, the residents of Paris attribute more importance to Jewish aspects and to ties with Israel.

Future immigration readiness and motives

When respondents, both migrants and native-born residents, were asked to what degree they are certain they will remain in their current country of residence, 28% responded they were sure and quite sure they would stay, 36% indicated that perhaps they would stay, and 36% were certain or quite certain they would not remain. No significant differences between the residents of the three cities were found in response to this question. The only difference that emerged was in the percentage of those who were certain and quite certain they would remain in Antwerp, compared to Paris and Brussels (42%, 27% and 26%, respectively). Thus, Jews residing in Paris and Brussels express a bit less certainty they will remain in their current city of residence than the residents of Antwerp, almost half of whom are certain and quite certain they will remain.

The motives for immigrating to another country that is not one's country of origin are primarily related to the desires of one's spouse, personal safety issues, anti-Semitism in the

current country of residence, children's education, family members living in the immigration destination, and economic and professional considerations. Push motives are quite prominent among the considerations to immigrate to another country, as are family motives. Emotional ties to the destination country are only of average importance.

Comparing the motives for immigrating to another country between native-born residents and migrants yielded numerous differences. For all differences, the average responses of the native-born residents were stronger than those of the migrants. Respondents attributed particular importance to family motives (spouse's desires and family living in the immigration destination), primarily among the native-born residents. Personal safety and anti-Semitism were also major push motives, again mainly among the native-born residents. One surprising finding was that professional advancement was a major pull factor to the destination country, again mainly among the native-born residents. Moreover, emotional ties to the destination country were only of average importance and apparently not as strong as the other push and pull factors. In general, motives for immigration were quite high among the native-born residents and average among the migrants. Economic aspects and children's education had a similar influence among native-born residents and migrants.

D, for example, an immigrant from Israel living in Paris, expressed a hesitant desire to return to Israel after living in Paris for thirty years and a very ambivalent attitude about Israeli culture. He expressed this attitude during the interview, but it is beyond the scope of this brief report and is therefore not included.

I don't think I have any plans [to emigrate from France, L.L.]. It's not on the agenda right now. Maybe I'd like to live in Israel for a few months to see what attracts me so strongly. Because when I'm there, even with all the anger I feel, I really enjoy life, I live life to the fullest. Much more than I do here. And my best years were there. But don't forget I was also much younger then.

Motives to immigrate to another country that is not the country of origin also differ in the three cities. In the overall measure of motives, the residents of Paris have the strongest motivation to immigrate, compared to those from Brussels and Antwerp (whose level of motivation to immigrate is similar). The desire to give their children a better education is highly characteristic of the residents of Paris and only average among the residents of the Belgian cities. Moreover, a large portion of Paris residents reported that their spouses were quite interested in immigrating to another country, as did the residents of Brussels. Family members in the immigration destination are also a major motivation to immigrate among the residents of Paris, while only an average motivation among the residents of the Belgian cities. Finally, the push motive of anti-Semitism was mentioned as a strong motive among the residents of Paris as well as those living in Brussels, but significantly less so among the residents of Antwerp.

When A, who was born in Belgium, was asked about the possibility of immigrating to another country, he answered that it was a possibility. He noted the economic difficulties in finding a job in a new place at age 53 and specifically mentioned his preferred destination:

Israel or Canada. Yes, possibly to Israel, indeed, or Canada or something like that.

That's more it, I think, one of these places, where there could also be a better future for the children, possibly. In Canada for sure, in Israel not sure, maybe. But again, Canada will change as well and who knows what will happen there?

Summary and Conclusions

Close to five hundred Jews participated in the research described in this report, about half living in Greater Paris and the rest - in Brussels and Antwerp. Two-thirds of the research participants were native-born (native-born residents) and the rest were migrants. Major findings and conclusions are summarized below. The study aimed to analyze patterns of ethnic identity and identification, alongside with economic and social integration and acculturation among the participants.

This summary report does not include theoretical background. However, concepts included in it, such as ethnic identity and identification, as well as acculturation strategies and integration among migrants and minority groups, are based on the following sources, among others: Berry, 2001, 2005; Lev Ari, 2013; Lev Ari and Cohen, 2018; Levitt and Glick Schiller, 2004; Rebhun and Lev Ari, 2010; Vertovec, 2010.

Research conclusions and the study's contribution to understanding characteristics, ethnic identity and identification, alongside with integration and acculturation of Jews, native-born and migrants residing in three cities in Europe, are presented hereafter. The main assumption is that European Jewry is very heterogenic in all the components examined in this study, and thus it should be taken into consideration as a multi-dimensional Jewish group, unlike the Jewry residing in single nation states such as Israel and the United States (see also Graham, 2018).

Socioeconomic background: Most research participants belong to the middle class and some to the upper middle class. Their ethnic distribution conforms to the findings of studies and surveys on this topic (e.g., DellaPergola, 2017). The innovation in this study lies in its detailed description of updated sociodemographic attributes of age, gender, occupation, educational level, home ownership or rental, ethnic affiliation and country of origin, in a comparison between native-born residents and migrants and between the residents of three cities. Most respondents are married and have higher education. The native-born residents are younger and more educated than the migrants. The residents of Brussels are the most highly educated among the residents of the three cities. Their occupations vary, though in this context the residents of Antwerp more resemble those of Paris, while the residents of Brussels are somewhat different. More residents of Brussels and Antwerp own their own homes than do those living in Paris. The Jews of Paris define themselves primarily as Sephardic, while those living in the Belgian cities are mainly Ashkenazi.

Structure of the Jewish Community: The social structure of the Jewish communities in their cities of residence show a pattern of separation between the native-born residents and the migrants. Native-born residents are aware of the presence of Jewish communities in the city, while the migrants are more familiar with communities of Jewish migrants. The Jews living in Paris and Antwerp are more aware of communities of Jewish migrants, apparently due to the relatively large number of recent migrants from Israel.

Integration and acculturation: The community in which most respondents reported a high degree of integration (economic, social and cultural) in each city is of the local Jewish native-born, particularly among those who are native-born themselves. The

migrants are more segregated from the local Jewish community. The residents of the Belgian cities are more socially involved in their local Jewish communities, whereas the Parisians mainly tend toward endogamous marriage. In contrast, patterns of integration and acculturation indicate growing segregation from the non-Jewish majority, particularly among the residents of Paris and Antwerp who tend towards diasporic identity and identification, Integration and acculturation strategies among the Jewish migrant groups in each city differ. These differences reflect moderate economic integration among the residents of Antwerp and Paris and cultural integration among the residents of Antwerp. In Paris, integration is apparent mainly in marital ties with Jewish migrants.

Social networks: The structure of social networks testifies to ethno-social separation, mainly among the native-born residents who tend to stick with their own kind. This is particularly obvious among the residents of Paris. The migrants also tend toward separation by way of social networks made up of other migrants like themselves, that is diasporic networks, and of friends living in their country of origin—transnational networks. Social assimilation patterns do not represent the majority, but do clearly characterize the residents of Brussels as opposed to those living in the other two cities.

Jewish ethnic identification: This identification is evident in the observance of Jewish practice, particularly on major holidays and among the residents of Paris and Antwerp. On the other hand, institutional community activities are more common among the native-born Jews and the residents of the Belgian cities and point to a high level of ethno-Jewish identification. In addition, language as a central cultural component and its use in most spheres of life, points to high Jewish ethnic identification that seeks to preserve the culture of origin that can be described as an environmental 'bubble', particularly among the

migrants. While for practical reasons the migrants use two or more languages in various contexts, primarily at work, their original language is dominant in most spheres of life.

Ethnic identity: Ethnic identity was examined in the context of feelings and attitudes. Feelings of Jewish identity and the place of Israel for the respondents were found to be particularly strong among all the respondents. Native-born residents are also emotionally attached to their current country of residence, though they, more than the Jewish migrants, have a sense of being a minority due to their Jewishness. The Parisians clearly identify with Judaism and with Israel. Nevertheless, compared to those living in the Belgian cities, their national-civic-French component and their sense of being a minority in the city are also relatively strong. The research participants, primarily the native-born residents and the Parisians, attribute major importance to their ties to their country of origin and to Israel. It is important for them to give their children Jewish education and to preserve their Jewish identity and religious customs. Particularly important for them is the Jewish ethnic-cultural dimension. When it comes to cultural and social integration with the majority non-Jewish society, a clear pattern of separation emerges. In contrast, migrants and residents of the Belgian cities tend more toward a pattern of social and cultural integration with the majority society, primarily in pragmatic contexts.

It seems that on the whole, the respondents' Jewish identity is the strongest, even compared to their civic identity, their identity as citizens of the world and their identity related to their country of origin. The migrants less identified themselves as residents of the country in which they live today. All have strong attachment to Israel, particularly those who emigrated from it, and continue to identify as Israelis. The residents of Paris and Antwerp have a strong sense of Jewish identity, while those living in Brussels feel that

their ethnic identity is also anchored in other ethnic groups, as citizens of their country of residence and as citizens of the world, that is, they adopt transnational identity.

Tendency toward future migration: It appears that two-thirds of all respondents, particularly the native-born and the Parisians who exhibit a strong tendency toward future migration. This is due to push factors related to feelings of lack of personal safety and manifestations of anti-Semitism as well as to the search for better economic opportunities and family considerations. In this context, Brussels residents resemble the Parisian ones, while the Jews of Antwerp feel more comfortable.

To sum up, it seems that there is a correlation between integration and acculturation strategies and feelings, attitudes and behavior, which indicate ethnic identity and identification. When comparing the three cities there are differences in socio-demographic characteristics between native-born and migrant Jews, as well as in their reports regarding integration and acculturation, ethnic identity and identification. The young and more educated (see also Berry, 1997), particularly those residing in Brussels and are native-born, report more balanced integration among the non-Jewish majority and even display a slight tendency towards assimilation. Those who define themselves as 'Sephardim' tend, on the other hand, to segregation from the non-Jewish majority and report attitudes and behavior which indicate stronger Jewish ethnic identity.

Residents of Paris and Antwerp keep moderate segregation from the non-Jewish majority, particularly regarding social and cultural strategies, and can be characterized as having strong ethno-religious Jewish identity. However, the Parisians are proud of their identity and identification as French and Parisians but feel as a minority there and tend to emigrate in the near future. In Antwerp there are more migrants, particularly from Israel, who influence the unique ethno-Israeli diasporic identity and identification as well as acculturation strategies, which characterize them as Jews and Israelis. Nevertheless, their

economic integration in Antwerp is rather full and they feel more secure and less intimidated by Antisemitism, compared with the native-born and those who reside in Paris and Antwerp.

The three Jewish communities studied here, maintain a unique Jewish character and all three feel strong attachment to Israel. Most communities are also integrated in their city of residence, mainly economically, and to a lesser extent – socially and culturally.

Nevertheless, many differences among these communities indicate various patterns of integration and acculturation strategies which for some, particularly native-born and young, indicate possible future assimilation. Another significant part of the respondents, on the other hand, is interested in future emigration to other countries, which implies on their personal and economical insecurity. This situation has already effected significant changes in the structure of the Jewish communities in the three cities and enhanced a sense of alienation and segregation from the majority, though not necessarily feelings of marginality, particularly among native-born Jews.

Bibliography

- Ben Rafael, E. (2017). Religion Jews and Neo Antisemitism. *Contemporary Jewry* 37(2), 275-293.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology* 46 (1), 5-34.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues* 57, 615-631.
- Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29, 697–712.

- Cohen, R. & Gold G. (1997). Constructing ethnicity: Myth of return and models of exclusion among Israelis in Toronto. *International Migration*, 35 (3), 373-394.
- DellaPergola, S. (2011). *Jewish demographic policies: Population trends and options in Israel and in the Diaspora*. Jerusalem: The Jewish People Policy Institute.
- DellaPergola, S. (2017). World Jewish population, 2016. In A. Dashefsky, S. DellaPergola & I. M. Sheskin (Eds.), *The American Jewish Year Book, 2016* (pp. 253-332). Dordrecht: Springer, vol. 116.
- DellaPergola, S., & Sheskin, I. M. (2015). Global dispersion of Jews: Determinants and consequences. In S.B. Brunn (Ed.), *The changing world religion map: Sacred places, identities, practices and politics* (pp.1311-1343). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Graham, D. (2018). *European Jewish identity: Mosaic or monolith? An empirical assessment of eight European countries*. JPR/ Report. Institute for Jewish Policy research. Retrieved from: <http://archive.jpr.org.uk/object-eur183>
- Kantor Center. (2018). Antisemitism Worldwide 2017. Kantor Center for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry. General Analysis Draft. Tel Aviv University. Retrieved from: http://kantorcenter.tau.ac.il/sites/default/files/Doch_full_2018_220418.pdf
- Kipnis, B. (2009). Greater Tel Aviv as a 'world city': A focus in a global network and 'giant head' in the Israeli space. In B. Kipnis (Ed.), *Tel Aviv-Jaffa: From a garden suburb to a world city* (pp. 227-26). Tel Aviv: Pardes [Hebrew].
- Lev Ari, L (2005). Social and cultural absorption of Israelis in the USA: Distinctions between Oriental and Ashkenazi Jews. *Pe'amim*, 101-102, 221-250 [Hebrew].

Lev Ari, L. (2008). *The American dream: For men only? Gender, immigration and the assimilation of Israelis in the United States*. El Paso: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC

Lev Ari, L. (2013). Multiple identities among Israeli immigrants in Europe. *International Journal of Jewish Education Research*, 6, 29-67.

Lev Ari, L & Cohen N. (2018). Acculturation strategies and ethnic identity among second-generation Israeli migrants in the United States." *Contemporary Jewry*, DOI 10.1007/s12397-018-9258-5.

Levitt, P., & Glick-Schiller, N. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review* 38(3), 1002-1039.

Macionis, J. J. (1997). *Sociology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rebhun, U. (2004). Jewish identification in contemporary America: Gan's symbolic ethnicity and religiosity revisited. *Social Compass*, 51 (3), 349-366.

Rebhun, U. & Lev Ari, L. (2010). *American Israelis: Migration, transnationalism, and diasporic identity*. Leiden: Brill.

Vertovec, S. (2010). Conceiving transnationalism. In R. Cohen & P. Toninato (Eds.), *The Creolization reader-studies in mixed identities and cultures* (pp. 266-277). Routledge: London and New York.

Yiftachel, O. (2001). The homeland and nationalism. *Encyclopedia of Nationalism* (chapter 1, pp. 359-383). New York: Academic Press.