

U

(signature of referee)

()
no

()
no

(signature of author)

The above-named thesis was microfilmed on _____ (date)

For the Library _____
(signature of staff member)

THE CONCEPT OF JEWISH NATIONAL CHARACTER:

A Study of American Jews

Jerrold Goldstein

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of requirements for the Degree of Master
of Arts in Hebrew Letters and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio, 1963

Referee:
Professor Robert L. Katz

DIGEST OF THESIS

National character is a concept of the social sciences. It refers to the regularities of psychological process -- emotion, motivation, and learning -- which are characteristic of specific human groups. National character is never observed directly, but must always be inferred from the regularities of conduct observed in the national group. Thus, a national character study is not meant to be a mere cataloging of typical behavior. It aims to analyse the common psychological forces underlying shared cultural patterns.

This thesis seeks to apply the concept of national character to a study of American Jews. The initial hypothesis proposes that American Jews share a common Jewish national character which leads them to regularly behave in distinctive patterns. In the third chapter, twenty-six recent investigations of the American Jewish community by social scientists are carefully surveyed for evidence which will either support or deny the hypothesis. The investigations represent the work of anthropologists, psychologists and sociologists. They are concerned with various aspects of Jewish life in America. Studies of such varied topics as Americanism, liberalism, authoritarianism, suburbia, sobriety and child-rearing attitudes are examined.

From this broad survey of social science literature on the American Jews, several patterns of Jewish culture become apparent. The conclusion notes, however, that these culture patterns of American Jews are not unified by a common theme. The culture does not consist of congruent parts. Jewish culture appears to be a broad configura-

tion of several preferred patterns, none of which are essential.

The absence of a monolithic Jewish culture indicates that there is no Jewish national character. The initial hypothesis must be rejected. There is no common Jewish National character which will account for all the features of an inconsistent Jewish culture. In Appendix B, the hypothesis of multimodal Jewish character is suggested as a preferable explanation for the observed phenomena of Jewish culture. There has not been, as yet, adequate research which would establish the validity of such a multimodal character concept, and further investigation is called for.

To Fran, who never let me dilly;
and to RLK, who never let me dally...

My most appreciative thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	
A. What is a National Character Study?	1
B. Task	4
C. Sources	8
D. Organization.	11
E. Hypothesis	12
II. THE STUDY OF NATIONAL CHARACTER	
A. History of the Concept.	14
B. Development and Use in Cultural Anthropology.	18
C. Development and Use in Sociology.	25
D. Development and Use in Psychology	29
E. Summary of Trends	40
III. INVESTIGATIONS RELEVANT TO THE STUDY OF JEWISH NATIONAL CHARACTER	
A. Introduction	43
B. General Studies	
Shtetl	46
American Jewish Ethnic Character	49
Acculturation and Ethnic Solidarity	51
Suburbia	55
C. Community Studies	
Park Forest	61
Northrup (Sharon, Massachusetts)	68
Riverton (Trenton, New Jersey).	71
North City (Minneapolis)	76
Elmira	84
Detroit	88
New Orleans	93
New Haven	97
D. Studies on Value-Orientations	
Liberalism (1)	102
Liberalism (2)	105
Liberalism (3)	106
Sobriety	107
Achievement	110
Education	112
Authoritarianism	113
Child-Rearing	117

Chapter	Page
E. Studies on Identity and Belongingness	
America, American, Americanism	119
Minority Awareness.	123
Jewish Boys	126
National Consciousness	127
Jewish Faces	129
Intermarriage	134
IV. INTERPRETIVE SUMMARY	139
Appendix	
A. TWELVE POSTULATES FOR THE STUDY OF NATIONAL CHARACTER	155
B. THE HYPOTHESIS OF MULTIMODAL JEWISH CHARACTER	157
FOOTNOTES	160
BIBLIOGRAPHY	174

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. WHAT IS A NATIONAL CHARACTER STUDY?

A young man applies for a job. He is given a form to fill out. Quickly, he fills the spaces with the required information. One item of the form calls for "religion." Now, not since last Yom Kippur has the young man been near a synagogue. Prayer plays almost no role in his life. Yet, without hesitation or doubt, he writes in the appropriate space "Jewish."

What is "Jewish" about this young man? Why does he answer "Jewish" to a question about his religion? Why doesn't he say that he has no religion? What does it mean to him when he identifies himself as "Jewish"?

Now, of course, the specific answers will vary according to the young man asked. There is no single right answer to any of our questions. Every individual human being sees his existence in his own terms. And in a profound sense we ought not to attempt an answer for anyone else.

Yet all of us are aware that individuals generally behave according to regular patterns. When a particular personality pattern is ascribed to John or Richard or Sam, then we can usually say something about how he would typically act in a given situation. All normal people generally act according to consistent patterns of conduct and their behavior is somewhat predictable. Such consistent patterns of conduct are due, we say, to people's character.

Now character is an abstract concept. It represents the individual's habitual manner of grasping and coping with reality. It is a configuration which we derive from carefully observing a person's behavior. Often, we find that character is most clearly revealed to us by an individual's particularly distinctive actions. But once we have established somebody's character pattern, then we can usually see how it plays a role in the determination of all his activity.

Every individual's specific character is different; no two persons are exactly alike. Nevertheless, the character patterns of several persons may be similar to one another. A son often has a character very much like his father's. In fact, all the members of a family may be known for their similarity of character. We frequently note the resemblances in character shared by people from a region like New England or the South. And it is also common for us to speak of such a thing as middle class character. By speaking this way, we mean to say that certain behavior patterns are typical of persons in the middle class. The concept of character, then, does not have to be limited to the study of individuals. It can be applied equally well to the study of people in groups. To the extent that the members of a group behave the same way in corresponding situations, to that extent can we say that they have a group character. But, of course, it is not the group which has the character; the ascription of group character is merely a short way of saying that certain patterns of behavior are typical for the individual members.

A national character study takes as its material those "relatively enduring personality characteristics and patterns that are

modal among the adult members of [a national] society."¹ It is generally assumed by those who focus their attention upon large societies that some kind of national character binds the members of that society together. One of the earliest students of national character, Alexis de Tocqueville, stated this assumption:

A society can exist only when a great number of men consider a great number of things from the same point of view; when they hold the same opinions upon many subjects, and when the same occurrences suggest the same thoughts and impressions to their minds. 2

"National character studies attempt to map regularities of psychological process, as of emotion, motivation, and learning, which are characteristic of specific groupings of men and women."³ The specific grouping studied is generally the "nation." One should not be needlessly confused by that term. While "nation" is frequently employed as a political term synonymous with "state" or "country," this is not its exclusive meaning. "Nation" can also be used to express "race" or "culture." In its Latin origin the word referred to being born and it was a racial concept. And often today it is still used with racial connotation. (Hitler's German nation, for example, was a "master race.") But nation is best understood as a cultural concept.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary offers among its five suggestions this definition for the term "nation": "Any aggregation of people having like institutions and customs and a sense of social homogeneity and mutual interest." Ellis Rivkin proposed that any group is a nation which can successfully defend its right to be called a nation. Oscar Janowsky has recommended that "since the term 'nation-

Ref. 2

ality' has not gained wide currency in the United States, the word 'people' might perhaps best characterize this conception."⁴ The confusion inherent in "nation" is avoided by Leibush Lehrer who refers to "ethnic character" instead of national character. In this thesis we shall utilize the term "nation" strictly as a cultural concept -- rejecting political and racial denotations.

A national character study is not meant to be a mere cataloging of behavior items. It aims to analyze the psychological forces underlying shared behavior patterns. National character should be conceived as a determinant of behavior and not as a concrete form of behavior. National character is never directly observed, but remains a hypothetical entity whose existence is inferred from the regularities of conduct observed in the national group.

In short, then, national character refers to the pattern of essential personality traits and dispositions shared by members of a large and differentiated cultural group. A national character study seeks to identify and describe such a pattern in what is called a national group.

B. TASK

In this rabbinic thesis we shall attempt to study the national character of American Jews. We shall first endeavor to discover what the concept of national character would mean when applied to American Jews. Then we shall venture its application. In this latter task there are three major goals:

(1) Jewish national character must be described in its manifestations.

- (2) It must be understood in its psychological implications.
- (3) It must be explained as a necessary effect of certain causes.

The study of Jewish national character should not be construed as a search for Jewish racial characteristics. There are those in our society who still insist upon referring to Jews as a racial category. Even so astute a rabbi as Joachim Prinz falls into the use of pseudo-racial terms as a means of describing Jewish national character. In his recent book he argues:

Quite apart from the question of faith, there has developed in our world a human being called a Jew who had made his mark in this world and who bears a particular imprint in his character, his outlook, the peculiar brand of his talent, his wit, his idiosyncrasies, his emotional structure and his mentality. For want of a better term, I submit that there lives today, clearly recognizable, a Homo judaicus. 5

Joachim Prinz is no scientific student of national character. What he has correctly noted is the existence of a distinguishable Jewish community in the United States. Prinz errs, however, in ascribing a pseudo-racial quality to the factors making for Jewish identity. Careful students of national character universally reject the notion that it is somehow biologically determined. "Whatever its more precise definition may be, national character is something learned, something acquired during a lifetime's interaction with one's fellowmen in society."⁶ The concept of national character is not a form of physiological determinism.

Just a cursory reading of Jewish history should indicate that Jews are capable of a seemingly infinite variety of behavior patterns. From one epoch to another the modes of Jewish conduct can change radically. If typical behavior is the key by which we discover the

existence of a national character, then it would seem clear that the national character of the Jews is not biologically fixed for all time. "...Even a little reflection," says philosopher Morris Ginsberg, "is sufficient to show that the processes involved in social change differ radically from those involved in racial change and that vast changes can be brought about in society without parallel change in the inherited constitution."⁷

The study of Jewish national character does not assume the existence of any racial phenomenon. It does, however, assume the existence of a separate recognizable group. There is no doubt that Jews in America are fully acculturated. They are integrated into the commercial, political, professional and scientific activities of this country. They are, nonetheless, a distinct minority group.

A minority group...refers to a status group based on descent, whose members are denied status equality with nonminority people, irrespective of individual achievements. In the United States, the Negro, the Jew, and immigrants of various nationality extractions find themselves in this position. 8

But to describe the Jews as a minority group is to use a negative criterion. Examined in terms of what they are, rather than in terms of what they are not, the Jews emerge as a nationality in the sense which Janowsky has indicated:

There is, then, a Jewish nationality, or a Jewish people. The term "community" is frequently employed to designate a local body such as the Jews of a particular town. In its broadest sense, it has the same meaning as the old word "Jewry," namely, the totality of Jewish institutional life of a particular country, i.e., the Jewish community of the United States, or the Jewish community of Great Britain. 9

Despite acculturation, the American Jews exist as a community. For acculturation "does not necessarily mean the sharing of the intimate relationship of family, worship, love, leisure hours, country club, social intercourse and all the other forms of 'after-six-o'clock' life."¹⁰ The activity of the Jewish press provides one significant indication of the contemporary American Jewish community's vitality.

A study conducted by the Common Council for American Unity in 1956 listed 228 periodicals -- ranging from weeklies to quarterlies and publications of irregular frequency, not counting mimeographed leaflets and bulletins -- published by or for ethnic groups in English. Fully 128 of these were put out by and for Jews, which means that the Jews alone had a larger press in English than all other ethnic groups combined. 11

The publication of 128 periodicals for a population of five and a half million (to say nothing of the countless Temple Bulletins) testifies to the existence of a real cultural community.

On several counts American Jews can be considered a community or a nation. It may be well, however, to keep in mind the caution of Morris Ginsberg. "We cannot assume," he says, "that all peoples who call themselves nations have a distinctive character, still less that this character is natural or native or equally diffused in all portions of the people."¹² Because there is an identifiable Jewish community does not necessarily indicate that there is a Jewish national character. National character can not be defined into existence. Its existence can only be inferred from observed regularities of behavior.

A study of Jewish national character in America will not

focus upon Jewish acculturation, but upon Jewish distinctiveness. It will concern itself with the identification and description of those personality traits and dispositions shared by Jews which differentiate them from non-Jews. It will seek out the values -- social, religious and otherwise -- which serve to maintain Jewish identity. It will constantly recall the intuitive observation of Ruth Benedict: "What really binds men together is their culture, -- the ideas and the standards they have in common."¹³

C. SOURCES

The most difficult problem for national character studies concerns methodology. What methods and techniques can yield the most reliable results? It will become clear in the next chapter that social scientists are by no means in agreement on the problem of methodology.

Inkeles and Levinson, in their definitive survey article on national character, indicate three general categories of research method.

Three broad types of procedure have been utilized, singly or in combination, in the assessment of national character: (1) personality assessment of varying numbers of individuals studied as a whole; (2) psychological analysis of collective adult phenomena (institutional practices, folklore, mass media, and the like), with the assumption that the posited personality characteristics are modal in the population; and (3) psychological analysis of the child-rearing system, with the aim of inferring or determining the personality characteristics it induces in the child and, ultimately, in the next generation of adults. 14

Because this thesis is not written on the basis of original research, the author has been spared the formidable problem of choos-

ing a basic research scheme. We have limited ourselves here to the survey, analysis and evaluation of many studies specifically or indirectly relevant to the concept of Jewish national character. But the largest section of this thesis will be devoted to the examination of various empirical studies conducted by reputable social scientists.

The nature of these empirical studies varies according to the discipline and interests of their authors. Some researchers have chosen to be comparative, as Ruth Benedict in her highly original Patterns of Culture. Others have been more analytic of a single broad culture, as Albert Gordon in his provocative study, Jews in Suburbia. A community approach was utilized by Sklare and Vosk in their carefully researched Riverton Study. On the other hand, Gerhard Lenski compared the four socio-religious groups of a single community in his book, The Religious Factor.

Most social scientists, however, have not taken such broad areas for study. Instead, they have concerned themselves with smaller, specific problems. Thus, they have investigated such questions as "Culture and Jewish Sobriety: The Ingroup-Outgroup Factor" or "Sources of Jewish Internationalism and Liberalism." Several of these monographs have been collected in Marshall Sklare's reader, The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group. Other worthwhile studies of specific problems appear in journals such as The YIVO Annual, Jewish Social Studies, and The Jewish Journal of Sociology.

There is no necessarily even quality to all these studies. And it is difficult to establish an evaluational criterion other than broad coherence. There is so little agreement concerning

methodology among social scientists that one is, in the end, forced to rely upon his own judgment as to the validity of their instruments and conclusions. In this thesis we shall regard as true those research conclusions which appear to be:

- (1) self-consistent,
- (2) consistent with all known facts,
- (3) consistent with other propositions held to be true,
- (4) explanatory of relations between and among observed data,
- (5) conducive to prediction of future behavior.

It should be noted that few of the studies referred to in this thesis are concerned with national character per se. Most of them just record the careful observation of group behavior. Others are only the attempt to correlate certain psychological and behavioral phenomena. Usually, the authors make very modest claims concerning their conclusions. Most social scientists today are very cautious about extending their conclusions into broad generalizations applicable to larger populations.

Kramer and Leventman offer a good example of this scientific caution. They have presented a "close-up portrait" of the Jews in a "typical American city" -- Minneapolis. Their materials and hypotheses throw light on the entire American Jewish community. Yet, in the "Foreward" of their book, they insist that their population samples were selected "to test specific hypotheses about the resolutions of conflict in a minority community rather than to permit generalizations about all American Jews."¹⁵ All is caution.

Inkeles and Levinson argue in their survey article that it

will be a difficult and long process of research to determine whether nations manifest specific character traits. Such caution is, in its way, admirable. Yet active minds cannot be held back from venturing comprehensive generalizations. If nothing else, inspired hypotheses can serve as the vanguard in an onward march of science; let detailed empirical studies fill in the spaces left behind. But remember too that hypothesis is only hypothesis, however inspired. "No matter how solid the foundations are upon which generalizations are constructed, detailed studies are still necessary to confirm, modify, or, as the case may be, to refute."¹⁶

D. ORGANIZATION

This thesis has four chapters. The chapters have been arranged in a logical, developmental sequence. This first chapter introduces the subject of Jewish national character, establishing the direction and goals of our discussion. The major terms have been defined and the task has been described. We have indicated the type of sources which this thesis shall consider, as well as our criteria for their evaluation. The organization of our discussion is here being set forth. It yet remains for us in this chapter to state our hypothesis.

The second chapter is still a form of introduction. Because the discipline of scientific national character study is so recent a development, its procedures have remained in flux. Certain trends have emerged in the general study of national character, and this thesis attempts to take account of them. We feel that an examination of the national character concept as it has been developed and

used by social scientists -- anthropologists, sociologists, and social-psychologists -- will clarify the procedures to be employed in chapters three and four.

A number of investigations relevant to the determination of Jewish national character will be considered in chapter three. This section is the largest and most important part of the thesis. It provides the empirical data from which any discussion of Jewish national character must, in our opinion, proceed. The chapter is divided by a number of subheadings. Each subsection contains summaries of several related scientific studies concerning a particular aspect of Jewish life in America. We have paid particular attention to studies of community interaction, value orientations, and identity. The chapter attempts to objectively report the findings of the different investigators without entering into any comparison or evaluation of their work.

Comparison and evaluation is reserved to chapter four. There we shall attempt to test our hypothesis. Materials from the previous chapter will be considered. Some effort will be made to find the major and minor recurring themes in this material. Likewise, the areas of agreement and disagreement among the different investigators will be noted. In conclusion, the state of Jewish national character study will be discussed and some directions for future investigations will be indicated.

E. HYPOTHESIS

What is "Jewish" about an acculturated, American-born young man who calls himself a Jew? In what way (or ways) does he exemplify

Jewish national character? Is there anything typically Jewish about him? These are the questions which this thesis set out to explore. We begin with the hypothesis that the American Jews do share a common Jewish national character which leads them to regularly behave in distinctive patterns. American Jews fully participate in the common American culture. But our hypothesis suggests that American Jews are not "just like everybody else" in this country. In given situations, Jews will act in a similar fashion -- a fashion which is not characteristic of non-Jews. In fact, if we can accurately portray the Jewish national character, then it should be possible to predict much of the behavior of American Jews, including the young man mentioned above.

But the hypothesis of Jewish national character should not be taken as a denial of our young man's individuality. At best, we shall only be able to predict the pattern of his probable behavior. His specific behavior can not be predicted. His unique response to his own specific situation remains beyond the limits of complete predictability. "An individual personality," asserts psychiatrist Viktor Frankl, "is essentially unpredictable."¹⁷ On ultimate grounds, we must concur with this assertion.

2
Pulmon

CHAPTER II

THE STUDY OF NATIONAL CHARACTER

A. HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT

So long as men have traveled about in the world, they have noticed differences between nations. A Greek was aware that people in Sparta were different from people in Athens. He knew also that Persians were quite unlike either Athenians or Spartans. Usually, the nation was described in the language of individual character. A nation was said to be brave, loyal, treacherous, avaricious, artistic, volatile, or some such. The descriptions were really only stereotypes. They were arrived at impressionistically, often on the basis of very limited experience with representatives from the national group. Indeed, many a national stereotype came into being on the basis of relations with only the most atypical national representatives -- a few merchants or mercenaries perhaps. Yet, despite their low degree of reliability, national stereotypes were (and are) always popular. They seem to provide a certain psychological security for the people who accept them; something is known immediately about the stranger even before interaction begins.

The national stereotypes were sometimes ascribed to "humors" and sometimes to climate. Often the stereotype was alleged to have originated in some pre-historic mythical situation. Or, in a later day, environmentalists emphasized the landscape, and certain materialists pointed to the technological development. People who talk in terms of national stereotypes are seldom in agreement on

etiology. But whatever etiology is assumed, men are still today in general agreement that Russians are not like Germans, and Italians are not like Chinese: there is something different about each of them.

In 1860, the Germans Lazarus and Steinthal began publishing their Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie. This was to be a journal "dedicated to the gathering of material on national cultures, and the determination of the specific mental characteristics of nations by means of psychological elucidation of that material."¹ They sought to discover whether the differences between national groups could be traced to some psychic attitude or characterological core. Their stated purpose indicates also that they were no longer satisfied to describe national character on the basis of casual observations. They were determined to introduce some elements of scientific procedure into the study of national differences. Moreover, the knowledge of psychology was to be applied in an effort to clarify the material at a more basic level.

Unfortunately, Lazarus and Steinthal came too early. Not enough was yet known about either individual psychology or comparative culture to make possible the desired analysis of national character. The scientific study of different cultures soon passed into the hands of anthropologists who were content to merely categorize the main social norms of observed societies. Lacking any psychological perspective, these early cultural anthropologists generally saw the norms as operating with unfailing power on all the individuals of the society. They had no insight into the dynamics of either social or individual behavior. Nor did they have

any apprehension of culture's essential coherence at basic levels.

The key to understanding individual behavior came in 1895 with the publication of Freud and Breuer's Studien uber Hysterie. Only then did it become possible to understand the dynamics of individual psychology. And with the development of that knowledge, it became possible to study national character according to the goals established by Lazarus and Steinthal.

The scientific study of national character began with Ruth Benedict's publication in 1934 of her seminal discussion, Patterns of Culture. Dr. Benedict was first able to conceptualize culture as an integrated whole and then apply to it the concepts of individual psychology. In this fashion she arrived at national character descriptions of the Zuni, the Kwakiutl and the Dobu societies. While her specific characterizations were later found to be inadequate, nevertheless her emphasis on the basic congruence of a culture's institutions laid the groundwork for the reinterpretation of all earlier fieldwork.

Major impetus was given to the scientific study of national character during World War II. At that time, knowledge of both enemy and ally national characters became crucial. Information on national character had to be applied in the writing of propaganda leaflets and in the briefing of men who were to be parachuted down behind enemy lines. Predictions had to be made concerning the probable behavior of the members of all nations involved in the war effort. For this purpose, interdisciplinary teams of anthropologists,

psychologists and psychiatrists were called into being by the Office of War Information and by the Office of Strategic Services.

Margaret Mead was one of the anthropologists most involved in this wartime work. In a recent essay she analyzed the state of national character study at the end of World War II.

By the end of the war, the term "national character" was being applied to studies that used anthropological methods from the field of culture and personality, psychiatric models from psychoanalysis, statistical analyses of attitude tests, and experimental models of small-group process... This period of wartime studies of national character was also the period of the initial application of developing technology to problems of research and training. The use of films both for training and for analysis of national character, of taped recordings that re-emphasized the value of verbatim reporting, the intensive exploitation of the interview, and the growth of small-group model experiments on stress, patterns of cooperation, and the like -- all these arose from and contributed to the development of more precise methods of collecting and analyzing data. 2

Needless to say, certain controversies had also developed among the representatives of the various disciplines involved in the wartime national character projects. Margaret Mead points out that:

...psychoanalysts questioned the adequacy of such speedy analyses compared with the hundreds of hours they would spend studying one patient. The psychologists, at the same time, found it difficult to recognize regularities in the wide range of expressions of national character that they elicited by questionnaires; and the sociologists were preoccupied by differences among subcultural groups. The anthropologists' use of material on child training as an available and productive clue led to overstatements both for and against the method by members of other disciplines....3

These controversies have by no means been overcome. Indeed, the separate disciplines have sought to maintain their characteristic

viewpoints even in the face of criticism from other fields. Yet, ideally, national character remains an interdisciplinary study. And in reality no one has been able to work on national character without taking into account the various kinds of investigation undertaken by each of the social sciences.

In this chapter we shall examine the development and use of the concept of national character in several fields of modern social science -- anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Because of the nature of national character study, the discipline of a particular researcher is not always clear. In any case, our major concern will be to make clear only the major trends in the study of national character.

B. DEVELOPMENT AND USE IN CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

As its name implies, the social science discipline called cultural anthropology is concerned with the study of culture. "Culture," however, is difficult to define. Within the context of a broader discussion, Kluckholm and Kelly offer this comprehensive definition. Culture consists, they say, of "all those historically created designs for living, explicit and implicit, rational, irrational and non-rational, which exist at any given time as potential guides for the behavior of men."⁴

The task of describing all the guiding "designs" of any society presents an enormous task. It has been attempted in only a few "primitive" societies. Cultural life, even in a so-called "primitive" society, is far too complex to allow its reduction to a single book-length description. At best, only what appear to be

the most important designs can be described in detail. Hence, cultural anthropologists have emphasized "the study of shared habits, of habits which are common either to all the members of a society, or at least to significant or relevant portions thereof."⁵

We are not concerned here with the specific anthropological techniques for studying culture. It must suffice to note that, through the years, significant refinement in methodology has been achieved; and it is now commonly expected that the separate observations of two anthropologists will confirm one another. All this has been important because, according to Mead, the study of a national culture must precede any study of its national character.⁶

The study of national character has had its roots in cultural anthropology. Yet, the study of national character is not identical with the study of culture; the latter is already presupposed by the former. "National character studies attempt," states Mead, "to trace the way in which the identified cultural behavior is represented in the intra-psychic structure of the individual members of the culture, combining cultural theory and psychological theory...into a new psychocultural theory to explain how human beings embody the culture, learn it, and live it."⁷

National character is not more or less synonymous with the sum of learned cultural behavior. It is, rather, "the organization of motives and predispositions within a society."⁸

Geoffrey Gorer, a cultural anthropologist who has specialized in national character study, points out three partly complementary and partly contrasting connotations in the concept.

1. National character isolates and analyzes the principle motives or predispositions which can be deduced from the behavior of the personnel of a society at a given time and place.
2. National character describes the means by which these motives and predispositions are elicited and maintained in the majority of the new members who are added to the society by birth, so that a society continues its culture longer than a single generation.
3. National character also refers to the ideal image of themselves in the light of which individuals assess and pass judgment upon themselves and their neighbors, and on the basis of which they reward and punish their children, for the manifestation or non-manifestation of given traits and attitudes. 9

Anthropologists have utilized two major approaches in their attempts to isolate and analyze the principle motives and dispositions of a society. Some have emphasized the child-rearing practices of a society as the key to grasping national character. And others have stressed the personality requirements inherent in the cultural institutions.

Those who have taken the latter approach have sought to analyze the psychological functions of the cultural institutions. They assume that it is the social structure which determines the framework within which national character must be manifest. "Most human beings," said Ruth Benedict, "take the channel [of emotional expression] that is ready made in their culture. If they can take this channel, they are provided with adequate means of expression. If they cannot, they have all the problems of the aberrant everywhere."¹⁰

The institutions of a society assume the existence of certain predispositions in the population. Unless such predispositions are present, anthropologists feel that the institutions will fail

to function. Where the society has achieved a degree of equilibrium, the various practices and customs are all congruent with one another. That is, they appeal to a coherently related pattern of motives.

"...If the end results of institutional activities are inspected, they will be seen to fall into patterns in which a small number of themes are dominant."¹¹

Benedict argued in Patterns of Culture that no single item of behavior could be understood by itself. Indeed, she spoke there as if every individual society member acted from motives, emotions and values that were themselves institutionalized.

If we are interested in cultural processes, the only way in which we can know the significance of the selected detail of behaviour is against the background of the motives and emotions and values that are institutionalized in that culture. The first essential, so it seems today, is to study the living culture, to know its habits of thought and the functions of its institutions..."¹²

Whether or not the basic motives, emotions and values are institutionalized (which may be just a matter of definition), it is the task of a national character study to discover them. Obviously, they are not themselves perceivable, and they must be inferred from a consideration of cultural evidence. The problem is whether all the cultural evidence needs to be considered. For if the institutions of a society are congruent with one another, then national character could be derived from the careful examination of any major institution. And if the society's institutions are not fully congruent with one another -- if one or more institutions appeal to deviant motives -- then only the crucial institutions should be examined. In either case, not all the cultural evidence needs analysis.

Many anthropologists feel that it is not useful to consider all the institutions of a society. Some cultural behavior may be quite peripheral to the society's main pattern and not at all a significant indication of its national character. Certain institutions may, as philosopher Morris Ginsberg suggests, reflect only the character of powerful elements and not of the society's membership as a whole.¹³ Other institutions, more primary in nature, are considered clearly crucial for the entire population. These latter institutions in particular call for careful examination. Thus we often find national character studies which pay special attention to religion, folklore, or commerce.

Anthropologists frequently judge that the child-rearing system is the most crucial institution for the determination of national character. The basic theoretical position of these anthropologists was stated by Gillin:

...The individual learns to be the kind of person he becomes, and...most of what he learns is cultural material conveyed to him by the members of his group and their artifacts. The cultures...vary..., but each has the effect of producing a certain similarity in personality among the individuals who practice the culture. These similarities...owe their existence to the similarities in training and conditioning to which children of a given group are exposed...If we know the child-rearing patterns of a society or social category, we are in a fair position to describe reliably the type of person we may expect to find in that society or category. 14

National character studies which take the child-rearing system as their basis, investigate the early feeding and weaning practices, the modes of toilet training, the pattern of rewards and punishments relative to character training. It is thought that a society's standardized child-rearing system will produce a basically

similar character disposition in all the children, and that this character will persist as the national character of the adult population.

Such emphasis upon the child-rearing system reflects an investigator's commitment to some particular psychological orientation. Gorer, for example, recognizes his dependence upon concepts taken from Thorndike and Hull ("law of effect"), Harlow ("learning sets"), and Freud ("stages of maturation in childhood").¹⁵ From this eclectic psychological orientation, Gorer developed a set of "twelve postulates" for the study of national character. These postulates can be found in the Appendix of this thesis.

To be sure, the psychological orientation which has had the most important impact upon national character study has been psychoanalysis. Kluckhohn has given a number of reasons for anthropologists being attracted to psychoanalytic theory. Basically, the anthropologist "recognizes that there are certain similarities in the problems that confront him in describing and interpreting a culture and those met by a psychoanalyst in diagnosing a personality: the relationships between forms and meanings, between content and organization, between stability and change."¹⁶

Nevertheless, no national character study based on pure Freudian theory has ever been undertaken. Psychoanalytic theory has provided, as Inkeles and Levinson point out quite correctly), only a persistent starting point for national character studies since 1934:

...Although it has been a seminal influence, a primary source of concepts and hypotheses, it has seldom been taken over intact as a systematic theoretical position in this field. For the most part, each investigator has been theoretically

"on his own," taking an approach in which traditional psychoanalytic theory is modified, fractionated or blended with a variety of other viewpoints. 17

Abram Kardiner represents a neo-Freudian psychoanalytic viewpoint. Together with several anthropologists (notably, Ralph Linton), he has developed what he calls the concept of a "basic personality structure."

We find that if childhood disciplines constitute one order of institutions then religion and folklore comprise another. We called the former primary and the latter secondary. Also there was something created in the individual by his childhood experiences which formed the basis for the projective systems subsequently used to create folklore and religion. This group of nuclear constellations in the individual was designated the basic personality structure. This concept proved to be only a refinement of a concept...known as national character. 18

Kardiner and his associates attempt to pull together and systematize various anthropological methods for the derivation of national character. Through the use of the Freudian concept of projection, they are able to link childhood experience and adult institutions. In other words, Kardiner provides the vocabulary by which the society's basic coherence can be stated. Institutions are related to one another not directly but through the medium of the individuals who comprise the membership. Their childhood experiences were so much alike -- their process of character formation was so similar -- that, as adults, they tend to project the same aspirations, fantasies, expectations and wishes on the customs and practices of the society.

It must be stressed that no anthropological description of

national character is meant to describe any individual member of a society. The descriptions are strictly stripped-down skeletons. An anthropologist seeks to discount individual variation in his statement of national character. For example, according to Linton, the basic personality type "does not correspond to the total personality of the individual but rather to the ...value-attitude systems which are basic to the individual's personality configuration. Thus the same basic personality type may be reflected in many different forms of behavior and may enter into many different total personality configurations."¹⁹

"The result [of a national character study]," says anthropologist Mead, "is an account necessarily less rich than is the individual character of those from whom it has been derived."²⁰

C. DEVELOPMENT AND USE IN SOCIOLOGY

For the most part, sociologists have not utilized a concept of national character. Perhaps this is so because they are not accustomed to analyzing entities as large as a nation. As Margaret Mead pointed out above, sociologists prefer to focus their efforts on the examination of subcultural groups. Primarily, they have devoted their attention to social relationships within a particular national frame. For example, many different aspects of American society have been carefully and ably described by sociologists. Yet, almost none of this examination has been carried on with the ultimate goal of describing the American national character.

Occasionally, sociologists have referred to some sort of basic personality pattern in the population. But it is not specified

in detail, and it is not an object of major concern. In an introductory text on sociology, Green mentions very briefly the presence of some "universals" in every society. "Every culture preserves universal features which exert a more or less uniform influence. Most personalities contain these universals to some extent..."²¹ For most sociologists these "universals" are not very interesting or important. They would agree with Green's conclusion on the subject: "It follows that the impact of American culture upon personality can hardly be assessed unless...separate status groupings are taken into account."²²

American sociologists have done a great deal to make clear the norms and values of different status groupings in our society. Anyone now wishing to study the American national character must necessarily take account of these relevant sociological investigations. Indeed, we shall see in the next chapter that our most valuable information for the description of Jewish national character comes from these sociological inquiries.

There are, however, some sociologists who have ventured into an examination of the national culture. In doing so, their scope and procedure become somewhat anthropological. That is, their focus changes from the status groupings of the society to its institutions. And assumptions of basic cultural congruence come to play a role in their thinking. Notice, for instance, the following discussion by Hertzler of the religious institutions:

Although religions are probably not as well integrated with other institutions or as dominant in a society like ours, as was the case in primitive and ancient societies, they nevertheless are a prominent part of the total institutional system.

First, this is evident in the fact that there tends to be a congruence among all institutions wherever studied; the principle of socio-cultural compatibility applies; the religious institutions must fit with the total way of life, be in accord with the other highly important and influential institutions of the community or society. Secondly, religious institutions are in a continuous state of functional interdependence and reciprocity with other institutions. (*italics mine*) 23

Hertzler suggests that every society has an ideological system which governs in many ways whatever its members do technologically and societally. Without a commonly accepted ideology to bind them together, a society's individuals and groups "would fly off in all directions." The ideological system is what people "have in their heads about their universe."

Thus, the ideological system is a society's intricately interwoven fabric of its facts, its interpretations, assumptions, and axioms, its sentiments and attitudes, its articles of faith and its creeds, its dogmas and doctrines, its conceptions of good and bad, and of useful and not useful, its standards and models, its bodies of judgments, its directives, compulsives, and taboos, its conceptions of responsibility and obligation, its convictions regarding the consequences of action, its bodies of rules, its justifications for existence, its rationalized hopes, its doctrines of ends, and its bodies of plans, policies, and programs. 24

These elements taken together determine the society's psyche and provide its ethos, says Hertzler.

A concept of ideological system is not a concept of national character. It does, however, seem to point to the same feature of society for which national character is an explanation -- namely, the cultural coherence. How Hertzler would account for socio-cultural compatibility is not clear from his book. Perhaps that still remains a field of speculation too far removed from sociological theory.

The sociologist who comes closest to a national character pre-

sentation is Riesman in The Lonely Crowd. In this well known work he examines various aspects of contemporary American life in terms of three character styles: tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed. Riesman indicates that the three styles are functionally related to the historical growth of industrialism and population. Today we are passing -- or have already passed -- a point when the inner-directed personality pattern is no longer dominant in a large scale society such as America.

Now, if Riesman has established the widespread dominance in America of a particular character style, can we then say that he has described the national character? The answer seems to be negative. First of all, Mead insists that "although [Riesman] has drawn on all the methods used in national-character studies, his work never articulates systematically with any of them...."²⁵

Whereas a full national-character study would take into account all the stages of the life history, and the specific rules of parents, grandparents, siblings, peers, offspring, and so on, Riesman, intent on identifying political styles, is content to find greater or smaller proportions of expressed themes, which he loosely attributes to the influence of the entire society, the specific early influence of parents, and the influence of peers. 26

Even more convincing is Riesman's own denial that his work represents a national character study. In a new "Preface" to The Lonely Crowd (1961 edition), he tries to make his own position more clear:

The concept of social character, as employed in The Lonely Crowd, involved a tentative decision as to what was important for salient groups in contemporary society. It was thus a different concept from national or modal character, which is usually a more aggregative statement about personality dispositions in a group or nation;

we were only interested in certain aspects of character in very imprecisely specified parts of the population, and even there primarily in what was changing. But we did not differentiate carefully enough between character, behavior, values, and a style or ethos of particular institutions -- the sorting out that this involves is a still uncompleted task for research. 27

Social character, according to Riesman, is not national character. But the varieties of social character which Riesman has hypothesized for America do represent a bold step in the direction of a sociological concept of national character. The furor with which The Lonely Crowd has been received within the community of sociologists indicates to some degree how bold the step was. Few contemporary sociological theories have been both attacked and defended with such vigor. 28

Students of national character can not look to sociology for methodological or theoretical guidance. Concepts of "ideological system" and "social character" are only approximations of the concept of national character. Sociology's major contribution to the study of national character will be abstracted from its investigations of the norms and values of society's different status groupings and their mutual interrelations.

D. DEVELOPMENT AND USE IN PSYCHOLOGY

In the introductory chapter of this thesis we first defined national character as those "relatively enduring personality characteristics and patterns that are modal among the adult members of [a national] society." 29 The disciplines which we have discussed so far in this second chapter concentrate normally on the study of society

and its institutions. It is psychology which takes as its normal field of study the human personality. One would think, then, that the study of modal personalities would be a natural concern of psychology. Yet we find that very little of the literature on national character has been written by professional psychologists.

Until recently, most psychologists had been exclusively concerned with the processes of learning and perception without regard to environmental factors. While they sought to uncover the universal principles governing individual behavior, they made an effort to exclude from consideration all the variables of specific social setting. For these psychologists, the study of modal personalities within a particular population was not a subject of interest.

A small group of social psychologists did take as their task the dispelling of stereotypic generalizations about the psychology of groups. As a lever against the unscientific statements of race psychology, they introduced rigorous methodological requirements into their empirical research. But their work tended to emphasize the ways in which an environment brings about differences in personality, rather than modal similarities.

Since the late 1930's, however, the scope of psychology's interest has widened. For one thing, environmental factors have increasingly come to be recognized as crucial variables which have to be considered. The national setting, the family, the neighborhood, the socio-economic class and the ethnic identity are all recognized to play a dynamic role in the formation of individual personality. In this new atmosphere, the study of modal personality patterns

becomes an appropriate field for psychological investigation.

Klineberg is a social psychologist who early became interested in national character. He began, however, by rejecting the simple unimodal typologies which Benedict had introduced in her pioneering work.

Types are unsatisfactory, both in the case of individuals and in that of cultures, because so few of them actually fit the categories which the typology assumes. Probably no persons and no cultures are completely introvert or extrovert, Apollonian or Dionysian. 30

Starting with the individual in a society, Klineberg sought to discover how anyone knows what is expected of him. Surely, he is never told to be Apollonian or Dionysian. But as a child, he learns the behavior patterns characteristic of crucial social roles. He is taught what the role of a boy-child is, what the role of a father is, and what the role of a brother is. The teaching goes on by example and imitation, very often in play. And frequently, when the growing boy is to give up a childish role and act according to the imperatives of a new role, the event is marked by significant rites de passage.

Where these rites de passage occur...they perform an important function both individually and socially. They make it clear that the adolescent has now definitely entered into a new status with a clearly defined role. ...He knows just where he stands and exactly what is expected of him. He experiences none of the conflicts which arise out of the uncertainty as to his role in society. 31

It may well be that the modal personality patterns which national character study seeks to describe are really just the major role conceptions within a society. In any case, role theory provides some valuable insights into the relation between culture and personality.

Roles may be regarded as a connecting link between culture and personality. It is largely by determining the role which the individual is expected to perform that the culture influences the behavior of individual members of any community. 32

Role theory is particularly relevant to national character study because it accounts for the individual's motivation as well as for the culture's influence. The individual has a need to know who he is. For a social animal like man, roles satisfy most problems of identity. When the individual's role or roles are not clear to him, he is troubled by much anxiety concerning his identity. That feeling of anxiety will motivate him to discover and act out the role which "seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of his group."³³

A great emphasis is put by the psychoanalyst Erikson on the study of what he calls the "ego identity". This is, I believe, a way to pursue role theory in its further implications. Erikson, too, is concerned to understand how the individual comes to know who and what he is. Every adult member of a society begins as a child, and it is to childhood that we must look for the first stages in ego development.

The growing child must, at every step, derive a vitalizing sense of reality from the awareness that his individual way of mastering experience (his ego synthesis) is a successful variant of a group identity and is in accord with its space-time and life plan. In this children cannot be fooled by empty praise and condescending encouragement. They may have to accept artificial bolstering of their self-esteem in lieu of something better, but their ego identity gains real strength only from wholehearted and consistent recognition of real accomplishment -- i.e., of achievement that has meaning in the culture. 34

Within any particular society there are available to children only a limited number of ego synthesis patterns. As Erikson says:

A child has quite a number of opportunities to identify himself, more or less experimentally, with habits, traits, occupations, and ideas of real or fictitious people of either sex. Certain crises force him to make radical selections. However, this historical era in which he lives offers only a limited number of socially meaningful models for workable combinations of identification fragments. 35

Out of ego synthesis there comes to the individual a sense of ego identity. The individual feels himself to be an authentic member of the society of which he is a part. He knows that his manner of coping with life is a minor variant of both the way in which others around him master their own experiences and the way they recognize such mastery by him. He knows who and what he is.

By viewing ego identity as a product and at the same time a functional constituent of the ego, Erikson places it within the over-all psychoanalytic theory of personality structure and development. His formulations not only advance ego theory but also reduce the gap between "individual" and "social" psychology. 36

In Childhood and Society, Erikson offers a number of reflections on the national characters of several societies. In general, he seeks to investigate the modal personalities as exemplified in identity (or role) patterns. Erikson, however, denies that he has established "basic character structures" for the societies which he investigated. To delineate the officially required behavior of a people is only to begin the description of its character. Attention also must be paid to the provisions for variation from the norm.

...To know how generous or how thrifty a people or an individual "is," we must know not only what the verbalized and the implied values of his culture are, but also what provisions are made for an

individual's "getting away" with transgressions. Each system, in its own way, tends to make similar people out of all its members, but each in a specific way also permits exemptions and deductions from the demands with which it thus taxes the individuality of the individual ego. 37

Psychologists regularly criticize anthropological studies of national character for their tendency to present a unimodal conception. A unimodal conception like basic personality structure does not account for the variety of identity patterns in a society. Erikson recognizes that national character descriptions have to elucidate the whole range of a people's behavior -- including deviation. Unimodal national character descriptions are not really possible. What is called for is a multimodal conception of national character.

Such a multimodal conception is presented by Inkeles and Levinson, whose definition of national character we have been utilizing in this section: "relatively enduring personality characteristics and patterns that are modal among the adult members of \sqrt{a} national/ society."³⁸

It should be emphasized...that our general definition of national character does not imply a heavily unimodal distribution of personality characteristics. National character can be said to exist to the extent that modal personality traits and syndromes are found. How many modes there are is an important empirical and theoretical matter, but one that is not relevant to the definition of national character. Particularly in the case of the complex industrial nation, a multimodal conception of national character would seem to be theoretically the most meaningful as well as empirically the most realistic. It appears unlikely that any specific personality characteristic, or any character type, will be found in as much as 60-70 percent of any modern national population. However, it is still

a reasonable hypothesis that a nation may be characterized in terms of a limited number of modes, say five or six, some of which apply to perhaps 10-15 percent, others to perhaps 30 percent of the total population. Such a conception of national character can accommodate the subcultural variations in socio-economic class, geosocial region, ethnic group, and the like, which appear to exist in all modern nations. 39

In large part, it has been a simplified monolithic depiction of culture and social structure which has given rise to unimodal national character delineations. A comforting but deceptive impression of congruence can be achieved when categories and relations are oversimplified. It may be that there is "'a strain toward consistency' in culture, and this may be matched in personality and social structure and in the resultant totality of any given social order."⁴⁰ But 'a strain toward consistency' is only a hypothesis and should not be used as a national character axiom -- a mistake which Gorer, for example, often makes.

The crucial point here lies not in criticizing the precision of Gorer's work, although this lack of precision deserves note as an example of a widespread tendency, but rather in emphasizing the importance of assessing multimodal patterns in personality in large-scale national populations. To discover such multiple modes where they exist is important not solely to meet the canons of reliable scientific investigation: knowledge about these personality modes is essential for an understanding of the interrelations between personality and the social system in complex, heterogeneous social structures characterized by multimodal patterns of structuring interpersonal relations and role demands. 41

It is true that the presence of appropriate psychological configurations in the membership of a social system will facilitate the smooth functioning of that system. "...Insofar as the relevant traits of character are modally present in the population of any

society, the chances are increased that culturally and structurally important goals will be aspired toward and implemented by the society's members, thus in significant degree ensuring the continued effective functioning of the social system."⁴²

There is, however, no reason to believe that a smooth functioning social system requires the widespread existence of a complementary modal personality. As Riesman has said, "...All our experience of the world...has led us to believe that modern industrial society can press into service a great variety of social character types."⁴³ The system will work regardless of prevalent character types. Yet it is nonetheless true "that character types who fit badly pay a high price in anomie, in contrast to the release of energy provided by congruence of character and task."⁴⁴

Inkeles and Levinson urge that care be taken in national character study to distinguish between two types of personality structure analysis, between:

(a) the "socially required" or socially congenial personality structures--those that can function optimally in a given setting--and (b) the actual, modal personality structures that in fact are to be found in the members of the society. Clearly, a disparity often exists between (a) and (b), particularly in a modern industrial society whose institutional structures are likely to change more rapidly than, or in a different direction from, its modal personality structures. ⁴⁵

Most studies of national character have not made this theoretical distinction. Particularly has there been confusion in those studies which have derived national character from a psychological analysis of collective adult phenomena--institutions, folklore, mass media, etc. At best, this kind of psychosocial analysis will tell us

only what the socially congenial personality structure is in that society. There is no guarantee that the actual, modal personalities in any society correspond to the national character as derived from psychosocial analysis.

In short, to establish systematic interrelations between modal personality and cultural or institutional patterns we must measure independently the elements to be related. This requires that statements about modal personality be derived from the study of individuals and not from cultural themes or institutional structure, and no less that such themes or structure be derived from data and analysis independent of that from which personality modes are derived. To do anything less is to run grave risks of circular reasoning, and certainly to minimize the chances of adequately relating personality to socio-cultural structure and functioning. 46

As we indicated earlier, the cultural institution most often emphasized as a determinant of national character has been the child-rearing system. Indeed, this emphasis is consistent with the psychoanalytic theory that childhood personality provides a nucleus or foundation for the adult personality. Nevertheless, psychoanalytic theory in recent years has been amplified and extended by several post-Freudians. Erikson, for example, presents a highly plausible theory of eight developmental stages of man. "It is, in fact, the purpose of this presentation to bridge the [Freudian] theory of infantile sexuality...and our knowledge of the child's physical and social growth within his family and the social structure."⁴⁷

While the child-rearing system is undoubtedly a significant determinant of national character, there is no reason to rule out the effect of many other determinants. The total developmental sequence, including middle childhood, puberty and adolescence, has to be con-

sidered. Shifts in the patterning of self-definition and interpersonal relationships from one age period to the next must be noted. So too is it important to evaluate these factors:

- [1.] conditions of sociocultural change as contrasted with stability;
- [2.] being raised by parents who are firmly rooted in their local culture as contrasted with those who are part of an immigrant minority in a strange culture;
- [3.] coming to adolescence in a culture in which the adults are respected as against one in which they are devalued relative to the adolescent peer culture;
- [4.] having available a rich store of valued role models as contrasted with having only an impoverished and degenerated cultural heritage. 48

Inkeles and Levinson suggest, however, that the search for national character determinants should not precede the identification of modal personalities within the adult population. Until the presence of modal personalities has been ascertained, the search for determinants of national character may be premature. If we mean to take first things first, then we must begin by developing methods for assessing modal personality structure.

Having rejected psycho-social analysis of cultural institutions as a valid method for the assessment of modal personality structures, Inkeles and Levinson call for "the psychological investigation of adequately large and representative samples of persons, studied individually."⁴⁹ Admittedly, this is an enormous task. It requires the use of brief clinical-assessment procedures for every member of a sample group. These procedures are only now being developed, and they do not yet lend themselves to statistical procedures which can be easily verified.

*You verify a
conclusion*

There have not been many national character studies in which individuals have been separately interviewed. This is due, in part, to the anthropological orientation of most national character studies. But it is also due to "the lack of an explicit, standardized analytic scheme, that is, a universally applicable system of concepts and descriptive variables in terms of which modal adult personality structure can be described and compared."⁵⁰ This lack, in turn, is the reflection of a general problem in psychology -- the absence of any generally accepted personality theory.

The full delineation of national character according to the suggestions of Inkeles and Levinson can not yet be done. Proper modal personality studies must wait for the resolution of psychology's central dilemma: what are the dimensions of personality? In the meantime, it is suggested that national character study concentrate on a limited number of psychological issues concerning which some research has been done. There are a number of analytic issues which most current investigators would recognize as significant, and which ought to be examined in modal personality studies.

Inkeles and Levinson call attention to five analytic issues upon which they feel the study of modal personality should focus:⁵¹

- (1) Relation to authority
- (2) Conception of self
- (3) Bases for maintaining inner equilibrium
- (4) Major forms of anxiety
- (5) Primary dilemmas or conflicts.

These are the kinds of issues that possess the quality of universal psycho-social relevance. Each of these issues is basic to the characterization and comparison of people in groups or as individuals.

The utilization of these five analytic issues as a start, together with adequate clinical-assessment procedures and sampling techniques, should allow the fairly reliable description of modal personalities. But none of these analytic issues is so clearly understood that the descriptive categories are perfectly clear. Much experimentation and testing remains to be done. It is true, however, that the study of national character has become subject to more rigorous methodological requirements than ever before. The old intuitive typologies of configuration and style are becoming less and less common, replaced now by the social psychologist's carefully stated, multiple descriptions of modal personalities. Just how fruitful the study of modal personality will become remains to be seen.

E. SUMMARY OF TRENDS

In this chapter we have discussed the history of the concept of national character. Some major trends in the development and use of the concept in the social sciences have been examined. In general, all students of national character have desired to state the essential differences between national groups without resorting to the use of stereotypes. In accord with the principles of scientific procedure, they have therefore constantly attempted to refine their methodology. Thus, anthropologists have given up the effort to comprehend culture as a whole, and they are now more likely to focus upon the examination of crucial institutions -- particularly the child-rearing system. This latter approach has suggested to certain students that a basic personality structure, shared by all the members of a society, links the various cultural institutions together. Some sociologists, on

the other hand, have suggested that a common ideological system binds the members of a society together and differentiates them from other groups. In all disciplines, however, there has been an attempt to make more explicit the exact subject matter of national character study.

Most descriptions of national character have proceeded from the assumption that the institutions of a society are basically congruent with one another. Recent theory has tended to challenge this assumption. In modern industrial societies, at least, the cultural institutions may not be congruent with one another. Similarly, the national character is probably not a monolithic entity. Social psychologists have called for a multimodal conception of national character, one which will account for the whole range of a people's behavior. Thus, they have tended to speak of modal personalities within a national population rather than of its single national character. And they have rejected the psycho-social analysis of cultural institutions as a valid method for the assessment of modal personality.

If national character is to be a valid scientific concept, then it must be tied to empirical methodology. National character can not be intuited by one who has the "feel" of the culture. It must be determined after careful investigation of individuals in adequately large and representative population samples. The investigation should proceed along the lines of certain basic psycho-social issues which are universal among all peoples and which will allow their comparison. Unless certain empirical criteria are insisted upon, the concept of national character can deteriorate into a pseudo-scientific rationalization for the propagation of national stereotypes.

A national character study must be concerned with the actual modal personality structures which are in fact found among members of a society.

CHAPTER III

INVESTIGATIONS RELEVANT TO THE STUDY
OF JEWISH NATIONAL CHARACTER

A. INTRODUCTION

The world has never lacked ascriptions of Jewish national character. Nearly all of them, however, have been offered by partial observers whose purpose was to arouse feelings of either friendship or hostility toward the Jews. Few, indeed, have been made by dispassionate social scientists empirically investigating the nature of a human group. That this is so is not unrelated to the general state of national character study. For only recently, in our own century, has the concept of national character been scientifically developed and applied. Prior to the twentieth century, the theoretical concepts and methodological apparatus were not available. But even in our own day, the study of Jewish national character has lagged as a scientific discipline. *style*

When it comes to the study of Jews, Bialik Prize recipient Moshe Meisels notes that all too often idea has taken precedence over character.

In respect to the Jews, no one inquires about the nature of the individual Jew, but rather about the nature of Judaism. The Jew, in popular opinion, is formed in the image of Judaism; the idea takes precedence over character. The vast literature on the nature of the Jewish People written by Jews and Gentiles alike, books of truth and love as well as of lies and hatred, all depict the character of the individual Jew through Judaism, deduce the qualities of his personality and spirit from his doctrines. 1

Meisel's observation can be illustrated by an example from the writings of Max Scheler. In his provocative presentation of "ressentiment," Scheler refers briefly to the Jews as exemplars of this generalized frustration. The Jews experience ressentiment, he declares, because their claims to superiority go unrecognized in the world. How does he know that Jews feel superior? Because it is a doctrine of Judaism that the Jews are a chosen people. And this is also how he chooses to account for what he regards as a basic character pattern of the Jews. This people, who are by religious doctrine specially chosen by God, find themselves persecuted and looked down upon. Their "extremely powerful acquisitive instinct" represents an over-compensative response to the alleged feeling of ressentiment.

Jewish ressentiment, which Nietzsche rightly designates as enormous, finds double nourishment: first in the discrepancy between the colossal national pride of "the chosen people" and a contempt and discrimination which weighed on them for centuries like a destiny, and in modern times through the added discrepancy between formal constitutional equality and factual discrimination. Certainly the extremely powerful acquisitive instinct of this people is due -- over and beyond natural propensities and other causes -- to a deep-rooted disturbance of Jewish self-confidence. It is an over-compensation for the lack of a social acknowledgment which would satisfy the national self-esteem. 2

Scheler's derivation of Jewish character from an idea of Judaism led to the validation of a pernicious popular stereotype -- the greedy Jew. It is in many ways a convincing line of argument. It is unconvincing solely because it is not empirical; no Jews have been studied, only their theoretical ideology. It is not validly established that a single Jew really feels the ressentiment of Scheler's description. It is not even verified that a single Jew has internalized the claims to national superiority inherent in the chosen people

doctrine. With Scheler, idea has taken precedence over character.

Eric Fromm's methodology does not vary a great deal from that of Scheler. In a lecture on "Character Development in Judaism and Basic Attitudes in Jewish Life," the famous analyst attempted to delineate a basic trait in the Jewish character matrix. He ascribes to the Jews an "ironical attitude toward force and power." Because secular power and secular institutions are neither dignified nor religiously appropriate, they have been distrusted by Jews.

Force, power, business, money remained what it was, namely something on a completely secular level which has never attained the quality of something transcending secular life or something giving meaning to life, of something religious in itself. 3

This description of a basic attitude is derived from a consideration of Jewish theology. According to Judaism, nothing on earth has value simply because it exists. Value is ascribed to something only because it is valuable in terms of judgment by God or by the moral and ethical principles of the religion. But, whether individual Jews act in accord with this idea of Judaism needs to be verified. It may well be the case that the idea is a moralistic doctrine which motivates the activities and operational attitudes of very few Jews -- perhaps none. Certainly, casual observation of the contemporary Jewish community tends to cast doubt upon the authenticity of Fromm's characterization.

Now it may be that either Fromm or Scheler is correct in his description of the national character. They may have intuited a verifiable truth, and an empirical study of the Jews might validate their conclusions. But the proof for a national character description must come from a study of Jews and not from the psychological examination of their theology.

In this chapter we shall summarize the crucial findings of several scientific investigations of Jewish behavior and value orientations. These are not usually studies of Jewish national character per se. But any authentic description of Jewish national character must be coherently cognizant of all these research conclusions, at the very least. They provide the only data by which an hypothesis of Jewish national character can be evaluated. It is from these materials that the manifestations of national character must be described, its psychological implications understood, and its derivation explained.

B. GENERAL STUDIES

Shtetl. -- In all the vast literature written about Jews, there is only one work which is specifically a study of Jewish national character. Zborowski and Herzog took upon themselves the task of describing and interpreting the life and character of the East European shtetl. Their book grew out of an extensive research project financed by the Office of Naval Research and carried on by Columbia University Research in contemporary Cultures. When the study was conducted, just after World War II, the East European Jewish community no longer existed. Margaret Mead states in the Foreward to Life Is With People that "this book is an anthropological study of a culture which no longer exists, except in the memories, and in the partial and altered behavior of its members, now scattered over the world..."⁴

Life Is With People is a study of national character at a distance. As such, it is somewhat unreliable. That is, although the

interview is still the main source of data, the material from interviews cannot be checked by observations. The informants, who are refugees from Eastern Europe, do not now form an inter-acting community. Their behavior patterns have been significantly altered; even their thought patterns have been affected. Memory, like perception in general, is intimately interwoven with one's present life situation. When national character is investigated under such conditions, the results can only be very approximate. And indeed, Life Is With People has been roundly criticized by many specialists in East European Jewish life. A review in Jewish Social Studies, for example, indicated that the book is "most unsatisfactory."

There are frequent references to practices in the shtetl that are really American or large city customs...Evidently, the authors were too credulous when it came to oral sources. Statements by older people obtained in interviews are often misleading and it takes a real expert to distinguish between the truth and imagination...In its present form the book is most unsatisfactory. It has been severely and justly criticized in Yiddish publications. 5

Perhaps because it is the only study of its kind, Life Is With People has become -- despite its failings -- something of a modern classic; it is the generally recognized and widely quoted authority on shtetl life. Although its authors claim to have portrayed only the shtetl's culture, the study is often interpreted by others to be a portrait of the total East European Jewish culture. Such interpretations must be viewed with caution. And likewise must we view with suspicion any effort to extend Zborowski and Herzog's conclusions to a description of American Jewish culture or character.

There is a drastic difference between the life situation of an East European shtetl Jew and his American born cousin some fifty or more years later. Generalizations from one sphere to the other should be made extremely tentative, remaining subject to further careful scrutiny.

According to Zborowski and Herzog, three major themes pervaded the shtetl culture: learning, wealth and yikhus. From the interweavings of these three themes in the life of the people, the national character can be delineated. The shtetl Jew was motivated all his life to raise his status, to obtain entry into the class of sheyneh yidn. This upper class was universally recognized within the community to be those persons with the greatest claims to learning, wealth and yikhus. Between the sheyneh yidn and their low class opposites, the prosteh yidn, there was a whole series of differentiated social strata. "The people in the shtetl are keenly aware of each individual's position on the social spectrum."⁶ And, likewise, every person in the community knew the proper behavior and attitudes linked with every position in the social scale. To behave improperly with respect to social position revealed one to be prosteh and meant the forfeiture of any claims to higher status.

The single most dominant theme in shtetl culture was the value of learning. No matter what the individual's social position might have been, the acquisition of learning was associated with proper role behavior. "Not every Jew in the shtetl is a scholar or even a learned man, but intellectual achievement is the universally accepted goal."⁷ Intellectual achievement was by no means prized for its instrumental value; learning was acquired only for the prestige it granted. The

acquisition of abstract, unrelated intellectual knowledge had all the quality of a moral requirement. The good, the beautiful, the authentic Jew studied Talmud and its dilemmas as much and whenever he could, even to the point of sometimes disregarding his income. "Historically, traditionally, ideally, learning has been and is regarded as the primary value and wealth as subsidiary or complementary."⁸

American Jewish Ethnic Character. -- In an article called "Problems of Jewish Ethnic Character," Leibush Lehrer emphasizes that the pattern of Jewish life in America is totally different from that of Eastern Europe. "Consequently, the constant influences under which Jewish personality develops nowadays are totally different and new."⁹ Only a pale shadow, if that much, remains of the historical Jewish culture. The change did not occur suddenly in America. The traditional values had already been severely challenged by the post-Haskalah generations in Eastern Europe. Lehrer argues that the shtetl values did not occupy "a position of primacy among the Jewish psychological absolutes" of even the immigrants to America.¹⁰

The openness of American society has had a great influence in changing the Jewish ethnic character from what it had been earlier. The boundary between ingroup and outgroup, though not completely obliterated, has become less pronounced. Social relations between Jew and gentile have been raised to a new level. And, while it is difficult to assess the specific effects which this has had on the Jewish personality, "it stands to reason that certain concrete psychological manifestations would result from such openness."¹¹ Although further research is required to ascertain it, Lehrer is inclined to assume

that there is a new ethnic character to be found in the American Jewish community.

The existence of this new Jewish ethnic character is indicated by the changed nature of Jewish leadership in America. From consideration of a community's leadership, it is possible to learn a great deal about the group's standards and values. In traditional East European life the value on learning was revealed in the leadership position of the rabbi-scholar. In America it is the man of technical training, the professional, who has assumed Jewish leadership. The implications for Jewish ethnic character are not drawn by Lehrer. He simply asserts that a changed pattern of leadership indicates clearly the presence of a new ethnic character among the followers.

Further indications of a new ethnic character among American Jews can be found in their attitudes toward intermarriage and leisure time. Intermarriage, says Lehrer, is no longer regarded as a dreadful catastrophe by American Jews. Likewise, there is a change in the use of leisure time. Where a tone of seriousness had been characteristic of traditional leisure activities, "in America world amusements and light entertainment have attained to such a high place that little leisure is left for anything else."¹²

The place of religion in the American Jew's concept of Jewishness may also point to a change in ethnic character. However, Lehrer is not so sure but that the emphasis on religion is a satisfying re-statement of what is basically a secular concern for Jewish survival. Again, Lehrer does not indicate the implications this has for a description of modal personality. He suggests that the professed re-

ligiosity of American Jews may tell the investigator more about their ethnic character than about their spirituality.

Acculturation and Ethnic Solidarity. -- C. Bezalel Sherman describes as "unique" the American Jewish ethnic community. It is unique, first of all, because it alone among all the ethnic groups of America has successfully converted the acculturation process into an instrument for consolidating ethnic solidarity. Furthermore, American Jewry incorporates within its community pattern an element previously unknown in Jewish life: it is built entirely on voluntaristic principles.

In his book, The Jew Within American Society, Sherman assembles data on Jewish demographic, economic, social and cultural progress in this country. All the evidence indicates that Jewish adaptation to American life has been swifter and more thorough than that of any comparable ethnic group. The participation in business, the absorption of American cultural patterns, the significant involvement in American intellectual life -- all these indicate a high level of acculturation in the Jewish community.

Acculturation on the part of a minority means adjustment to a way of life which the majority population has evolved. It means acceptance of standards set up by the majority. It means, in other words, a desire on the part of the minority to restrict the area of disagreement with the majority and extend the area of agreement. Jews, the great dissenters in human history, are increasingly losing their ability and capacity to dissent in America. 13

Surveys conducted in a number of universities all show that Jewish students are losing the distinctiveness that characterized the Jew on the campuses in former years...Jewish students are following general patterns in planning for a career...In clothing, physical appearance, choice of subjects, reaction to social events, and forms of recreation, Jewish students are coming to resemble their non-Jewish colleagues. 14

Reports from Jewish and government welfare agencies indicate a substantial rise in this country in the number of broken Jewish homes and abandoned children... The gap between Jew and non-Jew is narrowing in this area, and ... a basic traditional value is losing its hold. 15

Much evidence is available to indicate the degree of Jewish acculturation in America. Particularly well acculturated is the native born third generation of American Jews. But, where acculturation has accompanied the demise of every other white ethnic group, it has gone hand and hand with the maintenance of ethnic identity among Jews.

As an ethnic community, the Jews of America have never before been so consolidated and enterprising. We have seen that among other ethnic groups communal activity within an ethnic framework was almost entirely immigrant activity, rarely second-generation and never third-generation activity. In the American Jewish community, on the other hand, the bulk of the leadership has passed into the hands of the second generation, with a third generation coming into its own and asserting itself. Even the fourth generation is beginning to play a not-insignificant role in Jewish leadership. *page!*

...

Social scientists and scholars as well as practical communal leaders, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, are unanimous in observing that the Jews have revealed a stauncher sense of group identity and have thus far put up a more successful resistance to the external forces of assimilation than any other white ethnic group in the country's history. Varying interpretations and explanations of the fact may be given, but about the fact itself there are no differences of opinion among students of the subject. Jews are maintaining their ethnic identity. 16

The clearest confirmation of continuous ethnic identification is to be found in the existence of a Jewish ghetto in American life. With acculturation one would have expected the disappearance of neighborhoods of Jewish concentration. Wealthy, acculturated Jews would be expected to seek housing in non-Jewish districts. Yet the economic

and social tyranny of the majority have created boundaries beyond which few Jews have been allowed to move.

A paradoxical situation emerges: it was precisely the richer elements, possessed of a greater interest in leaving their ethnic environment than any other segment of the Jewish community, who were the first to come to a halt at the barricaded rung of the social ladder. They, who viewed themselves as members of a religious rather than ethnic group, make the painful discovery that even for them only the Jewish street was fully open. And so to their synagogues were added their own exclusively Jewish communal and charitable institutions, their own clubs, recreational centers and means of entertainments. Their social circles were chiefly Jewish, they met more Jews at the resorts, their homes had to be in a Jewish neighborhood. If one word were needed to describe this entire situation, it is -- ghetto. 17

The ghetto should be recognized as more than just a segregated residential pattern. It is a term descriptive of a broad social and economic solidarity. Patterns of endogamous marriage testify most convincingly to the social solidarity of the Jewish community. "Mixed marriages are certainly a problem for Jews, but they are far from constituting a serious threat to the continued existence of the Jewish community in the United States."¹⁸ The strength of the community tie is further revealed in the pattern of professional separation prevalent among Jews. Sherman brings evidence from a number of surveys which "demonstrate the extent to which Jews in intellectual occupations are dependent upon the Jewish environment."¹⁹ Most Jewish doctors and lawyers find the majority of their clients within the ghetto. And conversely, most Jews seek their medical and legal advice from Jewish professionals. Merchants too find that they are dependent upon Jews for much of their business. When Jewish professionals and merchants do turn to gentiles for business, it is generally to the socially depressed non-Jewish groups.

The process of assimilation always moves in the direction of the dominant group, never in that of an ethnic group which is itself underprivileged or on the way to dissolution...Access to Italians, Poles, Ukrainians, Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and other minorities cannot stimulate such a desire [to assimilate]. 20

The ghetto, however, is not simply imposed upon the Jews by external forces. There are forces of internal cohesion within the Jewish community which have contributed to its continuity. Sherman notes that acculturation accentuates a Jew's commitment to the American principle of voluntarism. Some years ago, Horace Kallen suggested that the acculturated Jew feels a compulsion to evaluate his Jewishness -- he can no longer accept it as a simple inherited status. "The more marginal the Jew -- that is, the greater the number and variety of his relationships, actual and probable with non-Jews -- the greater his feeling of insecurity and this urge to 'evaluate' his existence as Jew...."²¹

The very posing of questions relating to the roots of Jewish existence has an ethnicizing impact even on one who arrives at assimilationist answers...The overwhelming majority of the Jews, irrespective of social status, sought an answer to the Jewish question which would secure their collective existence. 22

Native born American Jews overwhelmingly assert their Jewish identification by voluntary membership in the synagogue. As late as the mid-1940's most American Jews were not affiliated with synagogues. But by 1958, with acculturation further accomplished, the majority of the Jewish population was affiliated.

Of even greater significance than the quantitative expansion of the synagogue is its qualitative growth. It is scoring its greatest gains among the young native-born American Jews. In the suburbs and in the new residential settlements in the large cities,

where the synagog is making its deepest inroads, few immigrants will be found in the leadership of the more liberal congregations. Second generation Jews are at the helm of these institutions, with members of the third generation broadening their participation to a very appreciable extent. It makes little difference from an ethnic point of view whether this development stems from a religious revival or represents a social process; what is important is the fact that a greater proportion of American Jews now want to assert their identification and give it organized form. 23

It seems that the acculturated American Jew has come to answer the question of Jewish existence by a declaration of Jewish faith. He knows that religious voluntarism is a primary feature of the American cultural system, and that Judaism as a religious position is fully coherent with American life. Yet it needs to be understood, says Sherman, that a belief in Jewish peoplehood has become a prime article of contemporary Jewish faith. In other words, a religious ideology has been seized as the legitimizing justification for the maintenance of an ethnic ghetto. His voluntarily accepted religious ideology makes meaningful to the acculturated American Jew his separatist ethnic behavior. The position is so coherent and meaningful within the pattern of American life that the survival of the Jewish ethnic group has been assured. In this survival, Sherman asserts that the Jewish community is unique among the white ethnic groups of this country. It is the only group which has successfully turned acculturation into an instrument for ethnic solidarity.

Suburbia. -- Albert Gordon's study, Jews in Suburbia, illustrates some major themes in American Jewish life. It points, first of all, to the thorough acculturation of the American Jew. The very move to

suburbia represents participation in a basic American trend. According to Gordon, "More than forty-seven million people live in the suburbs today."²⁴ Urban dwellers everywhere in the country are revolting against the pattern of life in industrial big cities. There is a widespread desire to live in a setting of yards, parks, trees and nature. People want space to live in and freedom from big city tension.

Suburban life is assumed to be free from the tensions, haste, crowding and crime of the city. Its schools are assumed to be less crowded and to provide superior educational programs. Parents assume that their children will find more pleasant playmates coming from more controlled homes and families. 25

Jews move to suburbia for exactly the same reasons and with exactly the same assumptions as other Americans. In this movement, Jews are not acting as members of a religious minority but as part of the American majority -- its middle class. They seek to realize the same five goals of American civilization as do all members of the middle class: success, prestige, money, power and security. And a tangible sign of value realization in America is an individual's move to suburbia.

The suburbs of a city are not all alike. They are differentiated from one another by criteria of social and economic status. "Suburban standards of dress, food, automobiles, clubs and games differ, in the main, according to the suburbs' economic status."²⁶ A family chooses its suburban location on the basis of the social and economic status it can afford. And once arrived there, the family seeks to fully "adjust" itself to the environment. Conformity is a basic pattern of suburban life.

[The people of suburbia] fear criticism and they seek to avoid controversy. They generally refrain from participation in any situation which makes one appear different. Acceptance by the larger group requires that one conform to its standards. 27

The conformity pattern has had its effect upon Jewish life in suburbia. In those suburbs where affiliation with a church is the generally accepted rule, Jewish families quickly become associated with a synagogue. Just as the church-goers are not overly concerned with matters of creed, so too the Jews are not interested in theological disputes. There is a community church, and there is a community synagogue. Anxious to agree with one another, the Jews are eager to find a compromise position (usually Conservatism) where differences can be submerged.

The status and problems of the present-day suburban Protestant church are similar to those of the suburban synagogues. Each functioning within the framework of its own distinctive religious tradition, is increasingly emphasizing the neighborhood, the community, the ethical, moral and social values associated with religion, and the needs of living people. Theological and denominational differences are seemingly less important. 28

"The synagogue is suburbia's nuclear and most important Jewish institution. More Jewish men and women are identified with it than with any other organized body within the community."²⁹ When Jews join the synagogue, they voluntarily identify themselves as members of the Jewish people. Viewed from the perspective of a sociologist, synagogue affiliation seems to be an act of conformity. But like so many conformist acts, to the participants themselves the behavior seems voluntary. The suburban Jew will insist that he is free to either join or not join a synagogue, free to be or not be Jewish. And, to a certain extent, he is right. The presence of many unaffiliated

Jews in suburbia testifies to the apparent existence of an alternative choice. Yet the majority of Jewish couples will join a congregation -- if not immediately, then when their oldest child reaches school age.

Suburban families are child-centered, and Jewish parents "are today in the forefront of this child-centered world."³⁰ Whatever Jewish parents do, they justify or rationalize it as being "for the sake of the children." Gordon quotes one father:

I moved out here for the sake of the kids. I want them to have the best that I can afford -- the best schools, the nicest friends, the most beautiful clothes that my money can buy. Nothing is too good for my kids. 31

Almost no Jewish parent will deny "proper" Jewish training to his children. A good Jewish education is considered to be a necessary ingredient in the upbringing of a cultured child. And cultured children are a credit to their parents. But busy, untrained fathers can not themselves transmit the tradition to their children. Thus, Jewish parents almost inevitably will join the synagogue when it is time to send their first born child to religious school. They need the help of a professional religious specialist who will train their children to be Jewish.

Gordon notes that "Jewish ritual observance is actually greater today among suburban families than it was a decade ago."³² One of the main reasons for this is the Jewish education of the children.

The present interest in certain ritual practices is better understood if we realize that Jewish children are largely responsible for re-introducing (or sometimes introducing for the first time) Jewish ceremonial and ritual into the home. The child-centered home usually concerns itself with fulfilling the children's wishes. Because children have been indoctrinated in the religious schools in matters of ritual, and because "children must be satisfied," parents have returned to certain of their Hebraic traditions. 33

Child-centered parents are guided by their children who in turn take their cues from the religious school teacher. On the other hand, the joint family observance of Jewish ritual creates a sense of family solidarity within the context of Jewish identification. If it was the children of a previous generation who Americanized their parents, it is today's children who are Judaizing their families.

[Suburban Jews] observe and practice that ritual which is associated most directly with their family life and with the home. They choose the ritual they will observe, less often on the basis of Jewish Law than on a far more practical basis -- what appeals to them and their families, what has significance and relevance for them, and what they believe identifies them as Jews. 34

The increase in ritual observance and the positive identification with Judaism does not necessarily indicate a new found piety among suburban Jews. Every survey of church and synagogue attendance reveals that Jews are by far the least frequent worshipers. Gordon quotes one Rabbi as having said, "'Jews just don't pray these days.'" ³⁵ Gordon himself declares that "only one motive -- ethnic interest in the Jews as a people -- really explains suburban Jews' affiliation with the one institution which is openly labelled 'religious.'" ³⁶

Yet Gordon does detect a genuine search for religion among some of the suburban congregants. Although he remains equivocal and uncertain, he does believe that the widespread positive identification with Judaism is not simply a matter of "belongingness." There is much which indicates a yearning for religious values and a desire for spiritual involvement. The quest for religion may be related to the general insecurity and anxiety of the world situation. Or it may be as Gordon suggests, more existential: "It is...a quest -- a search for the

meaning of human existence."³⁷

One might assert that the quest for life's existential meaning reflects a basic social frustration felt by some Jewish suburbanites. Gordon points out that the present generation of American Jews feel "at home" and secure in their Americanism. They are convinced of the equality of all citizens, and they believe that all Americans should live together in harmony. Many of them also think that no ethnic or religious group should form its own separate community. In fact, "they fear segregation."³⁸ Yet, within a few months of their arrival in suburbia, they discover with shock that they are often living in a Jewish ghetto.

Invariably, Jewish residents of suburbia, when pressed for a more careful examination of Jewish-Christian relations, point out that Jews seldom come to know non-Jews any better in suburbia than they did in the city. 39

To some extent it is true that the social segregation of Jews is self-imposed. Although they emphasize their desire to develop associations with gentile neighbors, they still reserve their closest friendships for other Jews who share the same community synagogue membership and same organizational interests. The primary friendship group in suburbia tends to be either all Jewish or all gentile. Surface pleasantries govern the casual interrelationships during the day. But after five o'clock in the evening there is an end to social contact. Gordon claims that this rule is confirmed by Jews in suburban communities all over America:

"It is a kind of '9 to 5' arrangement. The ghetto gates, real or imagined, close at 5:00 P.M. 'Five o'clock shadow' sets in at sundown. Jews and Christians do not meet socially even in suburbia...After five o'clock there is no social contact, no parties, no home visits, no golf clubs -- no nothing!"

Even more anxiety provoking than the "five o'clock shadow" is the tendency of non-Jewish families to move away from streets on which some Jews have bought homes. The resulting ready availability of good housing on these same streets brings other Jews into the area, and a "Little Jerusalem" or "Golden Ghetto" is quickly created. Few suburbs are exclusively or even mostly Jewish in population. But the presence of a large, easily identified minority group soon characterizes an area as theirs. So, despite the fear of segregation, Jews find themselves living this way.

"Jews find it difficult to understand why they are not yet accepted socially."⁴⁰ The social freeze-out is not comprehensible to them in terms of their self-image as good Americans. They do everything they can to conform to their suburb's standards. And still the specter of being different clings to them. No wonder if some of them find their lives lacking in meaning. The five values of middle class America are inadequate to their situation, and they are thus forced into "a search for the meaning of human existence." Whether they will find their answers within the framework of the child-centered, country club atmosphere at the average community synagogue remains to be seen.

C. COMMUNITY STUDIES

Park Forest. -- Herbert J. Gans has carefully investigated the origin and growth of one suburban Jewish community, Park Forest. His study records the processes which shaped that emerging communal structure

during its first six years of existence. Park Forest came into being late in 1948 as a partially planned garden city southwest of Chicago. As Marshall Sklare points out, Park Forest is not a typical Jewish suburb; most Chicago Jews have moved to the suburban areas north of the city. Park Forest's population remained less than ten percent Jewish. Nevertheless, Gans is probably correct in his assertion that "the generalizations and hypotheses developed here are probably not unique to Park Forest."⁴¹

From the moment of their arrival in the suburb, Jews began to look for other Jews with whom to associate. Whereas the gentile residents usually found their friends among the residents of their own court, Jews would seek out one another even in distant courts. The first problem for Jews was one of recognizing other Jews. "Recognition was initiated even before contact was made, for with the first glance, Jewish people were attempting to figure whether one or another person could be Jewish."⁴² Names, looks, mannerisms, conversation, mutual friends were noted. And within a short time, no more than four months, recognition has led to association and to friendship. "...In November of 1949 almost all of the families who were living in the village by July of that year had established some regular and stable sociability relationships with their fellow Jews."⁴³

The sociological make-up of the emerging Jewish community was most clearly revealed in the disputes surrounding the formation of a Sunday school for the children. Almost everyone agreed that the children should be exposed to a Jewish education. The disputes arose as to what the goals of the education should be. One faction took the

position that the role of children is to learn to be adults. For this group, Jewish education should teach youngsters how to practice Judaism. It should lead them to participation in congregational life. Gans describes this approach as "adult-oriented."

The other faction took a "child-oriented" position on Jewish education. This group sought to organize the school around the adjustment needs and problems of Jewish children. The members of this child-oriented faction were not committed to any program of religious or cultural activity for Jewish adults. Their projected Sunday school was to teach the children about Judaism without telling the pupils (and their parents) how to practice the religion.

It needs to be observed that this dispute does not reflect a struggle between generations; both factions were native born and similarly acculturated. Nor does it reflect a conflict between two socioeconomic classes; all these Jews were of a similar strata. The two factions can be best differentiated by the style of life to which they aspire.

The differences between the two groups are perhaps best illustrated by the deprecatory labels they attached to each others' styles. The /adult-oriented/ congregational supporters described the /child-oriented/ community school group as "pseudo-intellectuals," and the latter called the former "country-clubbers." 44

To some extent, life style aspirations can be correlated with occupation. The "country-clubbers" were in medicine, business and industry, and led by the professional Jews in the community. On the other hand, the "pseudo-intellectuals" consisted of academic professionals -- teachers, lawyers and scientists.

For four months the dispute carried on, until a professional

Jewish group worker was chosen president of the school committee. With some effort he was able to get both factions together in an acceptable program. The school was not to teach the child that he should observe the customs and ceremonies at home. He would only learn the background. But it was also suggested to the parents that minimal home observance might satisfy the needs of the children. Gans observes that "parental pressure had thus resulted in a child-oriented school."⁴⁵

The Sunday school was to be "a school in Jewish identity, in 'Jewishness,' not in Judaism."⁴⁶ Parents were not religious, but they were attached to the Jewish ethnic group. They wanted their children to develop that same kind of attachment -- ethnic but not religious. The parents had the impression that this could be done through learning about Jewish history and traditions. Jewish children were to be taught how to answer the questions of their gentile playmates: What are you? Are you Jewish? They were to be taught to stand up against the hardships of a minority position. Some parents even expressed the opinion that their children should be prepared to some day make a choice about being Jewish or not.

The community school was able to function on the basis of an avowedly child-centered program for six years. By the end of that period the influence of the "country-clubbers" was such that they successfully initiated a congregational Sunday school officially based on an adult-oriented program. The organization of this second Sunday school once again split the community into two camps. But now, in a larger community, only about half the Jews became involved in the

issue; many parents took no interest in the conflict. "Some observers felt that such indifference indicated that many parents were satisfied as long as schooling was available, and cared little about curriculum or educational philosophy."⁴⁷ When the fall term began for the congregational school's first year, more than 500 students were enrolled. Only 125 students remained with the community school. But the issue of adult versus child-orientation does not seem to have been crucial for most parents. Gans points to three other considerations which were probably more relevant to the parents' decisions. These other three considerations give important clues to the values of suburban Jews.

First, maintenance of two institutions -- a community school and a separate community synagogue -- placed an economic strain on Jews of Park Forest. With the cost of a high standard of living to consider, parents sought ways to cut down expenses on peripheral items. The congregational school, whatever its philosophy of education, offered tuition free instruction.

"A second factor was the congregation's symbolic role as a community focus...The erection of a building had transformed this symbol into a physically real and imposing object..."⁴⁸ A Temple building represented a tangible sign of Jewish respectability; it made the Jews a religious denomination like all the others. And to suburbanites eager to conform with the general community's pattern, it seemed appropriate to see the Temple as the legitimate instrument for teaching Jewishness to the children. Furthermore, Gans reports that a majority of the congregation looked to the rabbi as a figure

of authority. They saw him as an expert to whom they could entrust the task of initiating their children into Jewishness. The freedom to teach their children Jewishness as they wished was apparently too anxiety provoking. Better to escape from freedom through voluntary *style* subordination to an authoritarian expert who assumedly knows best.

The third consideration had to do with the status images associated with the two institutions. The Temple had taken on the aura of upper-middle class propriety. Its leadership were men employed in executive positions, businesses, and in law and medicine. Their wives in the Temple sisterhood were college-trained, with social and civic skills of various kinds. The Temple's financial needs gave rise to a full calendar of elaborate social events in which these high status people were conspicuously involved. On the other hand, the community school had entered into an agreement with a lower-middle class Orthodox synagogue in nearby Chicago Heights; Bar Mitzvah services were to be held there. Thus, one of the child-oriented community school's major social activities was linked with a lower status environment. For suburbanite Jews who were eager to ascend the trail of status mobility, the images associated with Temple and community school were clear. And in the absence of any compelling philosophic conviction concerning the nature of Jewish education, status aspirations could play a significant role in the decision to support the Temple.

Of course, the concern with economy, conformity and status is not child-oriented. It reflects parents who are considering their own adult interests. But it is of extreme interest to us that these

adult interests were not explicitly discussed in the Sunday school conflict. Rather, the whole debate revolved around the official issue: "What shall be done for the children?" Gans correctly notes this phenomenon. "Although the children may provide the impetus for community organization, some parents use the groups which they have set up to reap the fruits of their socio-economic and educational mobility, and to live the 'organization' -- and 'social affair' -- centered life of the upper-middle class."⁴⁹ In Park Forest, it remained uncertain whether the official adult-orientation of the Temple could bring about changes in the religious behavior of the adults. But given the "filiarchic" situation, it seemed inevitable that the children would introduce changes into their parents' life-patterns.

Gans cautions against seeing the growth of a new Jewish community in suburbia as a sign of religious revival. Indeed, none of the evidence which we have considered here points to the presence of spirituality in Park Forest. A better explanation of community growth will take cognizance of the strong ingroup sociability patterns which the new suburbanites practiced in the urban areas from which they came. In those urban areas, the informal nature of ingroup sociability patterns attracted no public attention. But, transferred to suburbia, they emerged in a network of organizations, budgets and buildings which suggested the possibility of a revival.

This transfer represents in part the increased organizational activity normally associated with achievement of upper-middle-class life styles, and the special conditions imposed by the suburban residential social structure in which it is happening. Above all, however, it has taken place because of the need and desire of Jewish parents to provide clearly visible institutions and symbols with which to maintain and reinforce the ethnic identification of the next generation.

Northrup (Sharon, Massachusetts). -- Perhaps a more typically Jewish suburb than Park Forest is Sharon, just south of Boston. In a series of Commentary articles extending over an eight year period, Evelyn N. Rossman (pseudonym) has chronicled the development of this Jewish community which she calls Northrup. From 1950 to 1962 the population of Northrup more than doubled. During the same period, the Jewish community grew from being a minority to being the majority in town. But according to Rossman, "there is very little social mixing of Jew and non-Jew."⁵¹ The Jews, in fact, have tended to group together in some of the newer housing developments where they are isolated from the older part of the town.

Originally, some twelve years ago, the Jews of Northrup felt (or imagined that they felt) a bond of community among themselves. At that time the community was sacred, and "anything done 'for the community' was automatically being done 'for a good cause.'"⁵² A community synagogue, the Jewish Community Center, was organized. And for ten years all public quarrels between different factions of the congregation were suppressed in the name of the community. After ten years of "growing pains," fragmentation in the community was revealed by the formation of two additional synagogues -- Reform and Orthodox. The Jewish Community Center remained as a Conservative congregation dominated by the older, more prosperous Jewish families. Younger families joined with the Reform group, and less prosperous Jews were drawn to the Orthodox synagogue.

The ideology of community remained as a value among the leaders of the Conservative congregation at least. Their recent campaign to finance a building addition called for contributions to "'Your Jewish

Community.⁵³ In actual fact, Rossman observes that the fund-raising campaign was needed not so much because existing facilities were inadequate, but because activity at the Center had come to a standstill. Except for the Hebrew School, none of the Center's activities were supported. Apathy characterized the congregation's involvement in Brotherhood, Sisterhood and Temple functions. But a building fund to finance the construction of additional classrooms and youth facilities could be counted upon to excite the enthusiasm of most members.

The success of the fund-raising campaign points to a number of personality themes present in the Northrup Jewish community. There is, first, the theme of child-orientation. Adults were willing to pitch in "for the sake of the children." They could get excited about the younger generation's "Jewish survival."

The Hebrew school was the Center's major on-going activity; most parents had joined the congregation just to be able to send their children. Yet parents had little influence on the school's educational program. They relied upon professional educators to instill Jewishness into their children, not caring what the content of that Jewishness should be. Adults were not interested in Jewish learning for themselves. And professional educators, who were not likely to be interested in the social conflicts of their pupils, made up the curriculum. Pupils were called upon to learn prayers and rituals which they seldom heard or saw at home, while adults demonstrated their Jewishness by occasional attendance at big holiday celebrations put on by the children at the Center.

Their Jewishness is expressed mainly as a form of public behavior. Holidays are celebrated as rallies and confirmations are social performances...The Bar Mitzvah or Bas Mitzvah marks the end of childhood and of Jewish education. 54

Jewish education and ritual participation were linked with childhood; they were presumably good for children but not very important for adults.

The fund-raising campaign also revealed a widespread faith in the efficacy of financial contributions. "Giving is expected to redeem the giver from guilt, anxiety, and death itself, while at the same time it measures loyalty and devotion to the community."⁵⁵ As prayer and study had long ago replaced the sacrificial system, so in Northrup the financial contribution to the Temple has seemingly replaced prayer and study. "Jewish virtue is measured by one's ability to apply and accept financial pressure."⁵⁶ A large building fund gave all the members of the congregation a significant opportunity to accumulate good deeds through actual contributions and limitless volunteer work on behalf of the fund. To aid the Center's leaders in their good work, a professional fund-raiser was brought in. Marshaling the full facilities of the congregation, the professional directed a frenzied month-long campaign.

No one dared to challenge the fund-raising campaign or its administration. Any questions would have been sinful. It would have meant an attack on three basic and widely held values of the community: (a) "for the sake of the children," (b) contributions are good deeds, and (c) professionals know best. States Rossman, "Many people preferred to believe that 'one could not fight the community' rather than

to admit that there actually was no unified community to fight."⁵⁷ Apparently, most people (perhaps everyone but Miss Rossman) felt a sense of community cohesion on this matter and these values. Community cohesion may be minimal, but it does tolerate a maximum of pressure at certain points. The fund-raising campaign drew its overwhelming strength from the manipulation of three values upon which the community's minimal cohesion was established. As Gans said in his discussion of fund-raising in the Park Forest Jewish community:

"...The cohesion of the Jewish group was such that appeals to group needs and pressures for aid and involvement were not, and indeed could not, often be denied. On the one hand, the group's cohesion is so minimal that social pressure has to be applied to get things done, but on the other hand it is sufficient to tolerate the application of pressure."⁵⁸

The three values stated above can probably be ascribed to a large portion of the American Jewish suburban population.

Riverton (Trenton). -- Marshall Sklare and Mark Vosk record in a booklet titled The Riverton Study their extensive investigation of a Trenton, New Jersey, Jewish population sample. Over 400 persons were interviewed in this attempt by the American Jewish Committee to learn how contemporary Jews look at themselves and their neighbors. Trenton was selected for study because it is fairly representative of middle sized American towns. About 8,500 Jews (7 per cent of the total population) live in Trenton. Research focused on those Jewish families with teen-age children. An effort was made to relate the factor of generation to the answers of parents and children. Several significant differences, as well as similarities, emerged as characteristic of the adult and adolescent generations.

Overwhelmingly, both adolescents and parents indicated that the crucial element in Jewish identity is a profession of the Jewish religion. Eight out of ten parents felt that being a Jew meant the acceptance of Jewish religion. And 97 per cent of the teen-agers linked Jewishness with religion alone.

The present Jewish self-image demands religious affiliation as the identifying characteristic. Nothing else can be defended in American terms. Among adolescents, hardly any other way of distinguishing a Jew is conceivable." 59

Yet, oddly enough, most Trenton Jews are not very religious by their own standards. Like Jews everywhere, they tend to define religion in terms of ritual observance rather than commitment to a creed or belief. "When one Jew describes another as 'religious,' it means he observes many rituals."⁶⁰ Eighty-nine per cent of the families interviewed observe only some of the traditional Jewish customs which they regard as religious. Very few are Orthodox in their practice. Only the High Holy days, circumcision, marriage and death are universal occasions for religious observance. Other rituals are observed by less than half of the interviewed Jews.

The rituals which have survived best, we may note, are not those designed to remind the Jews every day, and indeed every moment, that he is a Jew and that God expects a certain course of behavior from him, but rather those that are occasional and joyous, that involve the young, and mark the transition from one stage of life to another. It is also revealing that those which have survived do not demand rigorous devotion and daily attention, do not involve an unsupportable isolation from non-Jews, and are acceptable to the larger community as appropriate symbols of the sacred order. 61

The pattern of religiosity (or non-religiosity) which the teen-agers know as Judaism is approved of by 83 per cent of the

adolescents. Since the observances are occasional, joyous and usually child-centered, the children do not rebel against the religion of their fathers. Most parents admit that they have had no conflicts with their children over religion. Where there have been conflicts, it has been because a more observant child made demands upon his less observant parents.

The teachings of the Jewish schools, moderate as they are, and the general atmosphere of the synagogue are more traditional than many homes. Some children are influenced by friends from observant homes, others by grandparents. The child who takes a more traditional line is in a particularly advantageous position, for he can play upon the guilt feelings of a parent who revolted against Orthodoxy and then grew to feel uncertain about his new values. 62

Children are not drifting toward Orthodoxy, however. They are participating in a process whereby a common community norm of observance is being established.

Sklare and Vosk indicate that the religious interpretation of Jewishness brings about a minimization of concern for Jewish culture, Israel and Jewish philanthropy. Nevertheless, a majority of the subjects admitted a "warm feeling" toward the State of Israel. This deep involvement with Israel, which defies their strictly religious self-identification, reveals a "primitive link of 'peoplehood,' or group feeling."⁶³ Despite their rationalization that a common religion is the sole bond between Jews, they respond to the needs of their fellow Jews without reference to any ritual system. A responsibility is felt toward all Jews of the world Jewish community, even by the most assimilated non-religious Jews.

Even the individual with no synagogue affiliation, no Jewish organizational membership, no degree of cultural distinctiveness, still walks in step with the Jewish community in this one respect -- he gives. 64

Giving to "co-religionists" may be the official description of Jewish philanthropy, but, in fact, Trenton Jews seem to be responding to a deep feeling of ethnic consciousness; Jews, as kinfolk, have special claims to make upon one another.

This ethnic consciousness emerges most clearly in the attitudes of both parents and teen-agers toward intermarriage. A majority of the parents felt that their children would not marry a non-Jew. Seventy per cent of the adolescents indicated that they would not like to marry a gentile. The remaining thirty per cent were just not certain. There is no open rebellion among the teen-agers to the norm of endogamous marriage. Just as the young people tend to accept the religious behavior of their parents, so, too, they assent to the parental concern for Jewish survival. Both parents and children agree that "religion" is an important factor in social relations.

...Group preservation more and more depends on the individual's decision to marry within the faith. And since there is an almost universal desire among parents to preserve the group, they engage in elaborate efforts to transmit this desire to their offspring, and to create conditions which make it easily fulfilled. This means that Jews, in effect, are setting up obstacles to easier associations between themselves and non-Jews, and this at a time when less and less divides them in customs, culture and ideology. 65

Parents tend to assure ethnic consciousness in their children by settling in a part of town where many Jews are found. Only 28 per cent of the families lived in what they thought was an "overwhelmingly Gentile" neighborhood. Though 20 per cent actually lived in a predominantly Jewish area, some 40 per cent would prefer to live in a more Jewish neighborhood. There is a definite desire on the part

of most parents to limit their children's opportunities for contact with non-Jews. Of course, this desire for ethnic survival is rationalized as a zeal to keep the religion alive.

The answer, "we should keep our religion alive," must often be interpreted as a conventional phrase with little religious content. One second-generation mother, for example, who used this phrase, did not attend religious services and observed almost none of the usual customs and holidays. 66

The norms of ethnic segregation are effective. This is revealed clearly by the teen-agers who admit that the number of their non-Jewish friends falls off each year. More and more, as they grow older, their close friends are Jews. Fifty-six per cent of the young people said that they felt more comfortable with Jews. Eighty per cent reported that they could talk more freely with Jews. Forty-five per cent of the Jewish children felt that gentiles drink more; 59 per cent agreed that gentiles fight more; 42 per cent felt that gentiles care less for their children's education.⁶⁷ While the parents were even more convinced of these negative gentile stereotypes, it is significant that a large portion of the young people concurred in them.

The widespread conviction among Jews that these negative gentile stereotypes are true verifies the feeling that gentiles are an outgroup of inferiors. Young people do not see Judaism as a burden. It is for many a badge of distinctive superiority. Only 21 per cent thought that gentiles held unfavorable views of Jews. And, although 86 per cent of the adolescents reported having experienced anti-Semitism, it did not bother them. Many of them felt that anti-Semites were definitely inferior; only an ignorant person could be anti-Semitic.

In sum, 95 per cent of the teen-agers were in favor of remaining a distinct group. But, while parents emphasized gentile rejection as a reason for survival, the young people stressed the Jewish virtues. They had a clearly positive self-image as Jews, and they were eager to affirm Jewish continuity.

[Jewish adolescents] feel in many ways as their parents do: both generations agree that Judaism and the Jewish people should survive; that intermarriage is not a good idea; that life within the Jewish group is more comfortable -- one might even say cozier -- than life outside it. 68

North City (Minneapolis). -- For their study of North City (Minneapolis) Judith R. Kramer and Seymour Leventman interviewed two hundred Jewish males, selected with reference to three variables: class, status and generation. Their book, Children of the Gilded Ghetto, includes two separate investigations of two basic samples. The first sample was composed of two contrasting status groups within the second generation. The other sample was third generation and made up without reference to status groups. Part Two of the book records the investigation by Leventman of the second generation sample; Part Three deals with Kramer's study of the third generation sample. For sociological purposes, second generation is inclusive of all those persons born in this country of immigrant parents; third generation, of all those whose parents were native born Americans.

It is the thesis of Kramer and Leventman that membership in the Jewish group creates tension for an individual. Both the majority and the minority cultures make claims upon him, and response to one set of claims means the negation of the other set. The social tensions

and the consequent "conflict resolutions" are about the same for all the members of a generation. They share a similar "life situation." Hence, "characteristic patterns of behavior emerge and become normative for the members of a generation."⁶⁹ But it should be understood that the conflict resolutions of one generation provide the life situation for the next generation.

The life situation of the second generation was characterized by marginality. The resulting tension led members of this generation to seek improvement in their social position. They did this in three ways: (1) entry into profitable, albeit marginal, middle class occupations, (2) establishment of an acculturated but separate ethnic community, and (3) development of the Conservative and Reform synagogue. These three conflict resolutions -- economic, social and religious -- in the second generation produced what the authors title "The Gilded Ghetto."

It is the Gilded Ghetto which provides the life situation for a third generation of American Jews. This new generation finds it a source of tension that the status audience within the ghetto is so limited. "Thinly disguised in all the 'idealistic' objections of the third generation to paternal 'materialism' is a fundamental opposition to the exclusively Jewish status audience of the second generation."⁷⁰ Kramer and Leventman argue that the younger generation is no longer content to hear the applause of a Jewish community alone; they seek the approval of everyone, non-Jews primarily.

The most obvious place to win approval in America is in the job market. Jews of the third generation are entering a wider and

wider range of occupations. They tend to derogate the marginal business occupations of their fathers, and unless the family business is very lucrative, they will seek to enter some other occupation. The "Jewish" occupations are seen to have no status in the general community. Thus, the young Jews avoid going into the independent professions (e.g., law and medicine) as well as retail proprietorships. If they are interested in business, they prefer to work for a large organization. Increasingly large numbers of the young men have chosen to enter the newer salaried professions -- journalism, architecture, engineering, college teaching.

Eighty per cent of the professionals among the fathers are independent professionals practicing law, medicine, and dentistry. In contrast, 36 per cent of the professional sons are in such salaried professions as engineering, teaching, research, and another 20 per cent are in semi-professions such as journalism, advertising, and public relations. 71

Kramer and Leventman indicate that the growing acceptance of salaried employment reflects the third generation's desire to eliminate any social differences between them and their non-Jewish peers. "Jews in traditionally non-Jewish occupations are the social avant-garde of the third generation."⁷²

It is of interest that there is a significant correlation between the nature of occupation chosen and the degree of involvement in the institutions of the Jewish community. Those who have remained in the Jewish occupations maintain many more elements of ingroup behavior than do their peers in the new occupations. "Third generation Jews in the salaried professions and semi-professions are in every way less affiliated with the Jewish community than those in traditional occupations."⁷³

It is quite clear...that the economic resolutions of the third generation are directly influenced by status factors...Status factors influence both the choices the third generation makes and the ideology it formulates to justify them. The economic resolutions in turn influence the nature of the social resolutions. They provide the occupational reference groups whose styles of life are emulated by the third generation as well as the incomes that pay for them. 74

"Style of life" is very important to the third generation. These young men and their wives have been to college, and their consumptive tastes have been well nurtured. They put a great deal of emphasis on the "proper" use of leisure time; life should be "enjoyed." Actually, this third generation conforms closely to the pattern of leisure time activity general among their non-Jewish suburban neighbors.

No one seems to be pursuing scholarship at the cost of his social or athletic interests. Activities that can be classified as "social" (visiting, organizational work, playing cards, etc.) are mentioned most frequently as leisure-time pursuits (36 per cent) and "athletic" activities (golf, bowling, etc.) are next in frequency (28 per cent). Activities centering around the home (hobbies, gardening, etc.) are also popular pastimes, whereas "cultural" activities (concerts, museums, reading, etc.) are least frequently pursued at leisure. Members of this generation are young, sociable, suburban Jews, innocent of giving grounds for any stereotype of Jewish "bookishness." 75

Kramer and Leventman report a widespread behavior pattern which seems calculated to deny the stereotype of Jewish "bookishness." Only 1 per cent of the third generation sample belong to any study group. A scant 6 per cent attend any kind of class. Seventeen per cent belong to book clubs. Only 7 per cent read specifically Jewish novels or periodicals. Apparently, intellectual interests are too Jewish to be compatible with projected membership in suburbia's

majority culture.

The young men almost universally regard their fathers as having been "materialistic." For their part, the third generation men affect a rational of "refined sensitivity." They are wary of offending well-adjusted neighbors by any display of aggressive ambition. Instead, they concentrate on spending money and finding out what it can do for them. It is a feature of salaried occupations that they are built into large systems which guarantee regular salary increments. Thus, the third generation men believe that they are assured an adequate income without the materialistic preoccupations of their second generation fathers. "To be concerned with material gain...smacks of 'money grubbing,' a peculiarly Jewish vice in the stereotypes of American society."⁷⁶

Kramer and Leventman note that "there remains an echo of 'self-hatred' in the sensitivity [of some young Jews] to the subtleties of status."⁷⁷ There is such a headlong effort to avoid any behavior stereotyped as Jewish that little room is left for individual integrity. Every single characteristic that might make a Jew a "kike" is rigidly cast aside and despised. In blind submission to the majority's presumed stereotype of the Jew, many of these young Jews have sought to purge themselves of all social characteristics which might impede the development of relations with gentiles. In their desire to receive personal recognition from non-Jews, they decry and belittle all the values and behavior of their fathers.

Although many third generation subjects avoid all behavior which could be considered distinctively Jewish, over half of them

object to anyone who attempts to assimilate or deny his Jewish identity. But, of course, most young Jews feel that being Jewish is simply a matter of religion. It is their "cherished ideological position" that Jews are no different from anyone else except in religious affiliation. However, despite their censure of those who would deny their Jewish religious identity, these young people do not feel that they are religious.

Sixty-six per cent of the respondents feel they are "less Jewish" than other members of the North City Jewish community because, in their own opinion, they are "not as religious," i.e., they attend synagogue and/or observe ritual less frequently than they think others do. As long as Judaism is defined only as a religious affiliation, the self-image of the Jew is formulated in terms of religious observance. Those whose religious practices are minimal no longer have other grounds for identification as Jews. 78

While most members of the third generation regard their Jewishness as a strictly religious matter, there are some who acknowledge aspects of Jewish social superiority. "Sixteen per cent feel that Jews are in some way 'nicer' and more moral; their family lives are in some way better."⁷⁹ Jewish women are thought to be treated better; children, better loved; and parents, more respected. Kramer and Leventman claim that this is a last trace of the chosen people concept. Indeed, most young Jews would attribute their alleged family solidarity and sobriety to the influence of traditional religious values. Nevertheless, 62 per cent insist that there are no differences between Jews and gentiles; they doggedly resist the imposition of all positive stereotypes.

In the light of this insistence that Jews and gentiles are basically the same, it is to be expected that most young men claim

to have no preference for Jewish friends. Fifty-six per cent declare that they are looking for a social life based on shared interests. They assert that "being Jewish is no longer necessary or sufficient grounds for association."⁸⁰ It is therefore paradoxical that the overwhelming majority of the subjects admitted that their closest friendships were with Jews. Eighty per cent of the young men included only Jews among their four closest friends. Although 70 per cent have some gentile acquaintances within their larger social circles, mixed relationships remain peripheral to the third generation's social life.

Only 34 per cent confess their preference for Jewish friends. Defensive about their discriminating preference, they quickly seek to explain themselves. A comfortable intimacy is felt with Jews. Jews have "'a certain sensitivity and quality -- a cynicism combined with compassion, a humor and irreverence.'"⁸¹ All the reasons reflect a reluctance -- perhaps inability -- to forfeit all ethnic ties.

Unwilling to risk alienation from their origins, young Jews who have not been uprooted by their jobs are bound by the silver cord of old friendships to the Jewish community. The psychic cost of mobility is high for those who must break with the past, too high for some to incur willingly. 82

It is not just the "silver cord of old friendship" which ties these young Jews to the Jewish community. Other informal ties remain strong. Most of them utilize the services of familiar Jewish doctors, lawyers and dentists. Ninety-three per cent have chosen Jewish wives. Implicit in these choices is a feeling of Jewish superiority. Jewish professionals are better, and having a Jewish husband is "too good for the goyim." Probably the strongest community tie is through the family relationship.

Ninety per cent of the respondents have immediate family in North City and 94 per cent visit or keep in touch with them regularly. Even more significant, over half of the respondents continue to consult their parents on such major decisions as large purchases, moving, jobs, and education of children. They take for granted a continuing closeness with the family, seeking aid from them when the need arises. 83

The synagogue also functions as a strong community tie. Young Jews do not reject the religious patterns of their parents. Most of the third generation belong now or plan to join soon some Reform or Conservative congregation.

Sixty-five per cent of the sons give as their reason for choosing the synagogue they did join (or will choose when they do join) the fact that their families belong to them. Only 5 per cent claim that their choice is based upon religious convictions...No stronger indication of the third generation's acceptance of the religious institutions of the second can be found than its willingness to join the same synagogue to which the family belongs simply because the family does belong to it. 84

Members of both generations are only minimally observant. They are both child-oriented, rituals being somehow good for children. Observance centers around periodic holiday celebrations, particularly the child-oriented holidays. It is characteristically convenient and closely approximate to gentile religious practices.

Young Jews join a synagogue when it is time to provide religious education for their children. "Responsible parents" may prefer that their children receive the necessary religious training in "easy Sunday doses." But it is considered very important for the social adjustment of the children that they "know their identity." That is, they should know their religion -- the "watered-down, middle-class version of Judaism" which the second generation developed and the third generation has accepted.

Given their religious definition of Judaism, most third generation Jews feel that synagogue membership and the Sunday school education of their children are adequate signs of Jewish identity. Such signs of Jewish identity are fully compatible with the image of American suburban life to which these third generation Jews aspire. They are fully content, even eager, to maintain their Jewish identity and to extend it to their children. Their conscience is assuaged without the feeling of social isolation; even their gentile neighbors and colleagues can approve of their behavior. And they feel certain that they are no longer living in a "Gilded Ghetto."

Searching for new social anchorage, young Jews frequently turn to religion as the source of their identity. Although their "non-Jewish" social behavior belies their religious intent, they choose to be Jews. As other ethnic factors fail to provide satisfactory grounds for social identity, religion increases in significance -- and utility. 85

Elmira. -- Although he does not describe it in these terms, John P. Dean has portrayed many of the Gilded Ghetto features against which the third generation rebels. Dean has based his study "Jewish Participation in the Life of Middle-Sized American Communities" on materials gathered by a Cornell research team in Elmira, New York, from 1948 to 1951. He points out that the Elmira Jews are organization joiners. Only one in fifteen Jews belonged to no organizations. Ninety per cent of the Jews belonged to some Jewish organization, one-quarter to four or more. Half of them belonged to mixed membership organizations as well -- lodges, patriotic organizations, civic clubs. They do not, however, participate in the social elite organizations and the political, labor and church organizations. Among the Jews

affiliated with mixed membership organizations, 39 per cent reported that they believed gentiles felt differently about them than about other members. (The survey also declares that only 9 per cent of the gentiles admitted feeling different toward Jews.)

Acting largely on the basis of perceived or feared gentile rejection, ninety per cent of the Jews participate in predominantly or totally Jewish social cliques. In Elmira, there is "virtually no social mixing between Jews and Gentiles."⁸⁶ Younger people may mix, but with the passage of years there is "a strain toward homogeneity." Particularly after marriage are new all Jewish cliques formed.

If one spouse has acquaintanceship ties with an outgroup person that might develop into social visiting, the other spouse's prejudices, unfamiliarity with outgroup social habits, feelings of being ill-at-ease, or even outright objections will tend to throw invitation decisions toward ingroup couples with whom both spouses are comfortable. If at the time of marriage each spouse has an independent circle of friends, the couple will tend to become socially integrated into the circle least different in ethnic and prestige attributes from themselves. ⁸⁷

Another significant factor influencing the formation of homogeneous social cliques is the Jewish taboo on exogamy. Parents put a continuous pressure on their children to avoid circumstances which might lead to intermarriage. As a result, social visiting among Jews is encouraged and mixed visiting is discouraged. It is Dean's opinion that the most serious limitation on friendship formation between Jews and gentiles is the actual absence of contact between them. This, he feels, is even more important than any anti-Semitic prejudice which might be present among some gentiles.

For all these reasons, Jews tend to mix together. And the more that they mix together, the more they develop common interests,

similar cultural traits and mutual ties of acquaintance, friendship and affection. Through this "associational inbreeding," separatistic Jewish social groups are perpetuated and strengthened. Together with a "defensive insulation" against possible rejection by gentiles, associational inbreeding tends to give rise to a condition of "social insulation."

There are a number of characteristic reactions which Dean associates with social insulation. One of these reactions is a tendency toward oversensitivity. Rather than risk possible refusal, a Jewish woman did not invite gentile playmates to her son's birthday party. Eighty per cent of the Jewish men admitted that they avoided places and situations where they felt Jews were not welcome. "In this way sensitivity to rebuff leads to avoidance and the perpetuation of insulation."⁸⁸ Taken to its extreme, the oversensitivity of some Jews leads to the perception of all gentiles as potentially anti-Semitic. Given this perception, it is natural for these Jews to avoid mixed company and emphasize social insulation.

Social insulation also has the effect of intensifying social pressures within the Jewish community. "Although Elmira is a middle-sized community of over 50,000, social insulation makes the 400 Jewish families a primary community in which the detailed affairs of the community are prevailing topics of interest and conversation."⁸⁹ Intensified social pressure results in intensified status-striving within the community, with status going to those who are most "typically American."

In the small primary community, ideological conflict is fraught with high emotional impact. Anonymity is a state not to be

found within the Elmira Jewish community. The ideological position of every Jew is known to all the others, and there is a strong need for interpersonal harmony. Hence, in the name of community peace, individual ideological differences are repressed and there is apparent unanimity in the acceptance of common norms.

Again, because of the small size of the community, social circles tend to be established solely on the basis of age and status. There is not a large enough pool of peers to allow personal qualities and common interests to operate as criteria for clique formation. Congenial friendships have to be maintained at an almost superficial level. Any major family celebration -- a birth, wedding or funeral -- becomes a community affair to which everybody must be invited. Although there is no possibility of pleasing everybody in what is really a very heterogeneous group, hostesses and hosts are driven to intense anxiety in their efforts to do everything properly.

Occasionally, social insulation brings about the development of organizational forms and activities which emulate already existing institutions in the general community. This parallel development may result in the formation of a Jewish country club or a Jewish Women's Council, either of which organizations would function exactly like their non-Jewish counterparts. Another effect of social insulation is the encouragement of a virtual shtadlanut arrangement. Only one or two high status Jews may have effective contact with gentile leaders. They become, then, "ambassadors to the Goyim." "The lone Jew who is on the board of a social agency or in an organization frequently sees his role as a representative of the Jewish group, and tailors his behavior so that it will not reflect badly on the Jewish community."⁹⁰

Thus, in a middle-sized community like Elmira, there is a real Jewish sub-community with its own sub-culture. It comes into being as the combined result of associational inbreeding and defensive insulation. It is maintained partly because of the positive feeling of psychological unity among Jews and partly because of the widespread perception of gentile anti-Semitism. What Kurt Lewin called "interdependence of fate" is genuinely felt among the members of this socially insulated sub-community.⁹¹

Detroit. -- In The Religious Factor, Gerhard Lenski indicates that the socially insulated sub-community is not found only in middle-sized communities. His study of Detroit emphasizes that a relation exists between socio-religious group membership and the development and transmission of distinctive political and economic norms in a big city. Utilizing material from the 1958 Detroit Area Study, Lenski attempts to document this relation for White Protestants, Catholics, Negro Protestants and Jews. For a set of 35 items dealing with political behavior, child-rearing practices, stereotypes of other groups, civil rights, leisure time and a variety of other behaviors, Lenski found that membership in a socio-religious group was a significant variable. "Socio-religious group membership is a variable comparable in importance to class, both with respect to its potency and with respect to the range, or extent, of its influence."⁹²

Socio-religious groups exert influence upon their members in two different ways. There is, first of all, the official ideology which is communicated to the members through their attachment to the religious association (associationalism). Theology, says Lenski,

makes a difference to those who are caught up in church attendance. But involvement in a socio-religious group is not necessarily limited to associationalism. Most people require the intimate, personal relationships which can not be provided through associationalism alone but which can be found in primary groups. Hence, a network of informal, primary-type relations can be discovered within each of the socio-religious groups. This attachment to a religious sub-community (communalism) brings about a vastly increased interaction among group members. In this way, more than any other, the young absorb the norms and values of their group.

To understand the power of socio-religious groups it is essential to recognize their capacity to absorb primary groups as sub-units in their organizational system. Because of this, the norms of socio-religious groups are constantly reinforced in these intimate, highly valued social relationships which are so crucial in the shaping of personality. 93

For two reasons, Lenski's information about the Jews of Detroit may not be sufficiently reliable. First, it is based upon a limited sample of only 27 adult Jews who were included in the Detroit Area Study. Second, there was not a single third generation American Jew in the sample. Nevertheless, the survey provides us with carefully documented information which gains significance from its comparison with data from the other socio-religious groups.

In general, Lenski discovered that "while the associational bond is weak in the Jewish group, the communal bond is extremely strong."⁹⁴ All the Jews in the sample were lifelong Jews who had married lifelong Jews. Seventy-seven per cent reported that all or nearly all their close friends were Jewish. "If our sample is at all

reliable, the great majority of Detroit Jews find most of their primary-type relationships within the Jewish sub-community."⁹⁵ On the other hand, 56 per cent (based on a larger Jewish sample) indicated that they attended synagogue only on High Holy Days or a few times a year. Twelve per cent never attended synagogue. Of all four groups in Detroit, associationalism among Jews was weakest. And, whereas the middle class was generally more highly involved associationally than the working class, regular service attendance emerged as a lower class pattern among the Jews. Likewise, regular synagogue attendance was linked with age, being largely confined to the elderly.

The 1958 survey suggests that this strong association between age and synagogue attendance is more than a life-cycle phenomenon. Among the Jewish respondents in that one year, frequency of attendance was greatest among first generation immigrants and working-class Jews. Thus the synagogues of Detroit could be virtually deserted in another generation, except on High Holy Days. Except for the strong communal ties uniting its members the future of the group might well be in jeopardy. 96

One of the strongest indications of communalism among the Jews can be found in its residence pattern. Of all four groups, Jews are geographically the most concentrated. All the respondents lived in and around the same relatively small section where Jews seemed to constitute a majority of the population.

The fact that the coefficient [of residential concentration] for the Jewish group was even higher than for the Negro Protestants is especially remarkable since Negroes are so severely limited in their choice of residential areas both by finances and out-group hostility...One can only conclude that the magnitude of this coefficient is one more indication of the strength of the communal spirit in this group. 97

Lenski examines the economic attitudes of the Jews and finds

them identified with the individualistic, competitive patterns of thought characteristic of a capitalistic middle class. Jews emerge as most ambitious; they are most likely to express a positive attitude toward work; they value occupational independence, and they have the greatest confidence that ability is the key to success. Installment buying is most often criticized by Jews, and budgeting is most often practiced. Jews were most likely to favor doing without things in order to save for the future. "It seems clear that the Jewish subculture greatly facilitates the rise of individuals in an established capitalist system."⁹⁸

In the chapter on politics, Lenski notes that Jews are most likely to vote for a Democratic Party which is identified with liberalism, the welfare state, and trade unionism. He suggests that Jewish advocacy of the welfare state reflects a resentment of the discriminatory practices common in the capitalistic system. Jews express preference for a rational system which holds out the promise of social justice for all. The United Nations was most likely to be endorsed by Jews.

Only the Jewish group seems to be completely consistent with respect to the stands it takes in these four discussed areas of political controversy. On all four issues, this group leans toward the liberal side when compared with the sample as a whole. Its liberal tendencies are most pronounced on the issue of school segregation. 99

Jews in Detroit seem to have strong family ties. Half of them are natives of Detroit, and only 6 per cent have no relatives in the city. They are most likely (75%) to visit their relatives every week, and least likely to visit neighbors. Their religious beliefs are most influenced by their families. The Jewish divorce rate was the lowest

of the four groups. Yet, despite the strong emphasis on family solidarity, Jewish parents were most likely (90%) to value intellectual autonomy in their children; they most encouraged their children to think for themselves. Thirty-two per cent of the Jews felt that a twelve year old child should be allowed to decide for himself whether he would go to synagogue or Sunday school -- a higher percentage than in any other group. Jews favored the use of future-oriented symbolic sanctions for the disciplining of their children, feeling that this best developed a sense of responsibility and self-control. Jewish families tended to be among the smallest. And complementary to the men's favorable attitudes toward work, Jewish women were by far the most inclined to favor productive or constructive activities for their leisure time.

Jews were most likely to complete a given unit of education, and a higher percentage had completed college than members of any other group. They were least likely to feel that any conflict existed between the teachings of science and the teachings of their religion.

The Religious Factor has revealed that Detroit Jews hold distinctive views on economics, politics, family life and education. It is Lenski's thesis that membership in any socio-religious group gives rise to certain patterns of behavior and attitude; the "religious factor" is related to life patterns. But the religious factor is not limited to just the official theology of the church or synagogue. It extends to the popular folk ideology which is expressed in the primary groups of the sub-community. While many secular problems may not be

of concern to the religious association, they are of great interest to sub-community members and they will be seriously discussed in the primary groups.

In these latter groups basic, non-technical problems concerning politics and economics are often discussed. The pros and cons of basic political issues, attitudes toward work, the labor unions, big business, the chances of getting ahead, and a variety of other issues are frequently discussed within the family and among friends. To the degree that such primary groups form segregated communications networks limited to the adherents of the same faith, they facilitate the development and transmission of distinctive political and economic norms. 100

New Orleans. -- Leonard Reissman's study, "The New Orleans Jewish Community," throws light on aspects of heterogeneity within the sub-community. The Jews of New Orleans are unusual in the degree of their integration into general community life. Their sub-community is so well integrated, in fact, that it gives what Reissman calls "an impression of social fragility."¹⁰¹ Many of the usual features of a Jewish community are lacking. There are no solidly Jewish neighborhoods in the city. Likewise, there is not a large group of distinctive Orthodox Jews whose presence would reinforce a sense of separateness. The immigration of East European Jews to America had relatively little impact on New Orleans. A large proportion of the sub-community are the third and fourth generations of their families to be born in the city. There is a strong tradition of Reform Judaism; half of the community belong to the three Reform temples. The 9,500 Jews in New Orleans constitute only 1.2 per cent of the city's total population -- 2 per cent of its white citizens. For a city of this size, Jews make up what is really an unusually small proportion of the population.

New Orleans presents what Reissman believes is a unique type of American Jewish community. It is, in many ways, the dream community of North City's third generation.

Where other communities are seeking to expand religious identification, New Orleans has a majority already affiliated with a synagogue as part of its traditional pattern. [80 per cent belong.] Where other communities are feeling the reawakening of Jewish consciousness among the native-born, in line with Herberg's well-known thesis that this is the first generation secure enough in the American environment to do so, New Orleans has long since passed that generational bench-mark. Where other communities are reforming their relationship to the larger community, New Orleans has achieved a stable level of integration... 102

In an attempt to discover the character of Jewish identification among Jews in the New Orleans community, Reissman interviewed a 10 per cent probability sample of all known Jewish households in the city. The answers to one of the interview questions revealed significant information on the nature of the respondents' Jewish identification. They were asked, "If you were able to emphasize just one thing as being most important for the upbringing of Jewish children today, which one of these would you say it would be?" The answers fell into six categories:¹⁰³

- | | |
|--|-------|
| (1) Learning and becoming identified with the Jewish religion | 34.2% |
| (2) Learning to appreciate the culture of the Jews such as literature, etc. | 15.0 |
| (3) Learning an appreciation of the State of Israel | 0.4 |
| (4) Learning an appreciation for the civic activities, welfare concerns, and social justice of the Jewish people | 11.8 |
| (5) Not emphasizing Jewishness so much as teaching him to get along with other people in the community | 30.1 |
| (6) No answer or other answer given | 8.5 |

These answers reflect the spectrum of Jewish identification patterns. No single answer was chosen by a majority of the respondents. Religion, secular culture and social adjustment were the patterns appearing most frequently. The answer which a respondent gives can generally be correlated with a number of factors in his background.

Whereas Orthodox Jews chose religion most often, persons without any denominational affiliation preferred culture more often. Older people also selected religion most frequently. But the two factors most significantly related to the choice of religion were education and income. Two-thirds of those with grammar school or less education picked religion. Over half of those with incomes under \$5,000 preferred religion. On the other hand, college graduates and persons with over \$25,000 incomes were least likely to select religion as their pattern of Jewish identification.

Professionals considered Jewish culture important more often than any other occupational group. The higher the unit of education completed by the respondent, the more likely he was to chose culture as his answer. Likewise, increase in income was perfectly correlated with the likelihood of selecting culture.

Social adjustment was most often embraced by the young, the economically successful, and the educated members of the community. Yet the professionals chose it least often and the persons in clerical occupations preferred it most often.

From Reissman's investigation it becomes obvious that there is no unanimity of opinion within the New Orleans Jewish community concerning the basic question of Jewish identity. The community is very heterogeneous in its make-up. What then constitutes it a coherent

community? There is first the willingness of individual Jews to recognize themselves as Jews, however they may choose to define Jewish identity. And second, there is the "status ceiling" which prevents upper-class Jews from moving into the city's real social elite.

Full membership in the status and ruling elite of New Orleans is not open to Jews. Even though many of the Jews have what would appear to be adequate economic, political and genealogical qualifications, a barrier is raised by the Catholic character of the city. To illustrate, Reissman examines the Mardi Gras celebration. "Mardi Gras marks the peak of the social season for the status elite and for the status pretenders."¹⁰⁴ The festival is staged by "krewes" (associations) which are organized according to a tight status hierarchy generally recognized throughout the city. "Without any doubt, membership of one of the top three krewes is at once a prerequisite for entry into the elite as well as a recognition of one's elite status."¹⁰⁵

The Mardi Gras, however, has distinct Catholic overtones in its celebration. So much so, that most Jews feel restrained from asserting their status claims within the context of the krewes. Few Jews are members of krewes, and there is doubt whether any at all belong to those of highest status. For a Jew to gain membership in the social elite, he must largely repudiate his Jewish identity, however minimal it may be. Very few Jews are willing to do this. Therefore, by virtue of their Jewishness, high class Jewish families are disqualified from translating their class position into commensurate status position. To maintain one's Jewish identification is to accept the status ceiling.

I do not wish to give the impression that this situation produces intolerable frustration in the Jewish community, because I believe that it does not really affect the large majority. If anything, the ceiling has worked to set minimum limits for Jewish identification. 106

New Orleans, then, provides us with an example of a highly integrated community where a variety of identification patterns successfully preserve the Jewish sub-community's existence. It is notable that in this thoroughly integrated, third and fourth generation sub-community, only 34 per cent of the Jews select religion as the measure of Jewish identification. At least three other patterns of identification are popularly chosen. Different sectors of the sub-community have different degrees of Jewish identification, but the status ceiling functions to keep all of them within the Jewish community.

New Haven. -- Aaron Antonovsky has studied the variety of ideologies current among New Haven Jews. He discovered that there is no common agreement among second generation Jewish men on a definition of the American Jewish situation. From data gathered during two-hour interviews with each of 58 married men -- all children of Eastern European immigrants -- Antonovsky constructed six categories of contemporary Jewish ideology. His typologies were based upon the answers to interview questions in two areas: (a) the measure of Jewish identification, wherein the respondent was asked about his feelings of Jewishness and about his relations with gentiles; and (b) the perception of Jewish community cohesion, wherein the respondent was queried concerning his understanding of the sub-communities norms and values.

Jewish identification was measured by 13 brief questions with

multiple choice answers. Respondents were asked about their reactions to attacks on Jews overseas, Jewish lawbreakers, intermarriage of children, anti-Semitism, and hearing Yiddish spoken. Their feelings about famous Jews, social ease with Jews, neighborhood preference, parallel Jewish organizations and work dealings were also probed. Antonovsky notes that there were only two or three men who consistently indicated a desire to break away from Jewish identity. In contrast, "on almost every item, between 20% and 30% selected the 'most Jewish' response."¹⁰⁷

How Jews perceive the facts of being Jewish in America is an area in which little research has been done. Yet one's definition of his own life situation is intimately related to his beliefs about the facts of sub-community cohesion and stress. Antonovsky utilized a most interesting procedure in his attempt to tap this area. A number of hypothetical situations involving Jews were described and then followed by a question concerning interpretation of the facts in that situation. Multiple choice answers were provided. In this way, respondents were queried concerning their perception of relations within the Jewish community and between Jews and gentiles.

The Jewish community is seen by most, in terms of social relations, to be a fairly solidary community, a voluntary, natural social grouping, with little power or desire to impose sanctions on the small minority who may transgress the generally accepted minimal group norms and patterns. These norms and patterns, insofar as they refer to specific actions, are seen by most respondents as preferred rather than prescribed. 108

Most of the men did detect a substantial amount of social and economic discrimination against Jews, but they did not feel that the sense of well-being and opportunity among American Jews was shaken by

this. What did bother many of them was the feeling that large numbers of American gentiles approve the discriminatory patterns. "The interview materials indicate that to many Jews, large numbers of Americans are latently, albeit not strongly, hostile to Jews in their general attitude."¹⁰⁹

From the interview materials Antonovsky is able to spell out the presence of six types of ideology among his respondents. "The answers of an individual tend to fall into a consistent, albeit imperfect, pattern, and, in a two-hour interview, a general picture emerges which I have here termed the respondent's 'definition of the American Jewish situation.'"¹¹⁰ Each of the ideological types which Antonovsky outlines represents a composite picture, fitting no single man exactly. He claims that there are few second-generation Jews in this country who could not be satisfactorily characterized by one of these six ideologies.¹¹¹

Type One: Active Jewish Orientation. Jews of this type have a strong sense of solidarity with other Jews. They are more relaxed with their own ingroup, and they do not feel that being Jewish is a simple matter of religion. The formation of the State of Israel was very significant to them. They are very much aware that they are a minority in a somewhat hostile world. Jewishness is omnipresent in everything these people do.

Type Two: Passive Jewish Orientation. Those in this group are notably less concerned with Jewishness than those in the first type. They are opposed to the disintegration of Jewry without having any clearly formulated program for group survival. Being Jewish is a fact of life which they accept without much involvement.

Type Three: Ambivalent Orientation. In the sociological literature, this type of Jew has usually been termed the "marginal man."¹¹² These people are overwhelmingly concerned with what gentiles think and say about Jews. They believe that it is very important to be humble and discreet, refined and quiet. Anti-Semitism is blamed on other Jews, particularly the "New York kikey Jews." They do not attempt to deny their Jewish identity, but they insist that Judaism is only a religion. If Jews are just a religious group, they will be most readily accepted by the gentiles. A Jew of this type may become actively involved in religious institutions of the Jewish community, but his involvement tends to be "moderate, formal and organized rather than spontaneous and natural."

Type Four: Dual Orientation. These men feel themselves to be as much part of the general society as of Jewish life. They emphasize the acceptance of each individual on his own merits. Their ultimate perspective is the slow but steady integration of all sub-groups into the general society. For the time being, they willingly acknowledge their membership in the Jewish group and a sense of kinship with other Jews. But there is no desire for a more tightly-knit sub-community than is now found.

Type Five: Passive General Orientation. Jews of this type are indifferent to Jewishness. "The fact that they were born to Jewish parents has little to do with the origin, satisfaction or frustration of their needs."¹¹³ These men are part of the general society, drifting away from Jewishness but without any clear plan of assimilation. Asked about anti-Semitism, they stress its uniform

decrease during the past decades; in the progress of modern times, everything is getting better.

Type Six: Active General Orientation. Those in this group are actively and consciously oriented toward integration within the general community. Among these men, there is no sense of a tie to the Jewish group; Jews are referred to as "they." There are no qualms about intermarriage. In situations where they will profit from a denial of their Jewishness, there is no hesitation to do so. They minimize anti-Semitism and disparage the self-imposed segregation of Jews. They have no desire to see the survival of the Jewish community.

The 58 respondents in the New Haven sample were distributed among the six types of ideology in this way: ¹¹⁴

Active Jewish	36.2%
Passive Jewish	17.2
Ambivalent	13.8
Dual	13.8
Passive general	15.5
Active general	3.4
	<hr/>
	99.9%

This table indicates the caution and scepticism with which generalizations about "American Jews" as such must be taken. There is a wide range of feelings among them -- even within one generation in one city -- not only with respect to non-Jewish questions, but in the fundamental areas of Jewish identification and perception of Jew-Gentile relations. ¹¹⁵

According to this study of New Haven Jews, it can be seen that there is no common agreement among them on the meaning of Jewishness. It can be said that none of the respondents seemed to be working out a pattern of rebellion against an immigrant generation. Each of them has a working ideology of Jewishness which is individually satisfying. Why is it that a particular type of ideology is selected? We do not

really know. Antonovsky does not believe that ideology is related to personality variables: "There seem to be anxious as well as secure people, to select one dimension, in most or all of the types."¹¹⁶ In fact, no single variable -- generation, religiosity of the parental home or socio-economic class -- is sufficiently related to the choice of ideology for us to assign it a causative role. Whatever it is that causes it, there can be found within the American Jewish community at least six different patterns of Jewish ideological orientation.

D. STUDIES ON VALUE-ORIENTATIONS

Liberalism (1). -- To probe the salient motivations of Jewish voters in a big city, Lawrence H. Fuchs and others interviewed a systematic sample of eligible voters in Boston's Ward 14, an area of concentrated Jewish residence. In chapter six of his book, The Political Behavior of American Jews, Fuchs records the results of that survey. The interviews were conducted about six months after the 1952 elections. Respondents were asked to indicate the presidential candidate for whom they had voted. They were also questioned concerning their socio-economic status, ethno-religious involvement and political liberalism. Eighty-four per cent of the 276 respondents were Jewish (231). Among the Jews, 69 per cent of those who had voted indicated their preference for Stevenson, the Democratic candidate.

Fuchs reports that there is no correlation between socio-economic status and the choice of a Democratic candidate. Approximately two-thirds of the Jews in each class voted for Stevenson. There is likewise no correlation between either educational unit completed or

age group and voting record. Third generation Jews chose Stevenson with significant regularity (100%), but their number was too limited (only 8) to allow interpretation.

When Jewish respondents were rated according to a scale of ethno-religious involvement, Fuchs claims that no significant difference emerged between the Eisenhower or Stevenson supporters. In a puzzling statement, Fuchs declares, "The overall scores of each group were quite close, one-tenth of a point separating them on a five point scale."¹¹⁷ Yet he reproduces a table titled "Democratic Vote of Jews by Ethnic Involvement Groups," and a significant difference is revealed there between the high and the low groups:¹¹⁸

	% Democratic	
High Ethnic Involvement	46.2%	(13)
High-Medium EI	72.4	(47)
Medium EI	69.5	(72)
Low-Medium EI	60.5	(43)
Low EI	80.1	(20)

From the evidence, it seems clear that there is a negative correlation between ethnic involvement and Democratic preference. This conclusion is so much at odds with Fuchs' overall thesis that he finds it necessary, in a long footnote, to question the validity of his instrument. As we shall see later, when we consider a study by Litt, Fuchs' instrument may have been far more reliable than he was willing to believe.

It is with the scale of political liberalism that Fuchs is most concerned. The liberalism of respondents was rated according to their disposition to share power with outgroups and their willingness to respect those who are different. They were asked, for example, whether citizens in Boston should be taxed to help pay for the roads and education of people in Kentucky. Fifty-seven per cent of the Jews and 40 per cent of the gentiles agreed to be taxed for such a purpose.

In a similar fashion, 44.5 per cent of the Jews and 29 per cent of the Christians agreed that they ought to be taxed to help raise standards of living in Asia and Africa.¹¹⁹ This study of Ward 14 illustrated once again that a higher proportion of Jews than of gentiles can be considered political liberals.

Fuchs declares that the high Jewish preference for Stevenson was a clear reflection of their strong commitment to liberalism. Most Jews seem to have perceived the Democrat as the most liberal candidate. Those Jews who were rated most liberal were considerably more likely to vote Democratic than anyone else in the Ward.

To a much greater extent than the Christians, the Jews in the sample emphasized the personal qualifications and liberalism of Stevenson and/or the Democratic Party. Gentiles tended to stress the fact that the Democrats and/or Stevenson favored their economic group while Eisenhower and the Republicans did not. 120

In the last chapter of his book, Fuchs argues that the liberalism of contemporary Jews is rooted in the traditional values of Jewish culture: learning, charity and non-asceticism. His evidence is scanty. That Jews value learning is deduced from their verbalized admiration of Stevenson's intelligence. More evidence is to be found in the fact that 12 per cent of Ward 14 Jews felt that even Nazis and Communists ought to be guaranteed free speech, while not a single gentile in the sample supported that position. "To be sure, the insecurity of the Jews prompts their anxiety about civil liberties, but the value which Jews place on knowledge plays a role as well."¹²¹

The value which contemporary Jews place on charity is revealed in their willingness to be taxed to aid the less fortunate in Kentucky or even Africa or Asia. And their non-asceticism is demonstrated by

two findings of Kinsey:

...Kinsey found that American Jews have more marital intercourse than non-Jews at all age levels except the youngest. Even more significantly, Kinsey and his associates reported that Jews talk more freely about sex than Christians. 122

Fuchs does dwell at greater length on each of these values, but he has no more empirical evidence than we have reviewed here for believing that they are the source of Jewish liberalism.

Liberalism (2). -- Werner Cohn has also tried to locate the sources of American Jewish liberalism. In his article, "The Politics of American Jews," he reiterates the familiar fact of Jewish liberalism.

No other group has been so overwhelmingly attached to New Deal politics -- or so overwhelmingly opposed to anti-New Deal politicians. In a study by Gallup done in June, 1954, 31 per cent of a national sample of Americans was "intensely disapproving" of Senator McCarthy; 38 per cent of all Democrats felt that way; but among American Jews, fully 65 per cent opposed McCarthy "intensely." 123

According to a 1956 study of voting patterns in Chicago, Jews revealed an impressive preference for the Democratic candidate. While 72 per cent of the Jews voted for Stevenson, only 18.5 per cent of the non-Jews had chosen the Democrat. Even among the Jews of high socio-economic status, Stevenson was still the favorite of 66 per cent. It is clear that American Jews differ strikingly from gentiles in their political preferences. 124

Cohn claims that the liberalism of the Jews is rooted in their historical insecurity. He traces the modern history of the Jews in Europe and America and finds it unified by a constant position of insecurity; Jews, as Jews, always had to fear the irrationality of conservative governments. Liberalism, then, was the "rational point

of view^m which Jews embraced in their effort to gain equality with all other citizens of the nation-state. The phenomenon of liberalism persists among American Jews because American political mores still distinguish Jew from gentile in very many cases.

I regard this American Jewish Liberalism as the expression of what American Jews feel is their insecure place in the world-wide Gentile environment. The evidence indicates that there is a relation between Jewish insecurity and the relative importance of Jewish Liberalism...Its future, as I see it, depends more on factors in the Gentile world than on those operating among Jews alone. 125

Unfortunately, Cohn's article (based on his Ph.D. dissertation) presents a paucity of hard, empirically derived facts. It can not be claimed that he has proven the historical insecurity of Jews to be the cause of their rational liberalism.

Liberalism (3). -- Edgar Litt has carefully investigated the relation between "Jewish Ethno-Religious Involvement and Political Liberalism." His original study was not available to me. But the summary which appeared in a sociological journal, Social Forces, is very suggestive. Litt's study (based on an unknown sample) indicated a reverse correlation between Jewish ethno-religious involvement and political liberalism. Ethno-religious involvement of Jews was measured by attendance at synagogue services, use of Yiddish expressions in jokes and conversation, readership of an Anglo-Jewish periodical, activity in Jewish organizations and participation in all Jewish friendship cliques. Jews who scored high on this scale were not consistent liberals; Jews who were low in ethno-religious involvement were more stable in their liberalism.

What seemed to be of greatest importance to the highly involved Jews was the perceived political position of gentiles.

The high Ethno-Religious Involvement group seemed to take the position that if non-Jews were for more Negro power, we are against it, and if gentiles are against increased Negro influence, we support these demands for increased power. On the other hand, Jews who were less involved in ethnic channels tended to ignore gentile statements as points of reference and maintained their original opinions. 126

For the highly involved Jews, gentile political opinion served as a negative reference point away from which their own political opinions tended to move.

If Litt is correct, then it becomes difficult to associate Jewish liberalism with the traditional values of Jewish culture. As Fuchs' statistics on the relation between ethnic involvement and Democratic voting had indicated (without his comprehension), Jews who were closest to the tradition were least likely to vote as consistent liberals. Although Litt's study does not deal with Cohn's thesis that the historical insecurity of the Jews is responsible for their liberalism, his conclusions do suggest that ethnically involved Jews did not turn to liberalism because it was the rational point of view. Seemingly, the choice of liberalism by many Jews reveals a will to be different; it reflects their desire for distinctive identity.

Litt would lead us to believe that widespread Jewish liberalism indicates that Jews generally perceive the gentile majority to be conservative in orientation. Since the gentiles are seen to be conservative, Jews choose to be liberals. Liberalism is thus an expression of ethnic consciousness.

Sobriety. -- It is well known that the rates of alcoholism and other drinking pathologies for Jews are very low. Similarly, it is generally believed that there are more users of alcoholic beverages

among Jews than among any other major ethnic group in America. Charles R. Synder has investigated at great length the causes and meaning of Jewish sobriety. In an article in the Sklare reader, "Culture and Jewish Sobriety: The Ingroup-Outgroup Factor," Synder presents his thesis: "...Through constant reference to the hedonism of outsiders, in association with a broader pattern of religious and ethnocentric ideas and sentiments, Jews also learn how not to drink."¹²⁷

For his research Synder utilized two samples: (a) 73 New Haven Jewish men, and (b) a nationwide sample of Jewish college students. Most Jewish men admitted that they had been criticized occasionally for not drinking enough. These criticisms, however, came almost always from non-Jews. If Jews criticized the drinking habits of a fellow Jew, it was generally in the direction of moderation or sobriety. Jewish respondents were aware of an implicit norm of moderation within their own sub-community. Moreover, they perceive the non-Jewish milieu as governed by norms of much greater indulgence.

One of the situations under which sobriety as a value most often breaks down is military service. Here, family and community sanctions are least imminent and the sense of ethnic identification is weakest. There is a need to be accepted into gentile primary groups and hence a willingness to accept their norms. When asked about the social conditions in which they had been intoxicated, the respondents indicated that 60 per cent of the instances were either in military service or in college, with military service predominating. Only 14 per cent of the veterans reported that they drank more now than they had as servicemen, while 49 per cent of the veterans declared that

they now drank less. Having returned to civilian life, community pressures were once again felt operative.¹²⁸

Sobriety is felt to be one of the symbols of Jewishness. It is a virtue associated with ethnic consciousness. "The inner meaning of intoxication for the Jew himself is the degradation of Jewishness."¹²⁹ The difference between sobriety and intoxication comes to be seen as the difference between Jew and gentile. This dichotomy is both a contributor to and a recipient of the widespread Jewish stereotype of the gentile drunkard. Most respondents cited the little ditty "Shikker iz a Goy" when queried about their attitudes toward drinking. The stereotype is not found just among Orthodox Jews with high ethno-religious involvement; it persists even among those who have abandoned Orthodoxy. Sobriety seems to be maintained as a genuine value of the Jewish ethnic group. In fact, Synder claims that:

...sobriety has been incorporated into the ethnocentrism of the Jewish group...The principle function of ethnocentrism is the clarification and intensification of a group's norms and sentiments through the magnification of their opposites as characteristic of disliked or hated outsiders...Stereotypes among Jews of sobriety and drunkenness in terms of Jew and Gentile clarify sobriety as "our way" and intensify the emotional sentiments supporting it with broader feeling for things Jewish as opposed to things which are not. 130

Synder believes that the ceremonies of Orthodox Judaism serve to support a broad network of ethnocentric ideas and sentiments. With the waning of ceremonial observance, there is generally a corresponding loss in strength of ethnocentric feelings. Synder suggests that the weakening of ethnocentrism is a required condition

for increasing intoxication among Jews. Yet, the facts of his investigation force him to acknowledge that, despite the abandonment of most ritual observance, stereotypes of sober Jew and drunken gentile continue to influence Jewish sobriety. The operations of the socio-religious sub-community are not fully understood by Synder. Concepts of ingroup and outgroup can obviously be fostered in Jewish children without recourse to the ceremonial pattern of associationalism.

Achievement. -- The cultural values of a society are fostered and developed by its primary groups, principally the family. The relation between "Family Interaction, Values, and Achievement" is the subject of an article by Fred L. Strodbeck found in the Sklare reader. The article is based upon a larger Yale University project concerning cultural factors in talent development. The investigation set out to identify some of the crucial family values associated with achievement in the United States. To this end, it was determined to compare the "achievement potential" in samples from two immigrant groups: (a) Jews, whose average socio-economic status was well above average and (b) Italians, whose average socio-economic status was somewhat below average. It was assumed that the more successful Jews would produce more achievement-related responses than the less successful Italians.

The samples were obtained from the New Haven public and parochial schools. From a population of over 1,000 boys, data was obtained which allowed the selection of 48 third generation Italian

and Jewish boys between 14 and 17 years old. They were matched according to socio-economic status and divided equally between over-achievers and under-achievers. Questionnaires were given to the father, mother and son in each of the 48 households. A procedure was also designed to measure family interaction in each of these homes.

In Strodbeck's summary of the study's empirical findings, he isolates a syndrome of five values which seem important for achievement in this country:¹³¹

1. A belief that the world is orderly and amenable to rational mastery, and that, therefore, a person can and should make plans which will control his destiny...
2. A willingness to leave home to make one's way in life...
3. A preference for individualistic rather than collective credit for work done...
4. A belief that man could improve himself more by education and that one should not readily submit to fate and accept a lower station in life...
5. A lesser concern for establishing dominance in face-to-face relationships.

Strodbeck's article suggests that the conspicuous achievement of the American Jews as a group reveals the widespread influence among them of these five values. The status mobility of the Jewish sub-community can be traced to the value system immanent within their family life. Jewish families have produced an exceptional number of achievant individuals in the United States because the syndrome of values imparted to the children during socialization were significantly well related to the requirements for success in this country.

Education . -- One important indication of a mobility-orientation among American Jews, says Strodbeck, is their generally favorable attitude toward higher education. A survey conducted in 1956 by the Vocational Service of B'nai B'rith illustrated the effects of this attitude. In proportion to their numbers, Jews have at least twice as many students in the colleges as non-Jews. "While 62 out of every 100 college-age Jewish persons are actually enrolled in college, only 27 out of every 100 non-Jews are in college."¹³² Of all the students in the country studying for law, 14.3 per cent were Jewish. Thirteen per cent of all medical students, 8.8 per cent of all dental students and 12 per cent of all social work students were Jewish. Almost a third of the Jews were studying business administration, 19 per cent were in education and 18 per cent were in engineering.¹³³

These statistics indicate that there is a tendency among Jewish students today to enter in greater numbers the study of professions in which Jews were formerly little represented (particularly engineering). Likewise, they are showing somewhat less inclination toward the professional courses with which Jewish students were formerly more closely identified. Since 1935, there have been significant drops in the proportion of Jews enrolled in dentistry, medicine and law. Nevertheless, there is still a basic preference among Jews for intellectual pursuits which offer the greatest opportunity for self-employment and in which discrimination is less prevalent. The 1956 B'nai B'rith survey found that:

25.2% of all Jewish students reported for specific professions were in seven of these [self-employing and less discriminating] fields. If we add to this the figure for business administration, which includes a great many accounting students and those preparing to enter family business enterprises, we have accounted for more than half of the total. 134

Information from the B'nai B'rith survey leads us to believe that the attitudes toward education are linked with the values outlined by Strodbeck. There is no evidence that the high educational achievement is linked with intellectuality as a value in itself. Education is clearly viewed instrumentally; it is the means by which upward status mobility is obtained. The college major is chosen with careful regard for status considerations and absence of discriminatory obstacles. The students are motivated by a steadfast faith in the value of education as the means to self-improvement. Education is not pursued simply for its own sake; the shtetl orientation to learning is absent.

Authoritarianism. -- In the late 1940's, Adorno and others at the University of California developed a description of the so-called "authoritarian personality." This personality syndrome, they suggested, is found with great frequency in the populations of modern countries. Already by 1954, the authoritarian personality had been studied in enough situations so that Inkeles and Levinson felt it could be included as one of the five analytic issues upon which the study of modal personality should focus.¹³⁵ Briefly stated, the Adorno thesis is that ideological dispositions are closely related to general personality functioning. There is an essential correspondence in the type of approach and outlook which certain persons

have in a great variety of seemingly unrelated areas. A basic hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitative attitude pervades their life pattern whether they are in the nursery, the office, the voting booth or the corner drugstore. This authoritarian personality pattern is found in various degrees in all modern societies and groups.¹³⁶

Joseph B. Adelson has applied Adorno's information and procedures to a study of middle class Jews. A summary of certain aspects of this Ph.D. dissertation is found in the Sklare reader. The study was done in two parts. Adelson first interviewed intensely 17 Jewish fraternity men at Berkeley. From this sample he sought to uncover distinctive variables in the ideology of a Jewish authoritarian personality. Four items stand out.

(1) The authoritarian image of the Jew. Adorno has pointed out that a propensity for sharp and dichotomous distinctions is a fundamental feature of the authoritarian personality. Among Jews, this intolerance of ambiguity finds expression in a dichotomized image of the Jew: there are good Jews (the ingroup), and there are bad Jews (the outgroup).

The terms of the dichotomy frequently vary from person to person; each interviewee employing it tends to emphasize particular traits as characterizing ingroup and outgroup. For some, the outgroup figure is a social climber, intent upon "crashing into upper circles"; others stress his being "cheap," or a "spendthrift," or "coarse," or "loud." 137

In general, the bad Jew is seen as an "obnoxious" deviant from the norms of middle class respectability. By defining himself as a good Jew, the authoritarian Jew is able to identify with the gentile and free himself from any responsibility for anti-Semitism.

(2) The authoritarian image of the gentile. Once again there is dichotomization. The bad gentile is a stereotype of mass man -- inarticulate, brutish, untutored, envious and violent. In clear contrast is the good gentile, a middle class model of refinement and decorum. The good gentile has two faces. On one hand he is a brotherly buddy with whom the authoritarian Jew feels joined in a camaraderie of disdain for both bad Jew and bad gentile. At other times the good gentile appears to be "an older, more paternal figure whom one approaches deferentially, whose opinion is sought."¹³⁸ While the good gentile can be counted upon to differentiate between the two kinds of Jews, bad gentiles are held to be incapable of this distinction.

(3) The authoritarian evaluation of anti-Semitism. "Anti-Semitism is seen as a 'rational' or 'natural' response to the behavior of the 'bad' Jews."¹³⁹ Gentiles are justified in their rejection of immoral, nonconformist, radical, intellectual, crooked, over-religious and/or atheistic bad Jews. The problem of anti-Semitism could be solved if Jews would just behave themselves and be outstandingly good. For the authoritarian Jew, "the Gentile world is parental." It knows best, and it requires the suppression of all bad (i.e., deviant) impulses. Only by conformity "to a featureless Babbittry" can Jews expect to please and appease the gentiles.

(4) The authoritarian preoccupation with strength and weakness. The authoritarian Jew is typically preoccupied with the theme of power. "Some subjects dwell upon the 'weakness' of this or that kind of Jew, concentrating particularly upon those who deny being

Jewish.¹⁴⁰ Others are drawn to an admiration of the state of Israel because of the strength it has exercised in the Middle East. In general, there is a rejection of weak and an idealization of strong characteristics and behavior.

From interview materials, Adelson constructed a 22-item questionnaire designed to measure Jewish authoritarianism. This questionnaire was administered to 241 Jews in the University community. The instrument's validity was established by its correlation with the Adorno "F scale" which measures general authoritarianism. Some authoritarianism is found among the Jews of every group which Adelson tested. But authoritarianism was particularly characteristic of the fraternity and sorority members in the sample. Looking at the other tabulated variables associated with high authoritarianism scores, Adelson notes:¹⁴¹

- (1) The Reform Jewish score highest of the denominational groups, while the religiously unaffiliated score lowest.
- (2) Those who attend religious services only on holidays are the highest scoring group; those who never attend are the lowest.
- (3) The Republicans are the highest group in the political stratification, while the Progressives are lowest.
- (4) Those Ss both of whose parents are American born have higher scores than those with one or two foreign-born parents.
- (5) There is no sex difference.

Adelson's study seems to indicate that there is a correlation between Jewish authoritarianism and Reform Jewish affiliation, religious observance only on holidays, Republican Party preference, and membership in the third generation. If Adelson's work is correct, then we should be led to believe that a growing percentage of American Jews can be characterized as authoritarian in personality orientation.

Child-Rearing. -- Paul H. Whiteman has investigated the relation between membership in selected religious groups and parental attitudes toward child-rearing. (Two summaries of his study have been mimeographed by the University of Wisconsin.) The hypotheses and conclusions of this study are formulated in terms of three basic psycho-social issues as described by Inkeles and Levinson -- relation to authority, conception of self, and primary dilemmas.¹⁴²

Each of these three analytic issues was investigated by means of an integrated questionnaire taken from four other studies of child-rearing and parental attitudes. The instrument was administered to 90 parent couples drawn equally from three congregations: Jewish Conservative, Roman Catholic, and Conservative Baptist. The three groups of parent couples represented random distributions drawn from a common population with respect to education, socio-economic status, and family size. (Subjects required an average of an hour and a quarter to complete the full questionnaire.)

On several measures, the scores of the Jewish parent couples revealed statistically significant differences from Catholic and Baptist scores. In terms of the first analytic issue, authoritarianism, Jews scored significantly lower than the other two groups. The Jewish parents were less dogmatic, less strict and less intrusive. Jewish parents were most likely to regard their children as equals and encourage them to verbalize their feelings. On 9 of the 12 measures of authoritarianism, the gentile groups scored significantly higher than the Jews.¹⁴³

The tests designed to reveal differences in conception of self were not very discriminating. The Jewish group did character-

ize itself as more ascendant and in more complimentary terms than the Catholic and Baptist groups. But there were no significant differences with respect to the characteristics of responsibility, emotional stability, and sociability.

Within the third analytic issue, primary dilemmas, several significant differences appeared. Jewish parents were least likely to foster dependency or to suppress either aggression or sex in their children. On the scales for "Inconsiderateness of Husband" and "Martyrdom," Jewish scores were significantly lower. On the other hand, the Jews score significantly higher on the scales for "Marital Conflict" and "Irritability." Membership in the Jewish group seemed significantly related to certain patterns of family life.

Jewish parents were least likely to rate their children's aggressive behavior as a problem. But they were more of the opinion that withdrawing behavior in children constitutes a problem of some consequence.

Whiteman concludes his study by noting that "Jewish subjects are differentiated from Baptist and Catholic subjects to a greater degree than are the latter from each other."¹⁴⁴ The clearest differentiation between groups is revealed within the analytic issue of authoritarianism.

On the basis of the results, the Jewish group may be characterized as having the least tendency to adhere to a closed system of beliefs and disbeliefs, or to a system of beliefs hinging upon absolute authority. As parents, they are more likely to interact flexibly and democratically with each other and with their children. 145

Three of the measures revealed results for the Jewish group which Whiteman did not expect. Jews perceived the marital situation as more troublesome than did the other groups. Yet the scale "Rejection of the Homemaking Role" did not differentiate the Jews. They scored high on the measure of family irritability, and they rated withdrawal behavior in children as a greater problem than did either the Catholics or the Baptists. All of this is taken by Whiteman as a possible indication of greater willingness among Jews to accept reality (open-mindedness) and of a lower degree of psychological defensiveness when compared to other groups.¹⁴⁶ It may be that the doctrinal atmosphere in a Jewish family is such that the parents can openly express their personality differences in family arguments.¹⁴⁷ Whereas families of other groups might conceive intra-family quarrels as disruptive and therefore suppress them, Jews feel more free to bring disagreements out into the open. It is in this family atmosphere of open quarrels that Jewish children absorb the values of independence, self-assertion and aggressiveness which underlie their mobility aspirations and achievement records.

E. STUDIES ON IDENTITY AND BELONGINGNESS

America, American, Americanism. -- Nearly all American Jews, declares Joshua A. Fishman, are striving to remain Jewish and to retain their Jewishness. There is general accord on this common purpose. The differences between Jewish groups come about, not because some of them want to assimilate, but because there is disagreement concerning which nuances or principles of Jewish living are essential.

All the organizations of American Jewish life can be placed within a "retentionism continuum." From the least acculturated to the most acculturated, all groups of American Jews are intent upon preserving their distinctiveness as Jews. It is Fishman's hypothesis, moreover, that all groups of American Jews -- no matter their position on the retentionism continuum -- are similar in their feelings of American self-identification.

Fishman explored his hypothesis in interviews with 36 children from four different types of institutional schools: secular, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. Most of the interviews were conducted according to a specific interview schedule and in a group situation. In general, his hypothesis was verified; Americanism was "a comfortable pair of shoes" for all the children from every situation.

The interviewed children had no "dilemma consciousness." They did not feel that there was any conflict between their Americanism and their Jewishness. "Again and again, individually and collectively, these children rush in, very early in the interviews, to insist that the problem is no problem at all for them, that America or Americanism is not an issue with which they are preoccupied."¹⁴⁸ Fishman believes that they were actually uncomfortable when confronted with even the possibility that their Jewishness might have something to do with a specialized adjustment to America. Many of the children tried to squelch the discussion from the very first question. They would claim that their religion had nothing to do with their Americanism.

When pressed, however, the children admitted that one's Jewishness did influence his attitudes and feelings with respect to America. Being Jewish made one more appreciative of the freedoms, privileges and benefits granted to Americans. But being Jewish also made it impossible to accept prejudiced neighbors as good Americans. Jews are forced to regard prejudice and discrimination as incompatible with good Americanism. The typical American is imagined to be accepting of all other Americans, and most non-Jewish Americans are believed, by the children, to be fully accepting of Jews as fellow Americans. Personal experiences of anti-Semitism were seldom mentioned, and nobody felt that his major life goals would be frustrated by discrimination.

The children were clearly aware of their own group's minority status; they knew that non-Jews make up the majority in this country. Although none of them ever stated that he felt weak or insecure, a number of them did declare that members of the majority group must feel more secure and powerful. "Such attributed feelings may certainly be said to stem from the Jewish child's perception of himself as a minority-group member and from an awareness (no matter how submerged or how repressed from conscious verbal or conceptual formulation) of resultant status and power differentials, of an irretrievable imbalance of forces, and perhaps even of a deep-lying, carefully guarded fear."¹⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the Jewish children did not feel that the non-Jewish majority was any more favorably disposed to Americanism than they were. The children never say anything about other Americans which reveals that they feel themselves alienated from normal Americanism.

In every group -- whether from secular, Reform, Conservative or Orthodox institutions -- there were some youngsters who expressed feelings of Jewish superiority. Differences in educational emphasis, economic status, and social preferences were mentioned. And in every group there were some who rose up to deny the expressions of superiority. Still, "non-Jewish deficiencies are not altogether denied but are played down or ascribed to manipulable [sic] circumstances."¹⁵⁰ In general, there is little tendency to disparage the position of other Americans.

What criticism of other Americans they do express is directed at less acculturated Jews. "...The respondents in each school type in turn see no danger in disassociation from America in their own immediate circle (where they are rather inclined to see just the reverse) but they can visualize such a danger among the 'fanatics to the right.'"¹⁵¹ A peculiar kind of selective reasoning seems prevalent among the children. In every group they believe that their own kind of Judaism is fully compatible with Americanism; but to ascribe to either fanatical Judaism or diluted Judaism (from the perspective of one's particular group) is somewhat un-American.

Jewish children do not regard their relationship with America as a "pressure area." They are conscious of no clash of allegiances, no dilemma which must be solved, no "either...or" decision concerning their loyalties. Even the Orthodox youngsters regard the Puritans, Quakers and pioneers as their ancestors. Being American is natural and normal.

As things are, with acceptance of America-American-Americans such a natural, normal, and constant occurrence in their environment, it is no wonder at all that they have no special insight into what might be considered as clues to it. It has just never been a critical item for them and they have, therefore, never dissected themselves or another with reference to it. 152

Minority Awareness. -- Marian Radke-Yarrow has investigated the special problems faced by minority group children (particularly Jews) in the process of growing up. She emphasizes that the developmental problems of these children "are of the same kind and of the same timing as in normal processes of socialization."¹⁵³ All children participate in the ordinary struggles of growing up. But minority children infuse the maturational stages with elements peculiar to their own minority group. Jewish children, for example, learn very early in life that they have to establish their identity in terms of two reference groups -- Jewish and American.

In a study of five to eight year-old children, it was revealed that the Jewish children were far more familiar with their religious group than were either the Protestants or the Catholics. "Seventy-one per cent of the Jewish children were rated as having specific or extensive information about being Jewish, whereas the comparable percentages for Protestant and Catholic children when asked about their own groups were 25 per cent and 51 per cent, respectively."¹⁵⁴ Furthermore, half of the Jewish responses were accompanied by indications of intense personal involvement and group consciousness. Radke-Yarrow concludes that "minority children show earlier and greater differentiation of their own group as well as more personal involvement in the group identification."¹⁵⁵

In another study, Radke-Yarrow and others sought to learn how the Jewish child's concept of himself is linked with his minority group membership. Twenty-four groups of six children were interviewed. They came from three different environmental settings and four age levels. Following the group interview, in which issues of Jewish and non-Jewish interactions were discussed, a questionnaire was administered to each individual.

The interviews indicated that all the children (except for the youngest from an Orthodox background) regarded the non-Jewish world as essentially hostile territory. Anti-Semitism was assumed to be latent in every gentile. Moreover, there was common agreement among the children as to the outer facade to be assumed when confronted by outgroup hostility. One should attempt to "smooth things over" -- act as if nothing had happened. Teen-agers particularly were likely to suggest that the best way to avoid gentile hostility was to stick with one's own group. In general, the children understood the meaning of minority group membership against a background of the majority group culture. They learn while still young that they are somehow different.

The questionnaires were designed to discover how often the minority group child chooses his own group for his associations and interests. "Ingroup choices, it is found, are high among the youngest children but show a general and considerable decrease with age."¹⁵⁶ While 70 per cent of the seven and eight year-olds would want a Jewish name for their hypothetical club, only 25 per cent of the older adolescents would choose a Jewish name. Nearly 50 per cent of the youngest children would prefer to live on an all-Jewish street,

but half that many adolescents had the same preference. In only one case was the trend reversed. Where almost two-thirds of the adolescents gave first choice to a Jewish philanthropy, 80 per cent of the pre-adolescents indicated their preference for non-Jewish charities.

It is interesting to note the high percentage of adolescents who express aggression or rejection concerning the Jews in contrast to the low number who express hostility toward the majority group. Radke-Yarrow interprets this to be an indication of "peer-group conformity and acceptance needs, reinforced by adolescent rebellion against parental norms."¹⁵⁷ Likewise, the fact that 85 per cent of the adolescents verbalize sensitivity and tension in decisions concerning their Jewish associations and identifications is taken as an indication of the marginal social status of all adolescents. "Already in a marginal role (neither child nor adult), the minority role brings with it an additional marginality."¹⁵⁸ For the Jewish child, all the storm and stress normally associated with an adolescent maturational stage takes on elements of Jewishness. The basic ethnic consciousness asserts itself even in the formation of normal personality problems. Only an identified Jew could expand his adolescent rebellion into an expressed rejection of Jews.

Radke-Yarrow's research has revealed that Jewish children take on aspects of conscious Jewish identity beginning at age four or five. Being Jewish is quickly sensed to be not just peripheral to their lives; they learn that they are part of a special ingroup. Feelings of Jewishness become more complex as the child grows older, but the expressions of minority group identity remain high at all ages and in all environmental settings. The Jewish child is always

faced with the problem of integrating his minority group status adjustment with all other facets of his socialization.

Jewish Boys. -- What is the reaction of Jewish boys to various aspects of their being Jewish? Chein and Hurwitz studied 166 boys from 14 Metropolitan New York Jewish Centers. The study was designed to make possible the comparison of younger and older age groups, higher and lower socio-economic groups, and boys from two types of Jewish environment. A questionnaire (similar to that utilized by Radke-Yarrow above) was administered to the boys in an effort to uncover patterns of ingroup and outgroup preference. Once again we learn that the younger children manifest the most positive attitudes toward Jewish content activities and Jewish associations. As the boys get older, they make progressively less Jewish choices. Moreover, the reasons given by older boys for whatever Jewish preferences they make are significantly different in quality from those of the younger boys.

The reasons given by these older groups for their "Jewish" as well as "both" choices on content, association and charity items alike reflect essentially negative and defensive attitudes. They show that the older groups respond less than the younger ones in terms of reactions to content and more in terms of a preoccupation with intergroup relations and a desire to improve them. These reasons suggest that as these youngsters come into increasing contact with the non-Jewish world, the resulting broadening of horizons is accompanied by increasing defensiveness and feelings of insecurity. 159

Boys from lower socio-economic status homes are more likely than their high status peers to indicate preferences for Jewish content activities and Jewish associations. High socio-economic status subjects are most likely to assume that if Jews get together,

it is for a Jewish purpose. Thus, their preferences for an all-Jewish group are conditional upon the existence of a specifically Jewish task. But, of course, the high status boys were most interested in mixed groups without Jewish content activities. In a similar fashion, boys who scored low in terms of Jewish home environment were also most interested in mixed groups and non-Jewish activities. They were not, however, alienated from Jewish culture; they did choose Jewish content activities under circumstances which they considered appropriate.

Chein and Hurwitz reduce their findings to a single summary statement:

With increasing acculturation (a process that probably goes on -- although perhaps in different ways -- with aging, with improved socio-economic status, and, as a rule with a perceptible decrease in Jewish environment), there is an increasing desire for social and cultural integration with the general community. In the case of the age and socio-economic breakdowns, this desire for social integration is clearly associated with increased defensiveness and feelings of insecurity. 160

Jewish boys do not all react in identical patterns to certain aspects of their Jewishness. Indeed, this study by Chein and Hurwitz seems to indicate that their reactions are more closely linked with age, status, and environment than they are with any innate qualities of Jewishness.

National Consciousness. -- For many years now, Leibush Lehrer has been exploring the role which national consciousness plays in the life of a peoples' individual members. He feels that "it is quite conceivable that the degree of consciousness of national belonging and one's emotional relations to one's people would have an effect

on the psychology of a person, even on its purely intellectual manifestations."¹⁶¹ National attachment may have influences on a broad range of individual activities, many of which bear no surface relation to the acknowledged national norms and values.

In an early study (1932), Lehrer attempted to discover whether American Jewish children had a national (i.e., Jewish) consciousness, and if so, at what age and in what ways does it emerge. From a preliminary investigation of three, four and five year-olds, he learned that children below the fifth year have only vague notions about race and nation.

It is noteworthy that the absolute certainty of being Jewish or of Jewish descent, or such a positive attitude to the word "Jewish," manifests itself very rarely in the fourth year, not to speak of younger children. This consciousness and the feelings connected with it do not appear gradually, but emerge suddenly. At any rate, their rise and development require a very brief time, so that at the age of five they are distinct and pronounced. Frequently, they reach at that age such completeness that but little that is fundamental is left for subsequent years to add, save certain cultural attitudes revolving about these experiences, and additional information. 162

Lehrer interviewed 43 children -- 5 to 12 years old -- from several different environments. All but one considered themselves Jewish, and upon investigation it was discovered that the dissenting child had an abnormal family background. Lehrer concludes that "beginning with their fifth year, [Jewish] children are cognizant of the national grouping of people, and fully aware to which group they belong."¹⁶³ But asked how they know that they are Jewish, children of all ages do not respond at once. They seem unable to give a certain answer to this latter question. Searching for a straw,

many of the children finally replied with a very arbitrary "I know!" or "My father told me." The fact is, the youngsters do not know how or where they acquired their Jewishness; it is simply part of them.

...We may safely conclude that information on one's national belonging, just as on the existence of nations in general, is derived indirectly, is a result of minor, incidental, hardly noticeable events, words and suggestions that begin to be synthesized in the fifth year. 164

Being Jewish is already so much a part of the children that only seven could contemplate its possible elimination. Eighty-five per cent were sure that they would always remain Jewish. The conviction was deeply held -- at emotional, pre-logical levels -- that life lies and grows within a definite national framework. No logical reasons are given for wanting to remain Jewish; the reasons are all "psychologic."

National belonging is essentially a will, a striving, a yearning toward something under given circumstances and these characteristics are found in the very beginning, these form the beginning, of conscious national allegiance. They are well developed when formal education begins and are prominent in childhood even without schooling. And no matter how divergent the various circles of the Jewish people in America, no difference is noticeable among their children in the positive and impulsive character of their national belonging. Apparently, the Jewish environment is so constructed that every circle leads to the same psychological state in early childhood. 165

Jewish Faces. -- In a more recent study, Lehrer was concerned to ascertain the extent to which recognition of Jewish appearance was expressed in certain forms of behavior. Among Jews of East European origin, Lehrer asserts that the recognition of Jewish faces was a function of Jewish belongingness. Given the task of identifying

typical Jewish faces in a set of eight photographs, Jewish immigrants were able to respond without hesitation and with great unanimity of opinion. Native Americans, however, responded quite differently. Although the same photographs were used in both cases, native born Jews hesitated at length, often made mistakes, and frequently insisted that the very division between Jewish and non-Jewish faces was only imaginary. Lehrer concludes that this difference is apparently "not only a question of the objects viewed, but a function of the viewers as well."¹⁶⁶

This set of eight photographs was incorporated as one item in a questionnaire which Lehrer administered to 209 men and women ranging from 17 to 25 years-old. The subjects came from various sections of the country and differed in terms of family background, neighborhood of origin, and Jewish schooling. Some time after the questionnaires were administered, informal interviews were conducted with 33 of the respondents.

The respondents were not asked directly to indicate which faces were and which were not Jewish. Instead, without mentioning this issue, they were requested, on the basis of external appearance, to select those with whom "it would have pleased you to associate... more than with others." 167

Without giving any explicit indication that they were aware of the Jewish element in the photographs, native born respondents selected almost twice as many pictures of non-Jews as of Jews. None of the variables in the sample -- family background, neighborhood of origin or Jewish schooling -- seemed significantly related to any answer pattern. It should be pointed out that the Jews pictured were all serious and somber, while the photographs of the gentiles

showed smiling faces. The happy, carefree face may most closely approximate the standard American image of a popular person. But, what is most significant in this study, a substantial number of the young people stated -- and even stressed -- their objection to the principle of selecting friends on the basis of superficial appearances. "They turned a concrete, specific situation into a general, principled position."¹⁶⁸ On the basis of this particular photograph question, a great deal of dissatisfaction with the entire questionnaire was expressed by respondents. Some deep emotional chords were apparently touched by this question.

The later interviews reinforce this conclusion. Throughout the interviews, respondents maintained a level of intellectual nonchalance; they scrutinized their responses objectively, confronted the questions with eager curiosity, and often qualified previous answers or comments on the questionnaire. But when the question of the photographs came up, something happened to their composure.

As soon as the question of the photographs was raised, however, focusing on the issue of social relations between Jews and gentiles, all nonchalance evaporated. The interviewees became argumentative and even aroused. Since their opinions were not being disputed by anyone, it would seem that they felt it necessary to convince themselves, to remove obstacles located within themselves, of the desirability of overcoming the social distance between Jews and gentiles. 169

The question of the photographs clearly touched upon some inner conflict, some clash between inner feelings and conscious beliefs. If we recall Lehrer's earlier study, we know that native born American Jews have a deeply rooted Jewish national consciousness by the time they are five years old. Emotional commitment to

the Jewish group seemingly operates at a low level of conscious awareness. But it finds expression in the widespread actual choice among Jews of all Jewish friends. Lehrer's respondents, for example, have Jewish friends almost exclusively, and many refer to this fact as one of the major manifestations of their own Jewish identification. Nevertheless, they almost universally oppose, on a theoretical level, every social division between Jews and gentiles. The clash between operational emotion and idealistic theory is stated most clearly by one of Lehrer's respondents:

"I have only a few Christian friends. All my closer friends, let alone my intimate friends, are Jews. I can't imagine feeling truly comfortable in a company of Goyim. The older I get the stronger I feel my tendency to mix with Jews. My Jewishness is scanty indeed, but I feel more comfortable among Jews, and I don't care how Jewish they are. But at the same time I am convinced that the barrier between Jews and non-Jews is bad. We are all Americans. We must guard ourselves against European prejudices.

"You see, my practice and my theory don't see eye to eye. As I think about it I notice that my living and my thinking tend in opposite directions. When you asked me about manifestations of my affiliations with Jews I pointed out that most of my friends were Jewish. This was a question about practice, so I answered in kind. But point 8 [the photograph question] refers to theory, so I answered with theory." 170

When asked whether they disapproved of any particular Jewish behavior, most of the young people objected to various forms of separationist activity. Seventy-four per cent of the critical comments were concerned with conduct which leads to Jewish isolation in social relations. And, once again, the interviews became emotionally involved when this subject was discussed.

When the discussion came around to the point about the tendency among Jews to isolate themselves in various ways -- which many labelled "clannishness" -- the reaction became one of indignant opposition. Some spoke calmly, though a sense of struggling with an opponent came through, while others became hotly argumentative, forgetting that they were only being asked to describe and explain. 171

It seems clear that the "opponent" with which the young respondents struggle is an unconscious part of themselves -- their deep feeling of Jewish consciousness. The institutions of American life, to which they also feel committed, have taught them a doctrine of democratic equality. Americanism is conceptualized by young Jews in such a way that they feel compelled to reject all discriminatory practices as un-American (cf. Fishman study, pp. 119 ff.). Their own choice of Jewish friends is seen by the young people as a purely voluntary act which somehow affirms their Jewishness. But when they observe the Jewish community as a whole segregating itself -- a necessary concomitant of free individual acts like those of the respondents -- they fail to see it as voluntary any more. Self-segregation becomes clannishness when viewed with the American doctrine of democratic equality in mind. Thus, on the questionnaire's theoretical item concerning choice of photographed faces, young Jews expressed their intellectual adherence to an American principle; they selected the faces of outgroup persons with whom they would like to become further acquainted. This theoretical preference has to be seen, then, as an intellectual rebellion against an active, operational feature of their living behavior. As Lehrer had predicted earlier, the consciousness of national belonging can have an effect on the psychology of a person, even on his intellectual activity.

Intermarriage. -- Most American Jews practice endogamous marriage. Census Bureau statistics indicate that in only 7 per cent of marriages where one partner is Jewish is the spouse a gentile. Intermarriage is thus a deviant behavior pattern for American Jews. To what extent are Jews who intermarry different in character from Jews who do not violate this basic norm of the Jewish community? Maria and Daniel Levinson provide some answers in their intensive study titled "Jews Who Intermarry: Sociopsychological Bases of Ethnic Identity and Change."

The Levinsons interviewed both spouses in a 16 couple sample. Each spouse -- Jew and gentile -- was interviewed separately for two or three hours, and then subjected to several standard psychological projection tests. The 16 couples were obtained from various sources, and they were not a group of "maladjusted" couples who had come to some center for marital or other assistance. Six of the Jews were second generation Americans, and 10 were third or fourth generation. The sample included 11 Jewish men and 5 Jewish women. The investigation sought to uncover the constructive functions which intermarriage serves for the involved individuals. What forces in the social environment and within the individual personality facilitate the decision to make a cross-ethnic marital choice?

To begin with, the research does not support a common hypothesis concerning intermarriage.

...Jewish-Gentile marriage is not primarily a "mobility" phenomenon. That is, it is not motivated significantly by a search for a better class position, nor does it serve important mobility functions in most cases. 172

The Levinsons suggest that the most appropriate context for the analysis of intermarriage is that of deviance from ingroup culture.

Ingroup culture, it has been suggested, is learned within the primary groups of the sub-community -- within the family, particularly. As the 16 Jews of the sample describe their families of origin, there is no noticeable variation from a model commonly found in the Jewish community. There is a pattern of strong family cohesion combined with openly expressed irritability.

The prevailing image of the family as a unit contains two contrasting elements. On the one hand a majority of both the men and women describe the family ties as having been very strong; parents as well as children had a strong emotional investment in family life. On the other hand, in most of these same families there was serious and recurring open friction between the parents: arguments, nagging, and stormy outbursts. 173

Strong family attachments and interests are generally maintained even after the short-lived family crisis brought about by the decision to intermarry. Judgmental criticism and all-forgiving love seem to go hand in hand.

Most subjects report that their mother was the dominant figure in the childhood home. "In her relation to the children, the mother is described as controlling, possessive and overprotective."¹⁷⁴ Correspondingly, the father is generally seen as the least dominant parent. "The most common image of the father, among both men and women, is that of an easy-going unaggressive person who is not a stern disciplinarian."¹⁷⁵ All the characteristics of an authoritarian father are lacking.

The same family constellation is typically reported by all 16 subjects. But such a family background is not a sufficient

cause for choosing a non-Jewish marriage partner. Most Jews with this kind of family background still marry endogamously. Within the sample of 16, however, there were two groups exhibiting deviant patterns of Jewish personality adjustment. One group, "the reluctant," show a number of characteristic Jewish features. They are emotionally committed to Jewish traditions, values and religion. Being Jewish is significant to them, and they want their children to grow up with a clear sense of Jewish identity. They feel that gentiles are definitely an outgroup who are implicitly untrustworthy, morally inferior and potentially anti-Semitic. In principle, "the reluctant" even disapprove of intermarriage. Their own behavior must be seen, then, as an example of "neurotic exogamy."

The traditional East European culture transmitted in their homes and communal environments contained the image of the shikse: the Gentile girl who is devalued and taboo as a marriage partner, but who is sexually attractive, sensual, and more accessible than the well-protected Jewish girls. Images such as this one are used in coping with unconscious conflicts. The Gentile woman represents, at a conscious level, the female who is the antithesis of mother -- someone who is devalued, morally inferior, and an object of carnal sexual wishes. 176

A second group, "the emancipated," demonstrate a different pattern of Jewish deviation. They do not feel a sense of strong Jewish identification, and the importance of being Jewish is compulsively minimized by them. The Levinsons argue that the formation of ethnic identity is closely related to certain aspects of personality development in adolescence. Among this second group of subjects, the adolescent effort to achieve an ego identity took the form of an "emancipation syndrome."

For them the dichotomous distinction between "Jewish" and "Gentile" made by their parents is transformed into the distinction between "Jewish-traditional," as a restricted social entity, and "general American," a broadly inclusive concept that includes the self and all others "regardless of race, creed or national origin." By adolescence or even earlier, they attributed two primary meanings to the concept of Jewishness: first, it connoted a narrow and restricting social environment; and second, it had the flavor of the mother-dominated, close-knit, and often stressful home, to which they felt bound by ties of infantile dependence, ambivalence and guilt. The "general American" world seemed a more attractive place where one could move with relative freedom from family restrictions as well as from inner guilt and ambivalence. 177

Normally, a Jewish adolescent is able to form some kind of idiosyncratic identity which consolidates feelings of Jewishness with his feelings of Americanism. Americanism is not a pressure area for most youngsters. But, in contrast, "the emancipated" Jew has formed his ego-identity on the basis of an abnormal dichotomy between Jewishness (which represents all that is narrow and unpleasant) and Americanism (which represents freedom and relaxation). The emancipation syndrome results in a Jew who denies his ethnic identity and who feels emancipated from the group's taboo on exogamy. At sub-conscious levels, his intermarriage proves to himself the fullness of his emancipation. But also at sub-conscious levels, there is a character orientation revolving around an exaggeration of the normal Jewish-gentile dichotomy.

The Levinson study is important because it demonstrates two deviant patterns of Jewish personality. All the subjects who intermarried came from normal Jewish homes and would have been expected to marry endogamously. That their behavior was so variant reflects

the peculiarity of their personality formation, one group because of a neurosis and the other because of an adolescent emancipation syndrome. But, of particular interest is the fact that their deviation is coherent only as a variation from the normal Jewish personality. That is, in each case, the subjects seize upon elements of basic Jewish character and twist them to fit the needs of their individual personality.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETIVE SUMMARY

In this thesis we have been attempting to discover what is "Jewish" about American Jews. (We have wanted) to discover the meaning of Jewishness for American Jews. Technically, we have sought evidence for a concept of Jewish national character. That is, we have tried to identify the regularities of psychological process which are typical of one American group -- the Jews. Seeking to identify the Jewish national character, we have examined the reports of many recent social science investigations. Books and articles about aspects of American Jewry by anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists have been surveyed. In the previous chapter their relevant conclusions were presented. Now it is our task to gather together their common themes of agreement and disagreement.

All our studies indicate that a new American Jewish sub-culture has come into being. It is not to be identified with the East European shtetl, a Jewry whose patterns had begun to break down even before the mass Jewish immigration to this country. Being American, the new Jewish culture incorporates within itself basic elements which are quite foreign to the old shtetl culture -- utilitarianism, pragmatism and democracy. This new Jewish culture is not, however, identical with the standard, American middle class culture; it clearly embraces elements which give it distinctive individuality. Even the third and fourth generation American born Jew can be recognized by his participation in American Jewish culture.

The most obvious sign of the new Jewish culture is the willingness of American Jews to identify themselves as Jews. Studies in New Haven and in New Orleans, in suburbia and medium-sized town, all indicate that Jews are freely choosing to assert their Jewish identity.

"Perhaps the most striking conclusion which can be drawn from this series of responses (and the interview material which is not presented here)," observed Antonovsky from his study of New Haven Jews, "is that the assimilationist and self-denying Jew seems to be a phenomenon of the past. There are no more than two or three men who indicated any active desire to break away from Jewish identity."¹ That American Jews voluntarily choose to be recognized as Jews indicates the operation of two major factors -- acculturation and group awareness.

Acculturation. -- The post-World War II Jewish community is fully adjusted to the style of American life. Contemporary Jews are entirely caught up in that same quest for social stability and security which is characteristic of all middle class Americans. When Jews or gentiles move to the suburbs or attempt to strengthen family ties, they are both influenced by many of the very same socio-economic factors and personal considerations. In many ways, Jews are normal, acculturated members of the dominant American social class.

However, the acculturation of American Jews has not meant their assimilation. This phenomenon has been noted most explicitly by C. Bezalel Sherman. "Inner forces of cohesion within the Jewish group," he declares, "have turned acculturation itself into an instrument to develop and to strengthen ethnic individuality."² In the American situation, "Jewish" has come to be defined by Jew and gentile alike as

a religious denomination -- one of three facets of a common American faith. Moreover, religion in America is based on the principle of voluntarism. No religious affiliation is ever officially required; one is, strictly speaking, free to associate with any religion or none at all, as he chooses. But, strict theory notwithstanding, religious emphasis comes close to being one of the standard prerequisites of good Americanism.

The culture of American Jews incorporates this ideological set. Like everyone else in this country, Jews feel that religious identity is both voluntary and good. Since "Jewish" is popularly conceived as a religious denomination, Jews feel sure that one does not have to be Jewish. They will argue that one could choose to negate his religious tradition, and they insist that the affirmation of Jewish religious identity is an act of good Americanism. Understanding this, we can readily comprehend why "America-American-Americanism" represented no pressure area for the children of the Fishman study. They saw their own Jewishness as concomitant with good Americanism. In this sense, *style* then, the modern Jewish pattern of voluntary identification is a result (and a sign) of American acculturation. But it is also an indication of the deep-rooted sense of Jewish group awareness.

Group Awareness. -- Group awareness is that part of an individual's ego-identity which defines his relationship to his cultural group. As the Levinson's describe it, the group awareness "consists of the conscious as well as unconscious meanings, cultural images, feelings, identifications and self-images by which [one] comprehends his ethnic world and himself as a member of it."³ Group awareness is the feeling that one is different from a significant outgroup. Jewish group

awareness is the sensitivity to cultural roles, values and behavior patterns which govern one's life as a member of the Jewish ingroup.

In large part, Jewish group awareness is unconsciously absorbed by the growing child. Both Radke-Yarrow and Lehrer have demonstrated that it is a psychological state which emerges in the child's fifth year as a subtle synthesis of many hints from the environment. It is nourished and maintained through the interaction within the socially insulated sub-groups of the Jewish community -- the extended family, the friendship clique, the coffee klatsch. It is developed and rationalized by the formal institutions of the sub-community -- the centers, Sunday schools and organizations. From the age of five, then, Jewish children know that they are Jews, and they become ever more aware of their group's cultural patterns.

Roles. -- The studies we have surveyed point to the existence in Jewish culture of several Jewish roles. There is common agreement among Jewish children, for example, on the facade which they should assume when confronted by outgroup hostility -- one should try to act as if nothing had happened. Among adult Jews it is known that when circumstances place them in certain positions, they must serve as "ambassadors to the goyim." Jewish women conceptualize their roles of sister and mother as emotionally demanding, aggressive and dominating. The most common image of the Jewish father is that of an easy-going, unaggressive person who is not a stern disciplinarian.

The "intellectual Jew" deprecates the Jewish organizational world and decries Jewish materialism. He accentuates the traditional emphasis on learning, and chooses to go into one of the salaried pro-

fessions -- journalism, architecture, engineering, college teaching. On the other hand, the "sociability Jew" negates Jewish bookishness and ambitiousness. He is very concerned that leisure time be properly enjoyed, and he is eager to participate in the social activities of Jewish organizations -- card playing, bowling and organizational work. The "sociability Jew" either enters into the family business or into one of the independent professions where his status and income are relatively assured.

For the Jew who is particularly involved with Jewishness, there is the role of "professional Jew." The fund-raiser, the educator, the rabbi and the public relations expert are all central figures in the Jewish community today. These professional Jews are conspicuous members of the Jewish group whose position requires that they be imbued with a highly developed awareness of Jewish culture. In addition to their technical direction and co-ordination of organizational activity, they are also charged with the task of providing ideological guidance to members of the Jewish community. Given the increasingly rationalized, bureaucratic nature of much American Jewish life, it was inevitable that the role of specialist professional Jew would emerge as a clear pattern of Jewish identification for certain members of the group.

Values. -- American Jewish culture contains values and beliefs around which group members orient much of their life activity. We have already indicated the presence of voluntarism as a value in modern Jewish culture. Jews insist that they do not have to be Jewish -- that religious identity is strictly voluntary. This belief is fully compatible with their understanding of Americanism. Failure to make use of religious freedom would be tantamount to perfidy against both Americanism and

Judaism. Jews feel that, more than any other group, they must be appreciative of the freedoms, privileges and benefits granted to Americans. They also reject the possibility that prejudice or discrimination are compatible with good Americanism. For this reason, their own tendency to select Jewish friends and live in Jewish neighborhoods is somewhat embarrassing to them. But they nevertheless feel that they are good Americans, and that good gentiles like and respect their fellow Jewish Americans. Anti-Semitism is considered stupid. It is an attitude which education will overcome, and it is certainly no part of the American heritage.

Of course, there is also the presence in Jewish culture of contrary beliefs about gentiles. One culture pattern suggests that all gentiles are latent anti-Semites. Jews often believe that gentile Americans constantly watch the behavior of Jews, seeking opportunities to find fault. For these Jews, the gentile world is viewed as parental, and they believe that all Jews should act in such a way that negative gentile opinions are carefully placated. But whether or not they agree that gentiles are actually latent anti-Semites, Jews do believe that gentiles are basically different from Jews. In fact, this belief is probably the core value of Jewish group awareness.

Many values of the Jewish culture are generally expressed in terms of dichotomized ingroup-outgroup stereotypes. These stereotypes are not necessarily based upon first hand experience. They are cultural myths which the group members rely upon for ego-ideals. Just as the stereotyped image of the gentile is an exaggerated portrayal of values which Jewish culture rejects, so the stereotyped Jew is an

idealized expression of the values which the culture affirms. Thus, as gentiles are imagined to be indulgent and immoderate, so Jews are idealized as sober and non-impulsive. Gentiles are thought to be less educated, and Jews imagine themselves to be intellectuals. If gentiles are believed to be Republicans and conservatives, then Jews see themselves as Democrats and liberals. As gentiles have an impoverished family life, so Jews believe that their own family patterns are warm and close. It is imagined that gentiles are harshly critical of errors made by Jews, while fellow Jews are forgiving and understanding of one another. There are many exaggerated cultural dichotomies like these which provide operational values for American Jewish life.

But not all values of the group are expressed in dichotomized stereotypes. There is even a cultural pattern which denies the validity of these exaggerated images. Many Jews want to minimize the belief in Jewish superiority and emphasize the equality of all people. But these same Jews will still assert the value of Jewish peoplehood. Bezalel Sherman says that the belief in Jewish peoplehood has become a prime article of contemporary Jewish faith. This feeling of kinship is regularly appealed to in all the charity campaigns of the Jewish community. Jews do believe that they are kinfolk, and an interdependence of fate is one of the standard assertions of Jewish culture. The belief in peoplehood is so strong that we even find ideological differences within the community repressed in the name of "community harmony and peace." Group solidarity is a major value of Jewish culture.⁴

In Jewish culture there is also a definite emphasis on the values associated with achievement. Ambition is positively encouraged

by a set of congruent cultural values. Jews believe that the world is orderly and amenable to rational mastery. They express a willingness to leave home to make their way in the world. They have a preference for individualistic rather than collective credit for work done. There is an unwillingness to submit to fate and accept a low station in life. Compared with other American groups, the Jews emerge as most ambitious, most favorably disposed toward work, and most confident that skill and ability are the requisites for success. Jewish women are by far the most inclined to pursue constructive activities in their leisure time. Jewish parents were the most likely to value intellectual autonomy in their children, and they did the most to encourage children to think for themselves. To discipline their children, Jewish parents most often preferred future-oriented sanctions which they thought would best develop the child's "rational self-control." Their own rational self-control they manifest in an unwillingness to indulge present desires through installment buying. It is most rational, Jews believe, to do without things now and to save for the future. The Jewish culture encourages Jews to make ambitious plans for the future but to exercise properly rational self-control in the present. It is a value of Jewish life to be future-oriented and to plan ahead.

Jewish parents reveal an open-mindedness about their intra-family relations. Whiteman noted a "tendency of the Jewish group to express attitudes oriented in a psychologically desirable direction."⁵ The Jewish culture does not discourage parents from expressing normal irritation. Despite the value on family solidarity, there is no inhibition against marital conflict, and quarrels and arguments are assumed to be a standard feature of married life. Jews are least defensive about

their irritability and most open about their inter-personal differences. Jewish parents make little effort to be dogmatic, strict and intrusive with their children; they value flexible and democratic family relations. Individuality is so prized that no member of the family can or will be silenced.

Jewish families are child-oriented. The same culture which urges parents to postpone their own pleasure also demands that children should have the best of everything. "For the sake of the children," families save money, move to suburbia and join the Temple. Whatever religious practices are observed in the home, it is done with the children in mind. If Sabbath candles are lit, Hanukah observed or elements of Kashrut kept, it is "for the sake of the children." Youngsters are sent to Sunday school not to become adult Jews, but to become cultured, well adjusted children.

"For the sake of the children" is such a strongly entrenched value of Jewish culture that it even serves as rationalization for truly adult-oriented activities. Parents justify their Temple membership as being "for the kids," and then fully enjoy the upper-middle class respectability which accrues to them. The Temple building fund is an adult-oriented activity which gives adults a great deal of satisfaction, but it too is rationalized as being "for the kids." Even the move to suburbia is often really motivated by adult fantasies although always defended in terms of the children's welfare. The child-orientation is a pervasive and persuasive value of the American Jewish culture.

A certain amount of authoritarianism is present in the Jewish culture. We see this in the considerable reliance of Jews upon their professional educators, fund-raisers, social workers and rabbis for

leadership in more and more communal activities. Without a professional to galvanize the apathetic membership into activity, organizations can hardly exist. But with a professional Jew making plans and giving orders, the organization comes alive with eager followers. The indifference of most community members to the how and why of what goes on in their organizations and institutions reflects the submissiveness characteristic of an authoritarian orientation. Unless the demands become completely intolerable, the professional's goals and procedures go without basic criticism or challenge. But basically, the culture asserts that professionals know best and that their advice concerning institutional needs should be heeded.

Philanthropy has become one of the central values of Jewish culture. Charity is the community's most widely accepted and practiced good deed. For many Jews it has replaced prayer and study as the most efficacious way to expiate guilt feelings. Philanthropy is such a central value of the culture that appeals to group needs can hardly be denied. Indeed, individuals will tolerate a great deal of pressure on them if it is applied in the name of a good charity cause.

Behavior Patterns. -- Jewish culture does not merely present a set of idealized roles and values. Our studies have demonstrated that there are patterns of overt behavior which are typical of American Jews. These patterns are, of course, related to the cultural roles and values which we have already discussed. The behavior patterns represent the community's way of translating its ideals into the reality of daily life activity. It is in this process of translating cultural ideals into living reality that Jews realize their Jewish group awareness.

Because American Jews see their Jewishness as voluntary, one of their recurring conversational topics is Jewishness. They are constantly evaluating Jewish existence as if the choice of being or not being a Jew were a live option. Parents are agreed that their children should be sent to a Sunday school where professional educators will teach them what it means to be religiously Jewish. No force is used to make children Jewish; rather, they must want to choose for themselves to be Jewish. Among those parents who are themselves not so sure that they really want to be Jews, there is almost complete lack of interest in the Sunday school's curriculum. And in general, there is a submissive reliance upon the professional educators who are alleged to know best how to instill Jewishness in the children.

Actually, it seems doubtful that the children learn any more than a few theoretical essentials from their Sunday school education. Certainly, if the Sunday school's goal is to instill patterns of religious observance, then it is not successful. For, religious observance in the Jewish community is, as we have already pointed out, almost entirely child-oriented. Once the child is Bar Mitzvah or Confirmed, his participation in the ritual and ceremony of Judaism becomes minimal, and his parents are freed of the obligation to attend the rallies and performances associated with each of the Jewish holidays. Although adult Jews will repeatedly define their Jewish identity in terms of religion, and their religion in terms of ritual observance, they are not themselves observant.

Jewishness is only occasionally expressed through religious observance. It is most often manifest through participation in the

primary groups and formal organizations of Jewish life, Jews maintain exceptionally close ties with parents and relatives. There is frequent visiting back and forth, and major decisions are made only after consultation with the family. Since nearly all Jews marry endogamously, the entire extended family is Jewish. It is in this setting that basic problems of politics, economics and religion are often discussed informally. The mutual influence of family members on one another leads to widespread patterns of essential agreement. Moreover, since Jews generally prefer to live near one another, certain areas become disproportionately Jewish in population. In these "Little Jerusalem" districts of the city or suburb, Jews seek out and befriend fellow Jews. As a result, the social cliques of adult Jews seldom include gentiles. Here, in these all-Jewish social groups, family attitudes and child-rearing practices are informally discussed. It is in these small face-to-face situations that the distinctive values of the Jewish group are maintained and enhanced.

Another recurring topic of discussion in these small, all-Jewish primary groups is anti-Semitism. Instances of anti-Semitism are dwelt upon at length and carefully considered for larger and smaller implications. Nearly every Jew is certain that he knows what the gentiles think of Jews, and he will use his theory to interpret all intergroup relations. In many cases, we can even say that Jews are oversensitive to gentile opinion. They magnify the importance of every casual word, seeking its "inner" significance. Actually, most Jews have very little informal contact with gentiles. There is an unofficial, but effective, "five o'clock" limit on intergroup relations. Even Jews who work together with gentiles seldom see one

another socially after work hours. This social separation is not the result of gentile rejection alone, but also of Jewish preference. Americans in general, it seems, want to be with their own kind. But the separation does result in a situation where Jews feel forced to hypothesize gentile attitudes toward Jews from very scanty, chance remarks.

For some, this cultural obsession for talk about gentiles and anti-Semitism becomes an opportunity to express feelings of self-hate. They will seek to justify anti-Semitism. For other Jews these discussions provide an opportunity to assert Jewish superiority. But nearly all of these conversations rely upon the cultural stereotypes which we discussed earlier. A basic dichotomy is always assumed: gentiles are different from Jews. Whether it is argued that gentiles are better or worse than Jews, the dichotomy is still there. It is "we" or "they"; "our way" and "their way." But, what is most interesting, the stereotypes are partially self-fulfilling; as the Jews portray themselves, so they tend to act.

The Jew of the stereotype is always sober, and so is the real life Jew. He may drink often under social conditions, but never very much. An individual Jew will feel less Jewish when he takes a second or third cocktail, and so he stops. The gentile feels no such inhibition. Thus, compared to the Jew, the gentile is more indulgent and immoderate. The Jew of the stereotype is intellectually sharp, and an individual Jew will feel less Jewish if he drops out of school without finishing his course. So Jews stay in school, and they train for the intellectual professions. And, although many contemporary

Jews wish to avoid being "bookish," their educations and their professions reveal a contrary value.

Another Jewish stereotype portrays the Jew as a liberal Democrat. We find, too, that Jews do tend to think like liberal Democrats. Despite their vertical mobility, they still choose Democratic candidates and still indicate their overwhelming approval of welfare state legislation. Studies have demonstrated that this too is one of the ways by which Jews express their group awareness. But whatever the reason, compared with the middle class Protestant gentile, the Jew is a liberal.

The stereotypes of Jewish culture tend to cause Jews to act in such a way that the dichotomies approximate the truth of Jewish life. When an individual Jew acts in accord with the ego-ideals of his group, he achieves a sense of authenticity. He knows that his way of mastering experience is a recognized pattern of the group identity. But the same dichotomies which offer the Jew a definition of authenticity also provide him with a pattern for rebellion. When in a state of despair or extreme anxiety, the Jew can seek to escape his Jewish awareness by acting out the values of the gentile stereotype. For maladjusted Jews, there are recognized cultural patterns of deviation; they can act like the goyim.

Conclusions. -- Although we have been able to discover an American Jewish culture of roles, values and behavior patterns, it is not possible to isolate a single common theme by which the entire culture is united. The culture is not a consistent whole. It is made up of many contradictory and unrelated elements -- for example, the empha-

sis on intellectual autonomy and the tendency to submissiveness in organizational matters. The elements of Jewish culture are not congruent with one another, and there does not appear to be even a strain toward consistency. Instead, the culture seems to be a broad configuration which includes several patterns of preferred values, roles and behavior. There are patterns of achievement and of authoritarianism, of sobriety and philanthropy, of child-centeredness, family solidarity, ingroup sociability, liberalism, dichotomization and even self-hate. All of these and others too, together make up Jewish culture.

Just as the Jewish culture is not a unified whole, so too the national Jewish character is not a simple configuration. There is no basic Jewish character which we can identify. If Jewish culture were monolithic, with a single harmonious theme running throughout, then we might expect to find a single national character among Jews. But the culture is not monolithic; it presents different faces to different Jews. Very few Jews are given the opportunity during their formative years to experience all the patterns of Jewish culture. Thus, every Jew does not internalize the same culture patterns into his personality. According to the idiosyncratic combination of environment, socialization and biological constitution, individual Jews absorb different cultural patterns into their personalities.

Our evidence has led us to conclude that there is not a basic core of Jewishness which can be found among all Jews. While Jewish people do blend elements of the Jewish culture into their personalities, there is no standard culture pattern (or combination of patterns)

which is basic among all American Jews. The initial hypothesis of this study must be rejected: American Jews do not share a common Jewish national character which leads them to regularly behave in distinctive patterns. The fact that there are distinctive patterns of Jewish behavior needs to be accounted for in terms of some other explanation than national character. (Note Appendix B.)

APPENDIX A

TWELVE POSTULATES FOR THE STUDY
OF NATIONAL CHARACTER

These postulates for the study of national character are by Geoffrey Gorer. They have been published with slight variations in several different places. Here we repeat them as they appeared in an essay by Gorer entitled "National Character: Theory and Practice."¹

1. Human behavior is understandable: with sufficient evidence it is possible to explain any observed behavior, however incongruous isolated items may appear.

2. Human behavior is predominantly learned. Although the human infant may be born with some instincts and is born with some basic biological drives whose satisfaction is necessary to its survival, it is the treatment which the infant receives from other members of the society into which it is born, and its experiences of its environment, which through the gratification or frustration of its needs enables it to learn new needs and the new methods of gratification. (In this context I should perhaps state that I assume that, in a large society, genetic peculiarities do not involve any major inherent psychological differences in comparison with other large societies.)

3. In all societies the behavior of the component individuals of similar age, sex, and status shows a relative uniformity in similar situations. This is equally true in unformulated and un verbalized situations.

4. All societies have an ideal adult character (or characters, depending on sex and status) which is of major importance for parents and other adults in authority in selecting which items of children's behavior to reward, and which to punish.

5. Habits are established by differential reward and punishment (indulgence and deprivation) chiefly meted out by other members of the society.

6. The habits established early in the life of the individual influence all subsequent learning, and therefore the experiences of childhood are of predominant importance.

7. The chief learning in early childhood consists of the modifications of the innate drives of hunger, thirst, optimum-temperature seeking, pain avoidance, sex and excretion, and of the (possibly secondary) drives of fear and anger (anxiety and aggression) and of the biological derivatives of maturation, which are demanded by the adult members of the society; consequently a knowledge of the types of modifications imposed, the means by which they are imposed, and the times at which they are imposed, is of major importance in the derivation of adult behavior.

8. Since in the greatest number of societies it is predominantly the parents who reward and punish their children, the attitudes of the child to his father and mother, and, to a lesser degree, to his brothers and sisters, will become the prototypes of his attitudes towards all subsequently met people. In societies where the disciplinary role is normally taken by adults other than the biological parents, the attitudes towards such adults also become of major importance.

9. Except in situations of the greatest physiological stress, adult behavior is motivated by learned (derived, secondary) drives or wishes superimposed upon the primary biological drives.

10. Many of these wishes are un verbalized or unconscious, since the rewards and punishments which established the habits of which these wishes are the motives were undergone in early childhood, before the acquisition of speech, or because the verbalization of these wishes was very severely punished; consequently people very often cannot express their motives in words, and the motives have to be deduced from the observations of what satisfactions are actually obtained from different courses of behavior.

11. When these wishes, acquired through early learning, are shared by a majority of the population, some social institutions will eventually be developed to gratify them; and institutions which originate in other societies and are then subsequently adopted will be modified to congruence with these wishes (to the extent that this is possible without impeding the gratification of the primary drives).

12. In a homogeneous society the cultural patterns of superordination and subordination, of arrogance and deference, will tend to show a certain consistency in all institutions, from the family to the religious and political organizations; and consequently the patterns of behavior demanded in all these institutions will mutually reinforce each other.

APPENDIX B

THE HYPOTHESIS OF MULTIMODAL JEWISH CHARACTER

There is not a standard Jewish national character among American Jews. But there are several modal character orientations within the Jewish community. Certain elements of environment and socialization are fairly constant for large sections of the sub-community, and many Jews are exposed to some of the same patterns of Jewish culture in a similar way. Thus, one regularly appearing modal character in the Jewish community would be the "intellectual Jew." This basic character organization blends elements from many culture patterns, but it emphasizes the patterns of achievement, dichotomization and self-hate. Another frequently occurring modal character would be the "sociability Jew." In this basic character orientation the culture patterns of authoritarianism and ingroup sociability are stressed. A third modal character would be the "bureaucratic Jew" whose character structure favors elements from both the achievement and the authoritarianism culture patterns. The list of modal character structures is probably greater than three, but we have not been able to delineate others with clarity yet. The following chart outlines the multimodal concept of Jewish character which we are suggesting. It is not meant to be complete.

JEWISH CULTURE PATTERNS	JEWISH MODAL CHARACTER STRUCTURES			
	(1) Intel- lectual Jew	(2) Socia- bility Jew	(3) Bureau- cratic Jew	(4) ?
achievement	x		x	
authoritarianism		x	x	
child-centeredness				
dichotomization	x	x		
family solidarity		x		
ingroup sociability		x		
liberalism	x			
open-mindedness	x		x	
organizational		x		
philanthropy				
self-hate	x			
voluntaryism			x	

There are at least three modal character structures within the Jewish community. Each of them blends a syndrom of patterns from the same American Jewish culture. It must be noted that the syndroms are not mutually exclusive; some patterns are featured in more than one modal character. Moreover, no modal character is ever meant to be an exact description of anyone. It is only a hypothetical construct.

Of the three (or four or five) modal characters, who can say which is most authentically Jewish? Jews with a particular ideological position will argue that some patterns are more "rational" or more

"traditional" than others. Professional Jews may try to "sell" one particular set of culture patterns as the most authentically Jewish. But objectively speaking, all of these modal characters are found in the sub-community among people who identify themselves (and whom others identify) as Jewish.

The advantage of a multimodal concept of Jewish character is that it allows us to approach the American Jewish community on its own terms, without an obligation to judge what is authentic and what is not authentic. With a multimodal concept of Jewish character we are able to see that there are many ways in which Jews carry their culture. Community representatives are not expected to reveal a single basic character. The researcher need not stumble, then, when he is confronted by significant personality variations within his representative Jewish population sample. The task is to find the patterns of standard variation. Specific research is now required which will allow a more complete and accurate description of Jewish modal characters. Such research needs to be concerned with the study of individual Jews and not with the analysis of cultural patterns.

Footnotes to Chapter I

1. Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson, "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), Vol. II, p. 983.
2. J. O. Hertzler, American Social Institutions (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), p. 42, quoting Alex de Tocqueville, Democracy in America.
3. David G. Mandelbaum, "On the Study of National Character," American Anthropologist, 55 (April-June 1953), p. 175.
4. Oscar Janowsky, ed. The American Jew (New York: Harper & Bros., 1942), p. 255.
5. Joachim Prinz, The Dilemma of the Modern Jew (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1962), p. 200.
6. H.C.J. Durjker and N. H. Frijda, National Character and National Stereotypes (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1960), p. 165.
7. Morris Ginsberg, Reason and Unreason in Society (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947), p. 150.
8. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Character and Social Structure (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953), p. 325.
9. Janowsky, op. cit., p. 256.
10. Prinz, op. cit., p. 167.
11. C. Bezalel Sherman, The Jew Within American Society (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961), p. 125.
12. Ginsberg, op. cit., p. 133.
13. Ruth Benedict, Patterns of Culture (New York: New American Library, 1946), p. 14.
14. Inkeles and Levinson, loc. cit.
15. Judith R. Kramer and Seymour Leventman, Children of the Gilded Ghetto (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), p. XV.
16. Leibush Lehrer, "Problems of the Jewish Ethnic Character," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Studies, Vol. XII (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1958/1959), p. 42.
17. Viktor Frankl, "Dynamics, Existence and Values," Journal of Existential Psychiatry, (Summer 1961), p. 7.

Footnotes to Chapter II

1. Leibush Lehrer, "The Jewish Elements in the Psychology of the Jewish Child in America," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Studies, Vol. I (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1946), p. 195.
2. Margaret Mead, "National Character and the Science of Anthropology," Culture and Social Character, ed. Seymour M. Lipset and Leo Lowenthal (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 18-19.
3. Ibid., p. 18.
4. Clyde Kluckhohn and William Kelly, "The Concept of Culture," The Science of Man in the World Crisis, ed. Ralph Linton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), p. 97.
5. Geoffrey Gorer, "The Concept of National Character," Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, ed. Clyde Kluckhohn, Henry Murray, and David Schneider (2d ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), p. 247.
6. Margaret Mead, "National Character," Anthropology Today, ed. A. L. Kroeber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 651.
7. Ibid., p. 651.
8. Geoffrey Gorer, "National Character: Theory and Practice," The Study of Culture at a Distance, ed. Margaret Mead and Rhoda Metraux (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 58.
9. Ibid., p. 57.
10. Ruth Benedict, Patterns of Culture (New York: New American Library, 1946), p. 103.
11. Gorer, The Study of Culture at a Distance, p. 63.
12. Benedict, op. cit., p. 45.
13. Morris Ginsberg, Reason and Unreason in Society (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947), p. 137.
14. Quoted in Marian Radke Yarrow, "Personality Development and Minority Membership," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 452.
15. Gorer, The Study of Culture at a Distance, pp. 68-73.

16. Clyde Kluckhohn, "Culture and Behavior," Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), p. 964.
17. Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson, "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), Vol. II, 984.
18. Abram Kardiner et al., The Psychological Frontiers of Society (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), p. 23.
19. Ralph Linton, "Foreword," ibid., pp. vii-viii.
20. Mead, Culture and Social Character, p. 20.
21. Arnold Green, Sociology: An Analysis of Life in Modern Society (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952), p. 111.
22. Ibid., p. 112.
23. J. O. Hertzler, American Social Institutions (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), pp. 484-485.
24. Ibid., p. 41.
25. Mead, Culture and Social Character, p. 22.
26. Ibid., p. 24.
27. David Riesman, The Lonely Crowd (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), pp. XXI-XXII.
28. Note, for example, Seymour M. Lipset and Leo Lowenthal (ed.), Culture and Social Character (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961).
29. Inkeles and Levinson, op. cit., p. 983.
30. Otto Klineberg, Social Psychology (Rev. ed.; New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1954), p. 362.
31. Ibid., p. 369.
32. Ibid., p. 373.
33. Ibid., p. 363, quoting S. S. Sargent.
34. Erik H. Erikson, Childhood and Society (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1950), p. 208.

35. Erik H. Erikson, "Growth and Crises of the 'Healthy Personality,'" Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, ed. Clyde Kluckhohn, Henry Murray, and David Schneider (2d ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), p. 217.
36. Inkeles and Levinson, op. cit., p. 991.
37. Erikson, Childhood and Society, p. 159.
38. Inkeles and Levinson, op. cit., p. 983.
39. Ibid., p. 982.
40. Ibid., p. 1015.
41. Ibid., p. 1003.
42. Ibid., p. 1006.
43. Riesman, "New Preface," op. cit., p. XXII.
44. Ibid., p. XXIV.
45. Inkeles and Levinson, op. cit., p. 980.
46. Ibid., p. 1014.
47. Erikson, Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, p. 187.
48. Inkeles and Levinson, op. cit., pp. 1001-1002.
49. Ibid., p. 981.
50. Ibid., p. 988.
51. Ibid., pp. 989-992.

Footnotes to Chapter III

1. Moshe Meisels, "Idea and Character," The Reconstructionist, Vol. 28, no. 8, (June 1, 1962), p. 11.
2. Max Scheler, Ressentiment (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 51.
3. Erich Fromm, "Character Development in Judaism and Basic Attitudes in Jewish Life," (Manuscript from tape recording of lecture given at Hebrew Union College, Jan. 7, 1953), p. 8.
4. Margaret Mead, "Foreward," Life is with People, Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog (New York: International University Press, Inc., 1952), p. 10.
5. A. Ben-Ezra, Review of Life is with People, by Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog, Jewish Social Studies, Vol. 15 (April 1953), pp. 183-5.
6. Zborowski and Herzog, Life is with People, p. 74.
7. Ibid., p. 102.
8. Ibid., p. 74.
9. Leibush Lehrer, "Problems of the Jewish Ethnic Character," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Studies, Vol. XII (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1958/1959), p. 43.
10. Ibid., p. 68.
11. Ibid., p. 55.
12. Ibid., p. 56.
13. C. Bezalel Sherman, The Jew Within American Society (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961), p. 128.
14. Ibid., p. 128-9.
15. Ibid., p. 129.
16. Ibid., p. 120.
17. Ibid., p. 148.
18. Ibid., p. 184.

19. Ibid., p. 178.
20. Ibid., p. 182.
21. Horace M. Kallen, "The National Being and the Jewish Community," The American Jew, ed. Oscar Janowsky (New York: Harper and Bros., 1942), p. 271.
22. Sherman, op. cit., p. 154.
23. Ibid., p. 210.
24. Albert I. Gordon, Jews in Suburbia (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), p. 1.
25. Ibid., p. 12.
26. Ibid., p. 200.
27. Ibid., p. 199.
28. Ibid., p. 88.
29. Ibid., p. 85.
30. Ibid., p. 65.
31. Ibid., p. 65.
32. Ibid., p. 129.
33. Ibid., p. 129.
34. Ibid., p. 147.
35. Ibid., p. 134.
36. Ibid., p. 153.
37. Ibid., p. 166.
38. Ibid., p. 16.
39. Ibid., p. 170.
40. Ibid., p. 173.
41. Herbert J. Gans, "The Origin and Growth of a Jewish Community in the Suburbs: A Study of the Jews of Park Forest." The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 248.

42. Ibid., p. 211.
43. Ibid., p. 213.
44. Ibid., p. 240.
45. Ibid., p. 217.
46. Ibid., p. 219.
47. Ibid., p. 237.
48. Ibid., p. 241.
49. Ibid., p. 244.
50. Ibid., p. 247.
51. Evelyn N. Rossman, "A Fund-Raiser Comes to Northrup," Commentary, Vol. 33, no. 3 (March, 1962), p. 219.
52. Loc. cit.
53. Ibid., p. 218.
54. Ibid., p. 220.
55. Ibid., p. 221.
56. Ibid., p. 221.
57. Ibid., p. 223.
58. Gans, The Jews, p. 245.
59. Marshall Sklare and Marc Vosk, The Riverton Study (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1957), p. 26.
60. Ibid., p. 9.
61. Ibid., p. 11.
62. Ibid., p. 14.
63. Ibid., p. 22.
64. Ibid., p. 23.
65. Ibid., p. 42.
66. Ibid., p. 29.

67. Ibid., p. 44.
68. Ibid., p. 47.
69. Judith R. Kramer and Seymour Leventman, Children of the Gilded Ghetto (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), p. 25-6.
70. Ibid., p. 197.
71. Ibid., p. 134.
72. Ibid., p. 203.
73. Ibid., p. 202.
74. Ibid., p. 169-70.
75. Ibid., p. 188.
76. Ibid., p. 144.
77. Ibid., p. 186.
78. Ibid., p. 191-2.
79. Ibid., p. 194.
80. Ibid., p. 178.
81. Ibid., p. 177.
82. Ibid., p. 178-9.
83. Ibid., p. 189.
84. Ibid., p. 156-7.
85. Ibid., p. 213-4.
86. John P. Dean, "Jewish Participation in the Life of Middle-Sized American Communities," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 311.
87. Ibid., p. 313.
88. Ibid., p. 317.
89. Ibid., p. 318.
90. Ibid., p. 319.
91. Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948), part III.

92. Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961), p. 295.
93. Ibid., p. 310.
94. Ibid., p. 33.
95. Ibid., p. 34.
96. Ibid., p. 48.
97. Ibid., p. 72-3.
98. Ibid., p. 101-2.
99. Ibid., p. 190.
100. Ibid., p. 303.
101. Leonard Reissman, "The New Orleans Jewish Community," The Jewish Journal of Sociology, Vol. IV, no. 1 (June 1962), p. 110.
102. Ibid., p. 111-2.
103. Ibid., p. 114.
104. Ibid., p. 120.
105. Ibid., p. 120.
106. Ibid., p. 121.
107. Aaron Antonovsky, "Aspects of New Haven Jewry," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Studies, Vol. X (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1955), p. 145.
108. Ibid., p. 148.
109. Ibid., p. 151.
110. Ibid., p. 151.
111. Ibid., p. 152-157.
112. Kurt Lewin, for example, describes the marginal Jew in op. cit., chapters 9 and 10.
113. Antonovsky, op. cit., p. 156.

114. Ibid., p. 157.
115. Ibid., p. 158.
116. Ibid., p. 158.
117. Lawrence H. Fuchs, The Political Behavior of American Jews (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956), pp. 88-9.
118. Ibid., p. 89.
119. Ibid., p. 188.
120. Ibid., p. 91.
121. Ibid., pp. 189-190.
122. Ibid., p. 183.
123. Werner Cohn, "The Politics of American Jews," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 614.
124. Ibid., p. 626.
125. Ibid., p. 626.
126. Edgar Litt, "Jewish Ethno-Religious Involvement and Political Liberalism," Social Forces, Vol. 39:4 (May, 1961), pp. 331-332.
127. Charles R. Synder, "Culture and Jewish Sobriety: The Ingroup-Outgroup Factor," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 592.
128. Ibid., p. 565.
129. Ibid., p. 590.
130. Ibid., p. 578.
131. Fred L. Strodbeck, "Family Interaction, Values, and Achievement," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 162-164.
132. Robert Shostek, "Our Youth in College," National Jewish Monthly, (Nov., 1956), p. 9.
133. Ibid., pp. 32-3.
134. Ibid., (February, 1957), p. 32.
135. Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson, "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), p. 990.

136. T. W. Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950).
137. Joseph Adelson, "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 476.
138. Ibid., pp. 477-8.
139. Ibid., p. 478.
140. Ibid., p. 479.
141. Ibid., p. 487.
142. Inkeles and Levinson, op. cit., p. 989.
143. Paul H. Whiteman, "Attitudes Toward Child Rearing, Personal Characteristics, and Religious Group Membership," based on author's doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1959 (University of Wisconsin: Mimeographed by the author), pp. 13-14.
144. Ibid., p. 25.
145. Ibid., p. 18.
146. Ibid., p. 23.
147. Paul H. Whiteman, "Spouse Resemblances in Personality and Child Rearing Attitudes," based on author's doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1959 (University of Wisconsin: Mimeographed by the author), p. 10.
148. Joshua A. Fishman, "Patterns of American Self-Identification Among Children of a Minority Group," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Vol X (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1955), p. 247.
149. Ibid., p. 252.
150. Ibid., p. 255.
151. Ibid., p. 259.
152. Ibid., p. 262.
153. Marian Radke Yarrow, "Personality Development and Minority Membership," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 471.

154. Ibid., p. 455.
155. Ibid., pp. 455-6.
156. Ibid., pp. 465-6.
157. Ibid., p. 469.
158. Ibid., p. 470.
159. Isidor Chein and Jacob Hurwitz, The Reactions of Jewish Boys to Various Aspects of Being Jewish (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board - mimeographed - 1950), p. 3.
160. Ibid., p. 6.
161. Leibush Lehrer, "The Jewish Elements in the Psychology of the Jewish Child in America," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Vol. I (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1946), p. 198.
162. Ibid., p. 207.
163. Ibid., p. 210.
164. Ibid., p. 211.
165. Ibid., p. 216.
166. Leibush Lehrer, "Jewish Belongingness of Jewish Youth," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Vol. IX (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1954), p. 139.
167. Ibid., p. 162.
168. Ibid., p. 149.
169. Ibid., p. 154.
170. Ibid., p. 154.
171. Ibid., pp. 159-60.
172. Maria and Daniel Levinson, "Jews Who Intermarry: Socio-Psychological Bases of Ethnic Identity and Change," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Vol. XII (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1958/1959), p. 109.
173. Ibid., p. 111.

174. Ibid., p. 112.

175. Ibid., p. 112.

176. Ibid., p. 119.

177. Ibid., p. 124.

Footnotes to Chapter IV

1. Aaron Antonovsky, "Aspects of New Haven Jewry," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Studies, Vol. X (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1955), p. 145.
2. C. Bezalel Sherman, The Jew Within American Society (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961), p. 226.
3. Maria and Daniel Levinson, "Jews Who Inter marry: Socio-Psychological Bases of Ethnic Identity and Change," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Vol. XII (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1958/59), p. 120 -- a point of view derived from Erikson.
4. For a penetrating evaluation of this philanthropic pattern, see Marshall Sklare, "The Future of Jewish Giving," Commentary, Vol. 34, no. 5 (March, 1962), pp. 416-26. His point of view has not been considered in this thesis.
5. Paul Whiteman, "Attitudes Toward Child Rearing, Personal Characteristics, and Religious Group Membership," based on author's doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1959 (University of Wisconsin: Mimeographed by author), p. 23.

Footnote to Appendix A

1. The essay can be found in Margaret Mead and Rhoda Metraux (eds.), The Study of Culture at a Distance (University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 57-82. These twelve postulates are from pp. 77-78.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- T. W. Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- J. Barzun and H. Graff. The Modern Researcher. New York, Harcourt Brace & Co., 1957.
- Ruth Benedict. Patterns of Culture. New York, New American Library (paperback), 1946.
- Leon Bramson. The Political Context of Sociology. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Isidor Chein and Jacob Hurwitz. The Reactions of Jewish Boys to Various Aspects of Being Jewish. (Mimeographed) New York, National Jewish Welfare Board, 1950.
- Elliot Cohen (ed.). Commentary on the American Scene. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.
- H.C.J. Durjker and N. H. Frijda. National Character and National Stereotypes. Amsterdam, North-Holland Publishing Co., 1960.
- Erik H. Erikson. Childhood and Society. New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1950.
- Erich Fromm. Man for Himself. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1947.
- Lawrence H. Fuchs. The Political Behavior of American Jews. Glencoe, The Free Press, 1956.
- Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. Character and Social Structure. New York, Harcourt Brace, 1953.
- Morris Ginsberg. Reason and Unreason in Society. London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1947.
- Eli Ginzberg (ed.). Values and Ideals of American Youth. New York, Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Joseph Gittler (ed.). Understanding Minority Groups. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956.

- Albert I. Gordon. Jews in Suburbia. Boston, Beacon Press, 1959.
- _____. Jews in Transition. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1949.
- Geoffrey Gorer. The American People. New York, W. W. Norton & Co., 1948.
- Geoffrey Gorer and John Rickman. The People of Great Russia. London, The Cresset Press, 1949.
- Arnold Green. Sociology: An Analysis of Life in Modern Society. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952.
- J. O. Hertzler. American Social Institutions. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961.
- Francis L.K. Hsu (ed.). Aspects of Culture and Personality: A Symposium. New York, Abelard Schuman, 1954.
- Oscar Janowsky (ed.). The American Jew. New York, Harper and Bros., 1942.
- Abram Kardiner, et al. The Psychological Frontiers of Society. New York, Columbia University Press, 1945.
- Otto Klineberg. Social Psychology. Rev. ed. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1954.
- Clyde Kluckhohn, Henry Murray, and David Schneider (ed.). Personality in Nature, Society and Culture. 2nd ed. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- Judith R. Kramer and Seymour Leventman. Children of the Gilded Ghetto. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1961.
- A. L. Kroeber (ed.). Anthropology Today. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Gerhard Lenski. The Religious Factor. Garden City (New York), Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961.
- Kurt Lewin. Resolving Social Conflicts. New York, Harper and Bros., 1948.
- Gardner Lindzey (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge (Mass.), Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954.
- Ralph Linton (ed.). The Science of Man in the World Crisis. New York, Columbia University Press, 1945.

- Seymour M. Lipset and Leo Lowenthal (ed.). Culture and Social Character. Glencoe, The Free Press, 1961.
- Margaret Mead and Rhoda Metraux (ed.). The Study of Culture at a Distance. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Margaret Mead and Martha Wolfenstein. Childhood in Contemporary Cultures. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Joachim Prinz. The Dilemma of the Modern Jew. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1962.
- David Riesman. The Lonely Crowd. Abridged edition. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1961.
- Max Scheler. Ressentiment. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Manheim Shapiro. The Bayville Survey. Miami (Florida), The American Jewish Committee, 1961.
- C. Bezalel Sherman. The Jew Within American Society. Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1961.
- Marshall Sklare, Conservative Judaism. Glencoe, The Free Press, 1955.
- Marshall Sklare (ed.). The Jews. Glencoe, The Free Press, 1958.
- Marshall Sklare and Marc Vosk. The Riverton Study. New York, The American Jewish Committee, 1957.
- M. Stein, A. Vidich, & D. White (ed.). Identity and Anxiety. Glencoe, The Free Press, 1960.
- W. Lloyd Warner and Leo Srole. The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1945.
- Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog. Life is with People. New York, International University Press, 1952.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Aaron Antonovsky. "Aspects of New Haven Jewry" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science X). New York, 1955.
- A. Ben-Ezra. "Review of Life is with People" (Jewish Social Studies Vol. XV). New York, April 1953.

- Balfour Brickner. "From Security to Survival" (The Reconstructionist, Vol. 28, no. 12). October 19, 1962.
- Werner J. Cahnman. "Suspended Alienation and Apathetic Identification" (Jewish Social Studies XVII). New York, 1955.
- Isidor Chein. "The Problem of Jewish Identification" (Jewish Social Studies XVII). New York, 1955.
- Abraham G. Duker. "Socio-Psychological Trends in the American Jewish Community Since 1900" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science IX). New York, 1954.
- Joshua A. Fishman. "Patterns of American Self-Identification Among Children of a Minority Group" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science X). New York, 1955.
- Viktor Frankl. "Dynamics, Existence and Values" (Journal of Existential Psychiatry). Summer, 1961.
- Julius Gould. "American Jewry--Some Social Trends" (The Jewish Journal of Sociology Vol. 3, no. 1). June, 1961.
- Simon N. Hermon. "American Jewish Students in Israel" (Jewish Social Studies XXIV:1). New York, January, 1962.
- Leibush Lehrer. "The Dynamic Role of Jewish Symbols in the Psychology of the Jewish Child in America" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science Vol. VI). New York, 1951.
- _____. "Jewish Belongingness of Jewish Youth" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science Vol. IX). New York, 1954.
- _____. "The Jewish Elements in the Psychology of the Jewish Child in America" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science Vol. I). New York, 1946.
- _____. "Problems of the Jewish Ethnic Character" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science Vol. 12). New York, 1958-9.
- _____. "Retention of Jewish Identity" (Jewish Social Studies XVII). New York, 1955.
- Maria and Daniel Levinson. "Jews Who Intermarry: Sociopsychological Bases of Ethnic Identity and Change" (YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science Vol. 12). New York, 1958-9.
- Edgar Litt. "Jewish Ethno-Religious Involvement and Political Liberalism" (Social Forces). May, 1961.
- David G. Mandelbaum. "On the Study of National Character" (American Anthropologist). April-June, 1953.

Milton Matz. "The Meaning of the Christmas Tree to the American Jew" (The Jewish Journal of Sociology Vol. III, no. 1). June, 1961.

Moshe Meisels. "Idea and Character" (The Reconstructionist Vol. 28, no. 8). June 1, 1962.

Leonard Reissman. "The New Orleans Jewish Community" (The Jewish Journal of Sociology Vol. IV, no. 1). June, 1962.

Evelyn N. Rossman (Pseud.). "A Fund-Raiser Comes to Northrup" (Commentary Vol. 33, no. 3). March, 1962.

Richard L. Rubenstein. "Jewish Students in American Universities" (The Reconstructionist Vol. XXVIII). June 29, 1962.

Robert Shostack. "Our Youth in College" (National Jewish Monthly Vol. LXXI, no. 3,4,6). Nov., Dec., 1956; Feb., 1957.

Richard L. Simpson. "Parental Influence, Anticipatory Socialization, And Social Mobility" (American Sociological Review Vol. 27, no. 4). August, 1962.

Marshall Sklare. "Pointing the View" (Commentary Vol. 33, no. 4). April, 1962.

_____. "The Future of Jewish Giving" (Commentary Vol. 34, no. 5). November, 1962.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Erich Fromm. "Character Development in Judaism and Basic Attitudes in Jewish Life." Lecture given at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 7, 1953. (Tape recorded and transcribed.)

Robert L. Katz. "Notes on A Research on Jewish Identification." Doctoral dissertation by Joseph Adelson, University of California, 1951. Notes dictated by HUC-JIR, Dept. of Human Relations, Cincinnati, April 26, 1955.

Paul H. Whiteman. "Attitudes Toward Child Rearing, Personal Characteristics, and Religious Group Membership." Based on author's doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1959. Mimeographed by author at University of Wisconsin.

_____. "Spouse Resemblances in Personality and Child Rearing Attitudes." Based on author's doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1959. Mimeographed by author at University of Wisconsin.