



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series E: General Alphabetical Files. 1960-1992

Box 84, Folder 10, Jewish youth, 1972-1973.

DATE: 27 October 1972
TO: Seymour P. Lachman
FROM: M. Bernard Resnikoff
SUBJ: "Youth in Distress" - Findings of the Katz Commission

Marc Lachman

Marc: very important reading

The Katz Commission, named after Dr. Israel Katz, Director of the National Insurance Institute, has just submitted its findings and recommendations to Prime Minister Mrs. Golda Meir. The Commission, which was named by the Prime Minister to study the conditions of "children and youth in distress" and recommend ways of helping them, was the second such body to be set up following the emergence of the Black Panthers and the demonstrations they staged in the streets of Jerusalem early in 1971.

The Youth-in-Distress Commission was set up just over a year ago. It had a membership almost as large as that of the Knesset (113 by December 1971) and was headed by Dr. Katz, who is probably the most active amongst non-Orientals in the campaign against socio-economic inequalities and the so-called "ethnic gap." As a matter of fact, though his Commission's terms of reference speak of children and youth, its work ultimately concerned the ethnic gap at its very core. The "work subcommittees" into which the Commission was split have indeed studied every possible aspect of this gap.

Patterns of Deprivation

Owing to the complex nature of its task and the subject under study, the Commission first tried to define its own conceptual framework. There were, it decided, six "areas of inequality" - namely income, property, basic social services, educational and social mobility, participation (and representation) in decision-making, and social and self-esteem. Eleven subcommittees were set up, to deal with aspects of the problem grouped under four main subjects: Income, housing, education, and family care.

Since the present condition of the country's youth (up to eighteen of age) is a reflection not only of the present socio-economic picture but also an indication of things to come, the Commission made a thorough study of the conditions in which Israel's teen-age population live and study. Following are some of the data found:

The number of youth up to eighteen of age in the Jewish population (covering 86 per cent of the total population) in January 1969 was 837,440. Eighteen per cent of these are children of families with six children and more; 39 per cent come from families with four children or more. All in all, 11 per cent of the families in Israel have four children or more. The total number of children coming from such families is 485,000 - or 58 per cent of all Israeli Jewish children. About half of these come from families whose heads had eight years or less of schooling; 26 per cent of all the children (about 216,000) live in housing

units with an average of three or more persons per room; 11 per cent live at an average of IL 89 a month (while the consumption of the average child is IL 243); 13 per cent live at an average monthly expenditure of IL 130.

In somewhat more concrete terms, one of the subcommittees adopted a slightly different criterion. It classified areas of deprivation, or disabilities, into four categories - namely a low level of education of the family's head, belonging to a family with many children, substandard housing, and a low standard of consumption. Examining the condition of Israeli youth, according to these criteria, the Commission found that 3.5 per cent of the children (about 30,000) suffer from a combination of all four disabilities; 13 per cent suffer from three of the four disabilities; 36 per cent from two disabilities; and 58 per cent from one or the other of the four.

Ethnography of Deprivation

All these are grave enough findings in themselves. The Commission, however, found them far graver when one of its subcommittees took it upon itself to determine the relation between deprivation and ethnicity -- in other words, when it found that socio-economic deprivation is virtually concentrated in the Afro-Asian sections of the population. Here are some data:

Nearly 79 per cent of the inhabitants of new towns and townlets hail from countries of the Middle East and North Africa. Twenty-nine per cent of the children coming from this population are from families with six children or more. The average consumption per month among children of Afro-Asian origin is IL 192, compared to IL 321 among children from families hailing from Europe or America and IL 303 among children whose parents were born in Israel.

About 91 per cent of all children who live in substandard housing (four or more to a room) are of Afro-Asian origins - as are 80 per cent of children (up to 14) who do not attend any school and 82 per cent of youth (14-17) who neither attend school nor work. Finally, the percentage of 3-4 year olds who attend kindergarten is 47 per cent among Oriental children - compared to 81 per cent amongst Euro-Americans.

The subcommittee also found that, of the 12,000 primary school dropouts - two-thirds of whom are male and one-third female - as many as 90 per cent are children of Afro-Asian families. The following table gives the respective percentages of Afro-Asian and Euro-American children in various phases of schooling:

<u>STAGE OF SCHOOLING</u>	<u>AFRO-ASIAN</u>	<u>EURO-AMERICAN</u>
First Year	100	100
Fifth Year	96	99.5
Eighth Year	90.5	95
Ninth Year	24	55
Tenth Year	19	52
Eleventh Year	14	47
Twelfth Year	11	42
Matriculation	6	35

The Crucial Problem of Housing

The subcommittee reporting on housing submitted some of the Commission's gravest findings. Nearly 100,000 families, with a total of about 250,000 children, live in substandard housing. Despite efforts made to alleviate housing conditions, the Commission found that the actual gap in housing has widened during the past few years.

The facts about housing are as follows. While the minimum housing standard as laid down by the State is less than three inhabitants per room, there are in Israel today about 54,000 families living in substandard housing, i.e. three or more people per room. This figure comprises only 7.5 per cent of all Jewish families in Israel - yet it includes as many as 25 per cent of Israel's Jewish children. Moreover, about 30,000 families live in houses which are considered substandard in other aspects than the ratio of people per room - and another 8,000 families still live in huts and other types of "temporary" housing units. Finally, about 5,000 young couples have no housing of their own.

Though not likely to be included in the final version of the Commission's Report, what the subcommittee on housing found was that the government was largely to blame for the present sorry state in this sphere. The subcommittee found, for instance, that in the fiscal year 1970-1971, 74 per cent of the flats earmarked in the Budget were destined for new immigrants, 19 per cent for veteran settlers desiring to resettle in development areas, and only 7 per cent for those who are neither new immigrants nor new settlers. Such an order of priorities, obviously, could only widen the socio-economic gap.

Another type of official incompetence found by the Commission was the faulty planning as to the size of the flats built in recent years. One example will suffice. In 1970 and in 1971, 1,500 two-room flats were built each year. Yet demand for such flats was several times higher than the number built.

Demand for two-room flats came from three categories of customers. In the first place, there were the new immigrants: Of the 9,000 immigrant

families which came to Israel in 1971, two-thirds were composed of between two and three persons. Secondly, there were the newlyweds: 22,000 couples were wed in the same year, a third of whom at least were eligible for government help in housing. In other words, some 13,000 two-room flats were needed in 1971 - when only 1,500 were built.

However, the 6,000 new immigrant families which needed small flats were given large ones - three and four rooms - since the Government built about ten such flats to each two-room flat during that year! The result has been that, while small families of two or three got three- and four-room luxury flats, large Israeli families continued to live in overcrowded flats built hastily twenty years ago or so. This meant, in addition to widening the existing socio-economic gap, a deepening of the feeling of bitterness amongst the Afro-Asian sections of the population, who as the Commission found were those most affected by the gap.

Recommendations: The Right to a Minimum Income

The Katz Commission's first and most comprehensive recommendation is the one which deals with "a minimum income." According to the Commission, the State not only should but is actually in a position to guarantee such minimal incomes - and press reports have spoken about the principle having already been approved by the Cabinet.

To guarantee that each family gets at least a minimum income, the Commission found that there were three possible ways of achieving this, and it spent considerable time on choosing between them.

The first way was to continue with the existing "welfare" allocations, with its concomittant stigma of "welfare case" and all the disadvantages it is said to have. This method was rejected.

The second was what is known as "negative income taxation" - whereby each wage-earner submits an annual report to the Income Tax Department, and those who turn out to earn less than the minimum income get their income complemented by the department. This method too was rejected, on the ground that it has not proved its efficacy anywhere.

The third way of guaranteeing a minimum income - and the way which the Commission finally recommended - is that of allowances paid to all Israeli families according to their size. These allowances - calculated at the rate of IL 50 for each child - will be added to the family's income for purposes of income tax. Besides having the advantage of doing away with the stigma of "welfare cases," the method recommended will benefit only those families whose incomes are to be complemented, since those with incomes about the minimum will return a sizable part of the allowance in the form of income tax.

Benefits for Arab Families

It is learned, unofficially, that one of the central problems discussed by the Commission was the question as to whether Israeli Arab families -

which include those in East Jerusalem - ought to get the same benefits as those given Jewish families. It is calculated that out of an estimated IL 100,000,000 which the scheme would cost, about IL 40,000,000 would go to Arab families.

In the course of the discussions, ideas were entertained of finding ways of confining the benefits to Jewish families - partly because, it was argued, of the difference in the respective standards of living of the two populations and partly, too, because the Arabs' overall contribution to the national income is not as high as that of the rest of the population. According to Abraham Kushnir, the Economic Correspondent of Davar, however, the idea of discriminatory treatment for the Arabs was dropped. "All the inhabitants of Israel, including Israeli Arabs, are to benefit from the comprehensive assistance." (Davar, October 15, 1972.)





A PROFILE OF THE JEWISH ACADEMIC: SOME RECENT STUDIES

Dr. David Singer
Program Specialist
Jewish Communal Affairs Department
The American Jewish Committee

(For AJC staff use. Not for general distribution)

To the extent that the future of the American Jewish community is being shaped on the college campus that future is highly problematic. Irving Greenberg's assertion, made in 1968, that "by and large, college is a disaster area for Judaism, Jewish loyalty and Jewish identity" has by now become an accepted cliché of Jewish life. Remarkably enough, however, there has been little systematic effort to date to gather hard data about Jews situated in the academic milieu. We have had only scanty information about Jewish students, and even less about Jewish professors. Knowledge of the latter group is particularly critical since, by the nature of things, Jewish faculty serve on campus as the Jewish models. The recent appearance of a number of sophisticated, sociological analyses of Jewish academics is, therefore, an important development, in that it permits us to speak with much greater certainty about the "Jewish problem" on campus.

Jewish identity cannot be treated independently of its social context, which in the case of Jewish professors is, of course, academe. Thanks to an illuminating study by Seymour Lipset and Everett Ladd, Jr.¹ we now have for the first time a clear picture of the position of Jewish faculty in the campus world. Lipset and Ladd's article is an offshoot of a general examination of American academics that they are conducting on behalf of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The inclusion of approximately 6,000 Jews in a national sample of 60,000 academics has enabled the authors to gather (in 1969) a body of data whose analysis reveal findings that are quite remarkable. The history of American Jewry as a whole is a collective success story, but Jewish academics are the Jewish achievers par excellence. "By every criterion of academic accomplishment," Lipset and Ladd make it clear, "Jewish faculty as a group have far surpassed their Gentile colleagues." This is true despite the fact that Jews did not begin to establish a significant foothold on college faculties until after World War II. Thus, in Lipset and Ladd's sample, Jews constitute only 4 per cent of the professorial generation that entered academe in the 1920's, whereas they are 12 per cent of the current group (those under 25) of professors on all campuses, and an astonishing 25 per cent of those (under 50) teaching at Ivy League schools. As to the dimensions of the success of Jewish academics, the following findings may be cited:

*Jews are much more likely than Christian professors to be located in universities rather than two or four year colleges.

*32 per cent of the Jewish academics teach at "highest quality" schools, in contrast to 9 per cent of the non-Jewish professors. Conversely, 40 per cent of the latter are at "lowest quality" schools, as compared with 14 per cent of the Jews.

*Jews are heavily concentrated in law, medicine, and such health linked fields as biochemistry, bacteriology, and clinical psychology. They are overrepresented in the social sciences, but underrepresented in the humanities and history. Whatever their field, however, Jewish faculty publish many more books and articles than their non-Jewish compeers. This variation in research accomplishments is linked to the greater intellectualism of Jewish professors, who are much more concerned about research, and spend far more time on professional reading, than their Christian colleagues. Interestingly enough in this connection, Jews frequent plays, concerts and art films more regularly than non-Jews, but more than half of the former almost never attend an athletic event. Lastly, 36 per cent of the Jewish academics as compared with 17 per cent of the Christian professors firmly believe that they are "intellectuals."

*Jewish faculty translate their high-powered intellectualism into solid academic achievement as measured by rank and financial status. Thus 28 per cent of the Jews are full professors as compared with 27 per cent of the non-Jews (Protestants). Jewish professors also earn considerably higher salaries, with 16 per cent of the Jews, but only 7 per cent of the Christians (Protestants), receiving annual salaries of \$20,000 or more.

Despite the fact that Jewish professors are firmly established in academe, they are not supporters of the status quo in American life or in the university. On the contrary, Lipset and Ladd, in a survey of political and social attitudes, find them to be, as compared with non-Jewish academics, avant-garde advocates of change. American professors as a group are more liberal or leftist than the general population, but Jewish faculty are the paradigmatic liberal-leftists. In support of this point, Lipset and Ladd indicate the following:

*75 per cent of the Jewish academics, as compared with 41 per cent of the Christian (Protestant) faculty, identify themselves as either liberal or left.

*In 1964, only 2 per cent of the Jews, as against 24 per cent of the non-Jews (Protestants), voted for Barry Goldwater. Comparable figures in terms of support for Richard Nixon

in 1968 are 6 per cent and 42 per cent. Significantly, 62 per cent of the Jewish academics preferred Eugene McCarthy to Hubert Humphrey.

*Whether the issue is the Vietnam war, the legalization of marijuana, student activism, or the treatment of Blacks, Jewish professors take a much more liberal position than non-Jews. Thus, 59 per cent of the Jews approve generally of the radical student movement, in comparison to 40 per cent of the Christian (Protestant) academics. Twice the proportion of Jews as non-Jews favor immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. On the matter of marijuana legalization, 59 per cent of the Jewish faculty, but only 29 per cent of the Christian professors, take a positive view of such a step.

*Viewed purely in terms of self-interest, Jews, because of their greater success on campus, should be most committed to the present academic system. Jewish "conservatism" in this area does manifest itself to the degree that the gap between Jewish and non-Jewish professors is smallest on questions involving academic standards. The fact remains, however, that even here Jews are more change oriented. Jewish academics, for example, are more willing than others to waive fixed standards in order to admit minority group members to the student body and faculty (students: Jews 53 per cent--Protestants 38 per cent; faculty: Jews 31 per cent--Protestants 20 per cent). 73 per cent of the Jews, in contrast to 67 per cent of the Christians (Protestants), favor Black Studies programs. Finally, Jewish faculty are more open than their non-Jewish colleagues to giving students a major voice in the university decision making process.

I have outlined Lipset and Ladd's research findings at some length because the importance of their study resides precisely in its wealth of detail. There is, to be sure, nothing startlingly new in the view that Jewish professors are highly successful or extremely liberal. Lipset and Ladd, however, document these points with a mass of evidence, whose sheer volume better enables us to appreciate the remarkable dimensions of Jewish academic achievement and liberal-left politics. It is these dimensions which define the broad differences between Jewish and non-Jewish faculty. Moreover, it is these dimensions which account for the fact that the majority of Jewish professors, to judge from the data currently available, regard themselves as academics first and as Jews a poor second. Here, indeed, is the central link between Lipset and Ladd's study of the status and political views of Jewish academics, and Norman Friedman's² and Allan Mazur's³ analyses of the academics' Jewish identity. Given the prominence of Jewish faculty in academe, and their deep commitment to liberal ideology, it is understandable

that most Jewish professors, as both Friedman and Mazur clearly demonstrate in their studies, "prioritize" their professorial identity over their Jewishness. In order to fully clarify this complex process of "priorization", however, it is necessary to turn to an examination of Friedman's and Mazur's writings.

Norman Friedman's study of Jewish faculty is an outgrowth of his earlier research in the sociology of education. In examining the self-image and career behavior of public junior college teachers, Friedman was struck by the variety of ways in which instructors adapted to their ambiguous professional role. As a result, he began to formulate the concept of "priorization," which he presently defines as that "process whereby an acting unit, in regard to a given situation, gives precedence to one of its role-, identity-, self-, or membership/orientations over another or others." Friedman maintains that priorization is an operative factor whenever individuals are forced to adjust to environmental circumstances, but that it has its greatest importance in double identity situations. This last point was impressed upon him when, having previously examined one group of ambiguous academics in adaptation, he turned his attention to Jewish professors in order to further explore the priorization process. Friedman's specific research focus has been on the ways in which Jewish faculty come to grips with the dual reality of their academic and Jewish identities. In the self-definition of the bulk of Jewish professors, he shows in his study, being an academic is far more important than being a Jew.

In order to deal with Jewish identity in a manner both quantitatively suggestive and qualitatively probing, Friedman has chosen to study Jewish academics in the Greater Boston area, employing as his major investigative tool a lengthy, in depth, semi-structured personal interview. His sample of 42 professors (39 males and 3 females) is drawn from eight representative schools, and is made up of assistant and associate professors of English and physics. These two fields of specialization are singled out because they are "pure" facets of the humanities and the natural sciences, and thus provide as basis for comparative analysis relative to the issue of Jewishness. The individuals in the sample are largely (62 per cent) third generation Americans, are almost all (except for 3) of full Jewish parentage, and are uniformly liberal-left in their political views. There is nothing about them to suggest that they are in any way atypical of the current group of Jewish faculty on campus.

What, then, does Friedman's study, which was carried out in 1968, reveal? Basically, it is that Jewish academics, in relationship

to their Jewish identity, manifest one of three broad orientations, which mark them as either "Insiders," "Fellow Travelers," or "Separatists." Separatists are far and away the largest group, constituting 55 per cent (23 individuals) of Friedman's total sample. Fellow Travelers are a smaller but still numerically significant group, being 33 per cent (14 individuals) of those interviewed. As for Insiders, they are a marginal group among Jewish faculty, accounting for only 12 per cent (5 individuals) of the study sample. What differentiates Insiders, Fellow Travelers, and Separatists from each other, Friedman demonstrates, is the relative importance that they attach to their professorial identity and their Jewishness. The three orientations of Jewish professors, in other words, are reflections of distinct prioritization syndromes.

The distinguishing characteristic of Insiders is a relatively "fixed" or "closed" prioritization of Jewishness over the non-Jewish aspects of their lives. Thus, while Insiders are academics, their primary sense of identity is as Jews, and it is around Jewish life that they orient themselves. This holds true on the emotional, intellectual, and behavioral levels. Insiders are highly affirmative Jews, who adopt a "we" relationship to the Jewish community. They are enthusiastic supporters of Israel, and contribute financially to it and to Jewish communal institutions at home. These communal institutions are important to Insiders both as foci of identity, and as instruments for insuring Jewish preservation and continuity. All 5 Insiders in Friedman's study, for example, hold membership in synagogues, by means of which they identify with one of the branches of Judaism (2 Orthodox, 2 Conservative, 1 Reform). They attend religious services regularly, and maintain a high Jewish visibility in their family-home lives. Friedman's Insiders are convinced of the importance of formal Jewish education, regarding it as the best way of strengthening Jewish identity. A strong Jewish identity is, in turn, vital to them because they, in opposition to the dominant campus view, firmly oppose intermarriage. Insiders, in sum, want a Jewish future, both for themselves and their children. Small wonder, then, that when Friedman directly poses the academic/Jewish prioritization issue to the Boston Insiders, by asking them if they would attend a prestigious scholarly conference in their discipline that is being held on Yom Kippur, they unequivocally choose their Jewishness.

Separatists, like Insiders, manifest a relatively fixed or closed prioritization, but it is the prioritization of their academic identity. They, as either "Indifferent" Separatists (14 individuals) who have little or no pre-adulthood Jewish experience, or "Renegade" Separatists (9 individuals) who consciously minimize their Jewishness,

regard themselves as "professors", and it is to academe that they look for a sense of identity and a life-style. Thus, in a point by point comparison with Insiders, Separatists reveal an almost total non-involvement in Jewishness on the emotional, intellectual, and behavioral levels. Separatists, for example, most often respond to general inquiries about their Jewishness with such comments as "fundamentally indifferent," "tolerant indifference," "dispassionate," or "relatively unaware or unconcerned." When asked what role being Jewish plays in their daily lives, they reply "nothing," "none," "don't think about that much," "very little" or "no significance whatsoever." That Separatists mean what they say, may be surmised from the fact that those in Friedman's study are almost completely divorced from organized Jewish life. The 23 Separatists in the Boston sample, virtually without exception, identify with none of the branches of Judaism, belong to no synagogues or other Jewish organizations, attend no religious services, observe no religious holidays at home, and contribute to no Jewish charities. They are confirmed outsiders, who, as academics, adopt a "they" attitude to the Jewish community. That community, as compared with academe, is seen by the Boston Separatists, and particularly the Renegades, to be "narrow," "medieval," "sectarian," or "divisive." It is hardly surprising, therefore, that they show scant concern about the maintenance of Jewish life. Specifically, 45 per cent of the married Separatists in Friedman's study have non-Jewish spouses. 74 per cent of the Separatists give no thought to providing their children with any formal Jewish education, while the remainder are undecided. All of them, remarkably enough, express unconcern about the problem of intermarriage. In light of the foregoing, it is perhaps superfluous to add as a footnote that all the Boston Separatists are perfectly willing to attend a scholarly conference on Yom Kippur.

Unlike Insiders and Separatists, Fellow Travelers exhibit "flexible" or "open" prioritization in regard to their academic and Jewish identities. Standing between the polar positions defined by the former groups, they "more frequently... h[ould] open-ended future options, selectively and eclectically 'pick[ing] and cho[osing]' among alternative definitions from the 'best of both worlds.'..." As Jews who are also professors, Fellow Travelers, then, seem "to gain much life-style-like gratification from, alternatively and flittingly, (a) in some instances cleaving Jewishness to their hearts; (b) in other instances keeping it well at a distance; and (c) in yet additional definitions, keeping it reasonably though not overly close to their hearts." The Fellow Travelers' Jewishness is, in other words, a Jewishness studded with ambiguities arising from their professorial identity.

Fellow Travelers, for example, feel an abstract sense of kinship to Jews in the larger community, but very often find it difficult, because of differences in interest or life style, to interact with non-academic Jews. Likewise, they have a positive feeling about their Jewish identity, and regard themselves as vaguely defined "cultural" Jews, but being also "intellectuals" find little meaning in the Jewish religion. The result is a checkered pattern of Jewishness, which in Friedman's study manifests itself in a variety of ways. Thus, only 2 of the 14 Fellow Travelers openly identify with one of the branches of Judaism (1 Conservative, 1 Reform), and only 3 are members of synagogues (all Reform). At the same time, however, all 14 either attend religious services or do not work on the High Holidays. Moreover, 11 of the 14 celebrate Passover and/or Chanukah in their homes. Conversely, while all of Friedman's Fellow Travelers are strong emotional supporters of Israel, only 4 contribute regularly to its financial support. Similarly, and even more surprisingly, while 11 of the 14 definitely want their children to have some formal Jewish education (3 are undecided), only 5 express even mild uneasiness about intermarriage. Fellow Travelers, in sum, want a broad freedom of choice both for themselves and their children in deciding on any Jewish commitments. Understandably, then, the Boston Fellow Travelers, in responding to Friedman's question about attending a scholarly conference on Yom Kippur, hedge their answers with all kinds of qualifications.

Friedman, as mentioned above, focuses on English and physics professors in order to gather comparative data relative to the issue of Jewish identity. While his findings certainly do not indicate any clear-cut trends, they are suggestive as to how being in the sciences or the humanities can reinforce a particular orientation to Jewishness. Friedman finds that physics professors tend to perceive "science" and "religion" as separate spheres. In the case of Insiders, such as an Orthodox physicist in the Boston study, this perception helps to strengthen Jewishness because separateness is seen to preclude the possibility of conflict. Fellow Travelers, and, more particularly, Separatists (who are physics professors), on the other hand, see separateness as implying conflict, and thus as "scientists" have a very problematic relationship to the Jewish religion and, in so far as it has a religious connotation, to Jewishness as a totality. In contrast to physicists, Friedman notes, English professors see a good deal of overlap between humanistic scholarship and Jewishness as conceived in cultural terms. This, of course, makes it easier for Insiders, Separatists, and particularly Fellow Travelers (who are English professors) to develop and sustain certain Jewish interests (such as specializing in the writings of American-Jewish authors).

Friedman, it is apparent, adds greatly to our knowledge of Jewish professors by skillfully delineating the differences in the Jewish identity orientations of Insiders, Fellow Travelers, and Separatists, and by making it clear that the majority of Jewish faculty prioritize their sense of themselves as academics. He does not attempt, for the most part, however, to account for these differences in identity orientations, or to get at the root of this particular prioritization syndrome. For insight into these matters, one has to turn to the writings of Allan Mazur, which specifically focus on the causes of Jewish professorial behavior. In a study, conducted in 1968, that is remarkably alike Friedman's in conceptualization, content, and methodology, Mazur has explored the Jewish identity orientations of 63 male social scientists teaching at Harvard, Brandeis, and Boston universities. This group, to the degree that one can judge from the data published to date (38 per cent are married to non-Jews; 73 per cent never attend religious services; 83 per cent belong to no synagogue; 87 per cent are members of no Jewish communal organization), is similar in background and behavior to Friedman's sample of English and physics professors. Mazur's central contribution is to employ his sample of social scientists to examine the roots of the academic/Jewish prioritization process.

In seeking to account for the different orientations of Jewish professors to their Jewish identity, one can look at a variety of possible influencing factors. Mazur does so, and, by a process of elimination, comes to what is certainly a novel conclusion. Not surprisingly, he notes that the various orientations can be accounted for, in part, on the basis of the degree of childhood socialization in the Jewish sub-culture. It is to be remembered in this context the 14 of the Separatists in Friedman's sample have very weak pre-adulthood Jewish experiences. Likewise, a large percentage of those academics in Mazur's study who are most removed from their Jewishness and the Jewish community have minimal Jewish backgrounds. At the same time, however, Mazur finds, and this is corroborated in Friedman's study, that the bulk of the social scientists, no matter what their Jewish identity orientation, have quite similar Jewish backgrounds, which are, in fact, typical of American Jews in general. This holds true whether the measure is parental outlook, religious observance in the home, synagogue attendance, religious education, friendship patterns, etc. Another factor, therefore, is clearly involved in determining the different orientations, and Mazur claims it is the influence of the wife. It is the wife in most instances, he points out, who is the primary social influence on a man after he is married. This certainly appears to be the case with Mazur's professors, in that their various orientations to Jewishness correlate very highly

with those of their wives. It may well be, Mazur concludes, that the "present influence of the wife [is a] more important determinant of [a professor's] adult ethnicity than the childhood socialization of the past."

While Mazur stakes out a novel position in seeking to account for the different Jewish identity orientations of professors, he adopts a more traditional stand in explaining why the majority of Jewish academics so readily prioritize their professorial identity over their Jewishness. Mazur, following the line of analysis developed by Milton Gordon in Assimilation in American Life (1964), argues that academe is an independent sub-culture with a universalist ideology that is hostile to all particularist loyalties. Thus, he maintains, as Jews become more established in the campus world both individually and collectively, they find their Jewishness increasingly problematic. In support of this argument, Mazur cites the fact that the bulk of the social scientists in his study strongly manifest those characteristics that Gordon sees as central to the ideology of academe. Specifically, they (1) dissent from formal religious traditions, (2) disapprove of clannishness or exclusiveness, and are thus open to intermarriage, (3) disassociate from (Jewish) communal attitudes and concerns, and (4) participate only minimally in (Jewish) communal structures. All this, of course, is quite familiar from Friedman's study, as the majority of his English and physics professors fully share these characteristics. And why not, given the fact, which Lipset and Ladd document, that Jewish academics have found a home for themselves on the campus, and are extremely committed to a liberal-left, social-political perspective that is clearly universalist in its thrust? What impresses Mazur, and rightly so, is that a minority of Jewish faculty continue to maintain a Jewish identity of some importance to themselves. Given the ubiquitous universalism of academe, this is no small accomplishment.

It should be clear from the foregoing discussion that the studies of Lipset and Ladd, Friedman, and Mazur, constitute major contributions to an understanding of Jewish academics. Certainly, Lipset and Ladd's analysis provides a definitive picture of the status and social-political outlook of Jewish professors. While Friedman's and Mazur's analyses require further confirmation in follow-up studies, they offer valuable insights into the Jewishness of Jewish faculty. At the same time, it is to be borne in mind that academe is in a state of flux, and that studies undertaken between 1967 and 1969 may already be somewhat dated. In this connection, one thinks in particular of the impact of the "quota" problem on Jewish professors. At any rate, however, it is quite apparent that the Jewish community's concern about the alienation of its academics is well justified.

NOTES

1. Seymour Lipset and Everett Ladd, Jr. "Jewish Academics in the United States: Their Achievements, Culture and Politics" American Jewish Year Book, 1971, edited by Morris Fine and Milton Himmelfarb (New York, 1971) pp. 89-128.
2. Norman Friedman "Jewish or Professorial Identity? The Priorization Process in Academic Situations" Sociological Analysis (Fall, 1971) pp. 149-57; Norman Friedman "Orientations of Jewish Professors to the Jewish Community" (paper presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Aug. 28-31, 1972).
3. Allan Mazur "The Socialization of Jews into the Academic Sub-culture" The Professors, edited by Charles Anderson and James Murray (Cambridge, 1971) pp. 265-87; Allan Mazur "The Accuracy of Classic Types of Ethnic Personalities" Jewish Social Studies (April-July 1971) pp. 187-211; Allan Mazur "Jewish Social Scientists: Apathy: The Six Day War" Jewish Social Studies (forthcoming).

