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For the Enrichment of Jewish Thought

The Quintessential Other
Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: A Critical History
by Steven Beller
Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press

The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family and Identity in Imperial Germany
by Marion A. Kaplan
New York: Oxford University Press

A Review Essay
by Rochelle L. Millen

While neither the time periods nor geographical areas covered in these two volumes are the same (Austria, 1867-1938, and Imperial Germany, 1871-1918), the methodologies and substance, not surprisingly, overlap. Steven Beller, in *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: A Critical History*, is concerned with exploring the centrality of Vienna in the formation of modern culture and clarifying the issues regarding Jewish influence both on and in Viennese culture. Freud, Schoenberg, Schnitzler and Wittgenstein are among the many outstanding figures of Viennese culture who were of Jewish descent. While Carl Schorske insists the flowering of Viennese culture at the turn of the century is the response of class rather than of a religious or ethnic minority, the critic George Steiner is part of a long tradition that maintains that Viennese modern culture was primarily a product of the Jewish bourgeoisie. Beller’s examination of Viennese and Jewish culture of this 71-year time period must be put in this context—how should the relationship of the Jewish question and the cultural history of fin de siècle Vienna be understood?

Marion A. Kaplan, in *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family and Identity in Imperial Germany*, integrates German history, women’s history and Jewish history. Jewish history must be interpreted in light of women’s presence; women’s history must take account of ethnicity; and German history must acknowledge the roles of both Jews and women. Although in her preface Kaplan laments “the scarcity and arbitrary nature of the sources” (p. X), I find her narrative replete with fascinating factual material and personal history, interwoven with astute interpretations and written in an engaging style. Memoirs provided Kaplan’s richest sources. Although quick to point out the limitations of such material, Kaplan does discern in the memoirs of Jewish women and families of this period certain communal practices, social pressures and cultural similarities that are representative of the time. After all, from 1871 when German Jews were granted German citizenship, Jews were concerned to appear to be—indeed, to be—worthy of that supreme gift of German emancipation. It had taken 117 years since the publication of Lessing’s play *The Jew* (1754) and 89 years since the Dohm-Michaelis—Mendelssohn exchange (1782) for full rights to be accorded to the Jews of Bavaria in 1871 (Baden, Wuerttemberg and Bavaria joined the North German Confederation in 1871, forming the Second German Reich. Baden and Wuerttemberg had given full rights to Jews in 1861 and 1864, respectively).

The significant transition to full citizenship for German Jews brings to the foreground the roles German Jewish women played in the subtle—and not so subtle—processes of acculturation. Women, as keepers of the home, often created permeable walls through which Judaism and German culture moved, usually both in and out. Due to the kinds of materials available, Kaplan focuses on urban middle class homemakers and families. Thus, there are references to but not extensive analyses of the lives of Zionist or Orthodox female converts, independent single women, widows and rural families. Nonetheless, the slice of German-Jewish life uncovered by Kaplan renders visible the powerful influence of family, especially the mother, and gives voice to her conflicts and interests.

Writing about Vienna’s Jews nearly always conveys an eerie feeling to me, as if I am writing an epitaph or a memorial service. This feeling is enhanced in discovering that Torah scrolls in Viennese synagogues were often embroidered with the Habsburg double eagle insignia, a proud declaration of allegiance and belonging to a culture and a city that would drag its Jews into the streets in 1938, at the time of Anschluss, to scrub the cobblestones with toothbrushes. Yet as both Beller and Kaplan amply demonstrate, both in the Viennea of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and in Imperial Germany, German language and culture became a synonym for all that was liberal and progressive; the hopes of Jews rested on their trust in the virtue of the German people. As Beller states, “For the Jew Schiller was more real than actual Germans” (p. 151); Jews loved German culture. Schiller’s idealism justified the concept of a society based on individual freedom and simultaneously supported Jewish values “in enlightened dress” (p. 151). Thus, the Jews of Vienna—and the Jewish women of Imperial Germany—became standard-bearers for a culture that, tragically and unknown to them, persisted in regarding them as aliens and outsiders.

Beller tells us that the problem with anti-Semitic attacks on the “Jewish press” was that in Vienna all the major liberal papers were edited or owned by Jews. Jews were a substantial majority in the liberal professions, suggesting that the liberal educated class was largely Jewish. This leads to Beller’s focal question: How could such a small minority in the Hapsburg Empire come to play such a central role in Vienna’s liberal educated class and thus in the formation of modern culture? Beller’s meticulous statistics demonstrate that the proportion of Jews in Vienna’s population rose from 6.6 percent in 1869 to 9 percent in 1890, and from then on wavered between 9 to 12 percent.
amplified by the metaphysical tendencies and the Jew as "money-getter;" Jews have Jews-had traditions and patterns of interbirthplace of political Zionism. Mark Twain, spending 20 months in Vienna at the time of parliamentary upheaval of December 1897, interpreting the world that made them especially the anti-Semites' view of what was Jewish the Dreyfus case in France and the Viennese 70). Rather, Jews-especially assimilated the Vienna of 1900 was, in Beller's words, the liberal bourgeoisie leading to specific depened on what they feared. That fear was "made it the end and aim of life" to pursue over-inflated concepts that often charactered German thinking. Thus Jews came to be viewed as rational abstractions, instances of myth, part of a dominating ideational framework. Jews were rarely seen as part of a traditional culture attempting to fit into a hostile, unaccepting environment. The proclivity toward abstraction was to lead, as we know, to the dehumanization of the Jews and the attempt at their complete destruction.

Beller's chapter on "Ethics and the Individual" is fascinating and stands in support of his claim that Austrian Jews—and Viennese Jews, in particular—assimilated into the culture rather than into the society (p. 105). This was due not only to the barriers erected against true social integration but also to the Jewish commitment to Bildung, of which ethical responsibility was an essential aspect.

While the first generation of Jewish German nationalists worked to become part of the Germany of Bildung, the next generation struggled with how true integration of the Jew into society could take place through culture. This was a struggle early doomed to failure.

Beller clearly delineates the characteristics of Austrian Catholicism—its emphasis of the aesthetic, its loyalty to a centralized authority. This stands in contrast to 19th-century German-Austrian Judaism, which began a period of profound change in the post-ghetto period. Even putting aside the development of Reform Judaism, Beller is quite correct in affirming that while Catholics were taught to submit to authority and to question neither text nor canon law, the very premise of rabbinic Judaism was founded on the legitimacy of diverse interpretations. In addition, aesthetics, for reasons both practical and theological, played a far less significant role in Judaism; rather, emphasis was placed on the ethical. This focus on ethics and the responsibility of the individual to act led to concern for social justice; the messages of the Hebrew prophets had an impact even in fin-de-siecle Vienna.

I find somewhat strange Beller's designation and analysis of what he calls "Jewish stoicism," a term taken from Claudio Magris. Magris defines "Jewish stoicism" as "belief in an indestructible individual ethos" unaffected by an external system of values. Magris and Beller see this characteristic as blending well into the individualistic culture of the 19th century. Thus Judaism, according to this view, contributed to important aspects of what became modern culture. That Beller turns to Magris for a concept that is fundamental to the world-view of the Hebrew Bible and is an essential aspect of rabbinic texts is bizarre indeed; that "stoicism" is the term by which these theological notions are designated is stranger still (and a misnomer philosophically). Beller sees the emphasis on ethics in 19th-century Judaism as "the secularized form of Jewish stoicism" (p. 119). The emphasis on an individualistic ethics, whether in the early theorists of Reform Judaism or the neo-Kantian philosopher Hermann Cohen, derives not from a Jewish version of Greek stoicism, whatever that may be, but on a de-emphasis of mitzvah—deed, action, commandment—and an elevating of intention and motivation. Reform Judaism stressed intent over action, thereby adapting the theology of Christian ethics in which creed takes priority over deed. To write, as Beller does, of the "stoics of the shtetl" (p. 121) seems to me a distortion of the significant developments in modern Judaism. Additionally, Beller makes no references to the early theorists of Reform Judaism in discussing the Enlightenment and assimilation; it is an odd omission. However, the notion of the intrinsic value of human life, once a religious concept, was successfully transformed into Enlightenment terms. Thus assimilation came to be the continuation of Jewish identity by non-religiously grounded means.

While the first generation of Jewish German nationalists worked to become part of the Germany of Bildung, the next generation struggled with how true integration of the Jew into society could take place through culture. This was a struggle early doomed to failure. A poignant example is the famous Lenz Program, which had been drafted mostly by Jews. By 1885, however, Schoenerer and others had added anti-Semitic clauses. It was painfully clear that the German of the nationalists was not that of Goethe or Lessing. Where membership was defined based on ancestry and descent, Jews could never belong.

This is precisely where Beller's study ends. For it is clear by the mid-1880s, with the defeat of the Liberals in Vienna, that Jews could never belong; indeed, would undoubtedly remain isolated from the rest of society. There were separate cycling associations and Jews were excluded from the Burschenschaften. Thus, "the Jewish problem" became unavoidable for Jews; one could no longer hide one's head in the sand. Zionism was for many an unacceptable option, as was the emphasis on Jewish ethnicity of the Jewish National party. What was termed "the Jewish question" had to be solved, it seemed, by each individual. Jews persisted in seeing assimilation as the only real answer to the quandary, yet assimilation had failed. Beller quotes Arthur Schnitzler: "It was impossible, especially for a Jew in
the public eye, to ignore the fact that he was a Jew, for the others did not..." (p. 205).

Steven Beller’s conclusion, that “it was the Jewish problematic which empowered Vienna’s cultural innovation” (p. 244), is well supported in this carefully researched and clearly written volume. Beller, who assumes familiarity on the part of the reader with the literary, musical and political figures of fin-de-siecle Vienna, delineates clearly the logic of the Jewish experience in Vienna. If society refused to accept the intrinsic dignity of each person and saw people only in racial terms, one of the solutions available to perennial outsiders was to create a world outside that society. Thus, the world of ethics, culture and aesthetics could continue despite the Austrian ambiance that belied the claims of this world to universal rational truth. In creating this universe of discourse, Jews transformed Judaism into what became essential aspects of modern Western culture with Vienna at its center.

Marion A. Kaplan’s volume, equally excellent in its research methodology, provides insight and an abundance of interesting facts about the intersecting spheres of public and private life and their effect on women. Kaplan’s study is a fascinating account of how Jewish women viewed themselves during a crucial time of transformation into the era of modernity. Imperial Germany—together with Austria—was the crucible out of which Jewish modernity was created. Kaplan here corrects an important balance. Jewish tradition sees itself as based on a tripartite foundation: study of Torah, worship and acts of loving-kindness. Excluded from the first two as public activities inappropriate for their gender, women came to dominate—and wield considerable power—in the third arena. Thus Kaplan broadens our view of Jewish history by giving rightful emphasis to home, family and community. Gender is shown to be an important tool in historical analysis and the voices of women are no longer silenced.

During the ghettoization of Jews in Europe, women were known not only for their role in childrearing but also for their significant contributions to business. Glueckel of Hameln is perhaps the best known of these early “superwomen.” By the last decade of the 19th century, however, social changes led mothers to devote themselves more exclusively to domestic and child-centered tasks with less of an overt economic role in the family. Influenced also by the beginnings of family planning, women came to be viewed as the primary socializers of children, the transmitters of moral and ethical values in the home, the creators of social respectability.

As Jews settled more comfortably into the bourgeoisie, Jewish mothers came to play an especially pivotal role, one which exemplified the duality—and precariousness—of the position of Jews in Germany. They were both the arbiters of German culture and the transmitters of Jewish tradition. Women also had the difficult task of training their children so as to demonstrate the falsity of various anti-Semitic claims; Jews, it was asserted, were bad-mannered, loud, nasty and used too many gestures. Women created homes, therefore, in which German civility as well as Jewish ritual were embedded. Even German patriotism became centered in the home. I was amused to read that Franz Rosenzweig’s mother derived her knowledge of German leaders from the faces embroidered on handkerchiefs given her as a girl (p. 59).

Kaplan asserts that despite the permeability of the home—both German and Jewish culture went in and out—women remained the guardians of Jewish tradition much more than the agents of assimilation. Domestic Judaism was always powerful but became especially so as men diminished their involvement in the more public spheres. Then the mother’s reading of the Tseña Rina, her silver polishing, latke frying, Purim parties and Sabbath candlelighting came to be especially meaningful. Certainly Kaplan is correct in maintaining that even as the gender hierarchy in Jewish society stifled Jewish women’s public religious expression, strict sex-based roles elevated the homemaker to a position of honor. Kaplan discusses in detail the attempts of the Reform Movement to make women more equal; some of their efforts succeeded despite the sexism of German society.

Women were essential to the efforts of Jewish communal organizations where female competence, initiative and intelligence led to widespread efficaciousness. But Jewish organizations sought the membership not the leadership of women, who thus remained far from the centers of power; women were the infantry, not the colonels and generals. Kaplan’s chapter on “Domestic Judaism: Religion and German-Jewish Ethnicity” is both broad and deep in its descriptions. Clearly explained are the contradictions inherent in the position of middle-class Jewish-German women. Expected to be emotional, dependent, spiritual and domestic, such women’s duties demanded competent managerial skills in a time of polarization between “home” and the “outside world.” Socializing children both for Jewish identity and German culture was an inherently difficult task to balance. Indeed, attaining such an equilibrium remained a primary task of post-emancipation Jewry, most especially in the Diaspora. For all Jews, the ideology of the family—its centrality, its educative power—was focal for both identities, Germanness and Jewishness. The family was a rich source of activity and emotional satisfaction for women and simultaneously a restrictive boundary. Venturing less into the public sphere, women generally encountered less anti-Semitism and interacted less with non-Jewish Germans. Yet women maintained family systems that fostered the dual identity of Jewish-Germans.

The rich texture of this volume—its methodological directness, statistical supports, fascinating quotations from memoirs, its structure around basic themes—conveys an obvious depth in the life of German Jews. It comes as a shock, therefore, to discover that for most of the years of Imperial Germany, Jews constituted only one percent of Germany’s population. Kaplan’s book lacks the tediousness of some sociological studies and is a delight to read. For me, it placed the Jewish confrontation with modernity in context with the very roots of modern feminism. The discussions of women’s employment, entrance into universities, the formation of the Women’s Movement and the changes in marriage customs are excellent, demonstrating the intertwining of historic Jewish practices and attitudes with the culture of the day.

Steven Beller and Marion A. Kaplan have each given us thorough and engaging studies. In the nuance of detail they convey—Beller is more conceptual, Kaplan more factual—we come closer to comprehending the utter lack of comprehension of Austrian and German Jewries in the first three decades of our century. The very culture they helped create, to which they were utterly and unabashedly devoted and in which they saw the possibility of the triumph of justice for all, formed an ideology in which they became the quintessential Other, the apotheosis of Evil. These volumes move us—ever so slowly—toward a greater understanding of the unmasterable tragedy of the Holocaust. For the contributions of Beller and Kaplan to this ongoing endeavor I am indeed grateful.

Rochelle L. Milten is a professor of religion at Wittenberg University and a contributing editor.

My willow leaves have fallen
off the branches
The towel I wrapped them wet in
worked five days

Even the myrtle and palm
have started to mold
One thing and another, I threw them away

So much for water and tears
before their seasons
My harvest hut still holds beyond all reasons

I thought this year to stare bare at the moon
Yet here I sit and write and eat and pray.

—Richard Sherwin
In my view this book is a tour de force, whose thesis is relatively straightforward. In spite of the enormous corpus of material that has evolved asserting that the Allies either did nothing to assist Jews facing annihilation between 1935 and 1945 or actively abetted the Nazis in their genocidal activities, Rubinstein argues that evidence on the contrary points to an enormously successful program of rescue—the likes of which was unprecedented. For too long, William D. Rubinstein contends, the Allies have been forced to bear undue responsibility for not saving more Jews when, in fact, they saved as many as could be saved given that they were all prisoners of Hitler unable to escape. Where Jews could get out of Nazi Europe, moreover, they were invariably accorded refugee status and permitted to remain in the country of refuge.

This is, to say the least, a controversial argument. Rubinstein’s argument is, to date, unique in the scholarship of Holocaust refugee and rescue policy. There are no scholars, either of high repute or of lesser note, who would agree with Rubinstein and, in this regard, he might well be the harbinger of an entirely new stream of Holocaust thinking.

During the past 20 years or so, people have looked for ways to level responsibility at this or that individual or agency outside the Nazi sphere who assisted the Nazis. Studies have been undertaken in abundance that show how some denied succour to those still in Nazi hands; others have explored the closure of the gates of refuge, while others still explore the failure to align military goals with the destruction of the Nazi machinery of annihilation. The notion of Allied or neutral complicity in the Holocaust, shocking to contemplate at first, became more and more attractive as the number of studies has grown until, eventually, the notion of direct Allied collusion with the Nazis in the extermination of Europe’s Jews has come to be viewed as something of an orthodoxy within both the scholarly and non-academic communities.

The Myth of Rescue works hard to expose the fallacies that have come to characterize much of the literature on this topic. At times, I think the author has been quite successful; certainly, he has stimulated for me many new thoughts concerning earlier wisdoms that I have hitherto accepted uncritically.

On the other hand, The Myth of Rescue does not turn my thinking around on every issue, particularly with regard to the formation of the refugee policies of countries before the outbreak of war in September 1939. By assessing what the refugee policies of various countries were, and measuring them alongside what the countries in question actually did, we can learn just how far such countries were or were not restrictive or mean-spirited. Moreover, when looking for reasons to explain such a position (if one existed), we can ascertain the degree of anti-Semitism determining policy. I certainly agree with Rubinstein that it is an historical folly to proceed from a fixed position that a country was anti-Semitic and that it therefore adopted an anti-Semitic policy. Such was not always the case and it does the historical record a grave disservice to proceed in such a manner.

My primary concern with this book is that the author has often been too literal in his reading of statements and documents emanating from government sources. Government policy, in both its formulation and its execution, is usually a result of many compromises and a final decision or statement is invariably not the first one chosen. This is why the position of the free world relative to refugee Jews is not straightforward; it was not wholly antagonistic to Jews on every occasion, as some authors assert, nor was it totally welcoming, as Rubinstein argues. And it is facile to say that the truth lies somewhere in the middle; this, in my view, is not a viable position as it is just as definitive as the other two.

I will not say, therefore, that Rubinstein is completely right when he argues that the democracies could not have saved more Jews from the Nazis nor will I completely agree with others who hold that the opposite is true. A wide variety of additional questions have to be asked, just as an equally wide variety of alternative scenarios and decision-making processes also need to be considered. And this must be done on a case-by-case and country-by-country basis—a task that precludes by definition the application of a blanket approach.

Also, I am perturbed by the fact that Rubinstein’s analysis is not based on archival materials coming from government sources. To a great degree, the various positions appear to be derived from critiques of other scholars rather than explorations into the documents from which their studies have been constructed. Certainly, some archival research has been attempted but not clearly enough given the book’s subject matter. This apparent failure to examine the sources on which others have based their work leaves Rubinstein dangerously exposed to the criticism that he has made his assessment of government policy formation without recourse to the documents recording not only the decisions taken by politicians and civil servants but also the discussions that took place on paper as policy evolved. Such details are of great importance in a work of this kind, and it is unfortunate that Rubinstein did not examine in this book the documents on which so much of his thesis rests.

Notwithstanding this criticism, the book is a major contribution to academic scholarship on the rescue (or otherwise) of Jews during the Holocaust. While some may attack Rubinstein for daring to question the accepted position, I admire him for having catapulted the debate in a completely new direction. I cannot always agree with him but my thinking has been forced to address points I have previously taken for granted. This, surely, must stand as one of the hallmarks of a contribution to learning, which I consider this book to be.

Some scholarship argues that the Allied countries were just as responsible for the outcome of the Holocaust as was Nazi Germany. This is clearly nonsense—the Holocaust was entirely the product of the Nazi regime under Adolf Hitler and those aligning themselves with him as his political or military colleagues. Rubinstein reminds us that the Allies actually opposed Hitler to such a degree that they put themselves on the line by declaring war on him. Hitler was the bad guy, not the Allies. They might well have failed to save more Jews but that failure, according to Rubinstein, stemmed from reasons other than simple anti-Semitism. We should, in the first place, consider the Jews’ persecutor, Adolf Hitler, and look at the efforts the Allies made to destroy him before we implicate them in some enormous conspiracy to annihilate the Jews of Europe.

It must be reiterated that each of the Allies’ policies has to be examined according to the prevailing laws and practices of the day. Then, and only then, if they are found wanting, they should be condemned or praised. Rubinstein’s book is a powerful counter-position to all those who have made the automatic assumption that Jews perished because nobody cared. He argues that people did care but they were limited in what they could achieve—by geography, by Hitler’s domination of Europe, by military necessity. With all this I can agree. There were occasions, however, especially before the outbreak of war, when a little more flexibility and a little less duplicity in immigration policy could have gone a long way to facilitate rescue.

Rubinstein’s book is not all wrong, muddle-headed or mischievous; neither is it completely right on all counts. However,
The thrust and parry of academic discussion requires individuals such as Rubinstein, and it is for the thoughts he stimulates in this book that I recommend it. This is a book for thinking people and, even though I have substantial reservations about many of its conclusions, I nonetheless hold that it deserves serious consideration.

Paul R. Bartrop is a member of the faculty of the Jewish Studies Department, Bialik College, Melbourne, Australia, and a contributing editor.

The books I discuss in this review challenge conventional approaches to their subjects. It may not be altogether wrong to argue that critical reassessments of various aspects of Israeli life have become the norm rather than the exception in the field of Israel Studies. The first book offers a critical reappraisal of Israel's foreign policy. Rejecting the celebratory evaluation of the shift from war to de-escalation that began in the 1970s, Yagil Levy's *Trial and Error: Israel's Route from War to De-Escalation* lays out the theoretical framework and the basic argument of the book. Chapter Two, "The State's Construction of an Inequitable Social Structure," argues that in the first decade of statehood two inequitable groups were created, the Ashkenazi or Western Jews who dominated the economy and central state mechanisms and the Oriental Jews who were exploited as cheap labor. Simultaneously, the Israeli Palestinian population was sealed off from the Jewish population economically and by the imposition of military administrative rules, and Palestinian refugees were blocked from access to the Israeli labor market. Chapter Three, "Bellicose Policy Drives Internal State Expansion and Vice-Versa (1951-1956)," argues that the hardening of Israel's policies regarding Palestinian border infiltrations was inspired by internal considerations. The State protected the interests of the settlers who had seized previously held Palestinian houses and lands and who were uncompetitively employed as blue-collar workers. "Real assets were at the heart of the border wars rather than state existence in a threatening environment" (p. 99). For the most part, the main beneficiaries of the border conflicts were the "Western-dominated middle class." Chapter Four, "The Six-Day War (1967): Expanding the War-Prone Circle," argues that the military build-up was one of the major factors leading to the Six-Day War. The entrance of high military officers into civilian governmental and parliamentarian positions, the enhanced partnership of the civilian and military elites, the consolidation of the war-prone Labor Party and the creation of the national unity government in 1969 are cited as major factors in the continued militarization of Israeli society. The economic and social gains of the military and party elites have fueled the State's obstruction of peaceful settlements with its neighboring countries.

Chapter Five, "The Watershed Years (1968-81)," argues that the wars following the Six-Day War marked a new era when the relations of exchange between the State and the Ashkenazi middle class began to decline. The lengthy War of Attrition (1969-70) and the Yom Kippur War (1973) have led to increased taxation of the middle class who began to resent the economic cost of the wars. The early 1970s also witnessed the political protest of the Oriental population who began to demand equal opportunities in the military and in the civilian sectors. The right wing government that emerged in the late 1970s was pushed by two oppositional groups, the supporters of Jewish settlements in the occupied territories, or Gush Emunim, on the one hand, and the left wing Peace Now movement that called for territorial concessions in exchange for peace. Chapter Six, "From Escalation to De-Escalation (1982-96)," argues that Israel's military loss in the Lebanon War in 1982 and the outbreak of the Intifada in 1987 strengthened the political move toward de-escalation. These military and political conflicts were accompanied by the decrease of Ashkenazi visibility in the military and the increasing involvement of Oriental and religious soldiers. The western-dominated middle class began to express disapproval and critique of the military and war-prone orientations. Under the leadership of right wing politicians, the economy began to be shaped as a market-oriented capitalist style economy. This shift in economic policies highlighted the benefits of peaceful cooperation with moderate Arab countries and further curbed the earlier bellicose orientation. According to Levy, the main internal factors leading to de-escalation were the "growing materialism and consumerism in Israeli society" in the late 1970s and the concurrent emergence of an "inequitable social structure" (p. 208).

Chapter Seven, "Conclusions: Trial and Error," admits that internal processes alone cannot explain the shift in Israel's foreign policy toward de-escalation. The author admits that a parallel and complementary study of internal processes in the Arab and Palestinian societies is necessary to complete the picture.

Yagil Levy attempts to highlight the interaction between the internal problem of social inequity and the external problem of the Arab-Israeli conflict. He is sometimes successful and, in general, the theory is intriguing. The book as it stands does not, however, demonstrate conclusively that internal social processes and party structures...
influenced the shift to de-escalation. Levy sometimes argues that the State created social inequity intentionally, and he sometimes argues that internal and external policies were results of “trial and error.” This book then proceeds by fits and starts to make original claims, without always supporting them. Was Israel more belligerent in the 1950s and 1960s than it was in the 1970s and 1980s? Did Israel turn to non-belligerence because internal processes, notably the growing visibility of the Oriental factor, forced the government to change its foreign policy? The evidence marshalled by Yagil suggests that there may be a correlation between social inequity and Israel’s foreign policy, but more needs to be done, as the author freely admits, to conclusively prove this to be the case.

Critical Essays on Israeli Society, Religion and Government is divided into four parts and is a compilation of review essays on recent publications relevant to Israeli politics, society, religion and culture. Part One deals with the Arab-Israeli Conflict and includes two articles. One surveys publications on “Water in the Arab-Israeli Struggle: Conflict or Cooperation?” by Ofira Seliktar and another review essay addresses “Dialogue and National Consensus in the Pre-Madrid Period: Dilemmas of Israeli and Palestinian Peace Activists” by Mohammed Abu-Nimer. The latter essay focuses on the problems peace activists on both sides faced in their efforts to create and maintain a dialogue for peace between their communities. Before 1993 when the Declaration of Principles was signed by Yasser Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin there was a legal ban on dialogue or public contact with the PLO. Violating this ban meant “crossing the red lines” of national consensus. Yet, activists and members of the peace camp on both sides—Palestinians and Israelis—broke their respective communities’ defined consensual boundaries. After 1993, peace activists, notably members of the Israeli Peace Now movement, found themselves holding cabinet positions and expected to negotiate face-to-face with members of the PLO—the same individuals who were prohibited a few years earlier.

Part Two, “Society and Government,” is devoted to relatively neglected areas in Israel’s political life: local politics and the judiciary. Efraim Ben-Zedek’s article, “Neighborhood Renewal through the Establishment and through Protest,” notes the gradual progressions of Israel from a national, center-based society to a territorially based polity. This shift is directly related to the change in Israel’s elections policy that made it possible for mayors to be elected as individuals by local voters. The shift toward local or territorial politics has made it possible for an increasing number of citizen-participation groups to become visible. This trend also included a rise in the number of local public protests, such as strikes and demonstrations. For the first time, and despite the government’s paternalistic efforts, protest and citizen participation became legitimate and wide-spread activities. An increasing number of local governments in Israel began to promote new forms of citizen decision making and neighborhood self-management. Local protest movements were effective in narrowing the socio-economic disparities between working-class Oriental neighborhoods and the rest of Israeli society. Jeff Halper’s review essay, “Modern Jerusalem: Politics, Planning, People,” deals with English publications mostly in the Social Sciences. The article highlights the need for more research in anthropology, and the need to move beyond description, including historical and geographical descriptions, to analysis. Basic ethnographic studies are missing, including work on interactions among the various population groups in contemporary Jerusalem.

Taken together, the three books surveyed here reflect a growing critical awareness among scholars, notably among social scientists. Among the most common themes are the neglect of the Jewish Oriental issue, the neglect of the Palestinian issue, the problematic hegemony of the Ashkenazi male elite and the marginalization of certain religious groups.

Part Three, “Religion,” includes review essays dealing with aspects of Judaism as revealed in the works and lives of single scholars, a single community or small groups within larger communities. Zvi M. Zohar’s essay, “Sephardic Religious Thought in Israel: Aspects of the Theology of Rabbi Haim David HaLevi,” shows that HaLevi was fully engaged in searching for halakhically defensible solutions to very modern problems in politics and governance, including such controversial ones as Jewish settlement on the West Bank and the character of the peace process. Water Zener’s review article, “Remembering the Sages of Aram Soba (Aleppo),” surveys books memorializing sages and communities. These books are used by the readers as inspirational sources and their subjects are seen as role models for Middle Eastern Orthodox Jews in Israel. The Aleppian Rabbis are noted for their militant conservatism though there are more tolerant trends in this Jewry as well. Understanding this ethnic group is vital for our understanding of the politically powerful party SHAS, which is supported by the vote of conservative Sephardic Orthodox Jews. The article by Kevin Avruch, “Localizing Israeli Judaism,” looks at two books about the lives of Orthodox Jewish women in Israel. Despite the illiteracy of marginal Orthodox Middle Eastern women, many experience their Judaism vibrantly and fully. They are ritually innovative and, because of their illiteracy, are permitted to live in their own women’s space and to create their own gynocentric traditions. On the other hand, Orthodox women who are well-educated, especially in Ashkenazi institutions, are often educated for ignorance. They are often taught to focus on the practical, such as laws regarding housekeeping or childraising, and other laws relating directly to their roles as wives and mothers.

Part Four on “Literature and Culture” includes critical essays on various aspects of Israeli cultural life. Pinia Lahav’s “Israeli Military Leadership During the Yom Kippur War: Reflections on the Art of Reflection” looks at three books by Israeli military leaders. She interprets these books as apologetic and self-serving testimonies about the disastrous Yom Kippur War of 1973. Lahav points out the dry and technical approach of all three military writers and their concerted effort to avoid evaluation and to stick to what they see as “facts.” Lahav argues that “Israelis are not encouraged to reflect on their actions nor on the meaning of their existence” (p. 185). She explains the failure of these military writers to express a broader evaluation of the war and its implications as a result of the “nondiscursive paradigm” in which they were raised. Nancy E. Berg reviews three novels by Sephardic novelists that she categorizes as part of a subgenre of immigrant literature or Sifrut Hama’s sabrakh (transit camp literature). This literature often questions the Zionist idealization of the move from Iraq to Israel. By depicting an alternative view of the ingathering of exiles, these authors question the integrity of values that are basic to Israeli society as well as the success of Zionism. Finally, Nurith Gertz’s article, “Historical Memory: Israeli Cinema and Literature in the 1980s and 1990s,” deals with the critical cinematic responses of the late 1980s and 1990s to conventional dogmas regarding Zionism and the State. Most protagonists in these films are worn down by a militaristic and violent society. National slogans from the past, as reflected notably in the War of Independence, are exposed as cliches. In the style of Western Post-Modernism, these films often defy a sequential or linear plot, or coherent storyline. These films appear to search for a different history to construct a new future.

This volume represents the fourth volume in the successful series launched by State University of New York Press. Though
most of the sections in this book offer new information, the fourth section is by far the best written and the most exciting in the book.

Where the former volume considers critically various aspects of Israeli society and politics, The Changing Agenda of Israeli Sociology: Theory, Ideology and Identity is a critical assessment of the way in which scholars usually study and analyze Israeli society. The major approaches this book sets out to survey, according to the introduction, are functionalism, elitism, pluralism, feminism and colonization. In Chapter Two the author highlights that Israeli sociology has become less rigid and began to admit critical schools and methods though it is by no means dominated by critical approaches. Chapter Three points out that the perspective that dominated Israeli academic sociology in its first two decades was the issue of nation building. Yet, there are basic questions about the Yishuv, the embryonic structure of the future state that have never been adequately answered by this approach. The next chapter assesses the limited success of the revised functionalist approach to remedy the narrow vision of the first phase. Both the revised and revisited versions of functionalism fall short of providing either an adequate interpretation of Israel or an adequate agenda for its sociology, according to the author.

Chapter Five surveys the elitist approach that explores the “shadowy side of politics.” This trend that emerged in the 1970s portrays an image of a society under the domination of an oligarchical Labor Party elite supported by the bureaucratic apparatus. Later the focus of this approach shifted to the “status politics” of the emergent right wing. The next chapter, “Beyond the Melting Pot,” deals with the pluralist approach. Spearheaded by Sammy Smooha, this approach focused on the disadvantaged groups of Oriental Jews and Arab Israelis. The pluralist perspective emerged in the mid-to-late 1970s in the context of a growing discontentment of Israel’s Mizrahi (Oriental) population with the persistence of inequality in a society with an egalitarian ethos. According to the author, “Smooha’s agenda represents an enormous advancement over those of the mainstream” (p. 117) mainly because this approach, which seeks a modus vivendi between groups, is a giant leap beyond the present context of Israeli “hyperchauvinism.”

Chapter Six, “Developed to be Underdeveloped,” considers the Marxist approach in Israeli sociology. This approach posits as its focus the concept of class; that is, of economic domination and exploitation. According to this approach, “ethnicity” is reproduced by capitalist modernity, the major weakness of which is its lack of political and cultural analysis. The consideration of politics as secondary to economics is problematic. Nevertheless, the Marxist approach exposes the inadequacy of other approaches in tackling economic and social inequalities in Israeli society. Chapter Seven, “Telling the Untold Tale,” deals with the feminist approach. Ram sees this trend as an offshoot of the New Left and Civil Rights movements of the 1960s. He sees feminism sociology as one of the most vibrant and productive academic branches in the Israeli academy. As late as the mid-1980s the status of women was not perceived as problematic. However, in the 1980s programs in Women’s Studies were established in major Israeli universities. Subsequently, three major anthologies were published collecting major works by leading Israeli feminist sociologists. Ram differentiates between three major trends in this approach: liberal, Marxist and radical. Uri Ram argues that the most valuable contribution of this approach will be to explore Israeli society and its evolution from the vantage point of gender. The challenge, according to him, is to study “the masculine cast of the Israeli national identity as such. It would ask how the suffusion of the Israeli identity with male images reinforces the nationalistic and militaristic tendencies of Israeli political culture” (p. 169).

Chapter Nine, “A Late Instance of European Overseas Expansion,” deals with colonization. This approach takes as its vantage point the Israeli-Arab bi-national set of relations. Israel is viewed from this perspective as a colonial society. For a long time Israeli sociology evaded the geopolitical issue that frames Israeli society. In recent years, the demand was made to study both the Arab and Israeli communities and how they construct each other. The sociologist Baruch Kimmelman focuses on the acquisition of territory and imposition of control over it. The sociologist Gershon Shafir focuses on the market relations in land and labor between Arabs and Jews. The scholarly colonization agenda surfaced in the early 1980s and the dominant tendency is still to disclaim this perspective or ignore it. Most contemporary sociologists upholding the theory of colonization recognize the rights of both the Israeli and Palestinian nations to self-determination. Uri Ram believes that this perspective will become dominant in Israeli sociology in the 1990s.

In Chapter Ten, Ram explains the growing diversity of approaches in Israeli sociology as the result of the establishment of additional academic institutions in the 1960s-1980s. Another explanation is the increasing Americanization of this academic discipline. The Epilogue, “Towards a Post-Zionist Sociology,” argues that “today Israeli sociology is a discipline in search of an agenda, just as Israel is society in search of an identity” (p. 205). What is currently taking place is a confrontation between the legacy of 19th century Eastern-European Zionism and the imperatives of a late 20th-century society located in the heart of the Middle East. Israel’s social identity has shifted from one grounded in Zionist nationalism to new identity claims by groups and movements who were either excluded or appeased to its core identity. According to Ram, the time is ripe to form a post-Zionist agenda that would be congruous with the consolidation of a democratic Israeli civil society; a society of free and equal citizens of diverse backgrounds. Zionist sociology promoted the idea of an identity among unequals and the exclusion of others; post-Zionist sociology should promote the idea of an equality among non-identicals and the inclusion of the others” (p. 207).

This is a brilliant book that offers a thorough, systematic and careful survey of major trends in Israeli sociology. Its theoretical insights are incisive and its ability to synthesize and identify historical provenance is remarkable. Although it is a highly specialized book, it is well written, and its technical apparatus does not obscure the inquisitive mind that produced it. It is essential to sociologists and highly recommended to Israeli Studies and Jewish Studies scholars interested in major developments in the Israeli academy.

Taken together, the three books surveyed here reflect a growing critical awareness among scholars, notably among social scientists. Not only are conventional verities and interpretations of Israeli society and politics examined critically but scholarly and academic approaches to the subject matters is scrutinized as well for ideology bias and prejudicial predications. Among the most common themes are the neglect of the Jewish Oriental issue, the neglect of the Palestinian issue, the problematic hegemony of the Ashkenazi male elite and the marginalization of certain religious groups. Increasingly, the idea of a coherent and unified national identity is exposed as an untenable myth. This critical trend in social and political analyses of Israel is not new but it is becoming increasingly dominant. It promises to foster a much needed debate among various political and interpretive communities that must take place if Israel is to evolve and protect its democratic endorsement of social equality, ethnic and religious pluralism, and cultural diversity.

Esther Fuchs is a professor of Judaic studies at the University of Arizona, Tucson, and a contributing editor.

EARLY SPRING
Black petals on snow from this brick tree
Plum blossoms even in Auschwitz.
—Richard Sherwin
Viktor Frankl is the Jewish neurosurgeon/psychiatrist of Austria who lost his family in the Nazi horror at such places as Auschwitz and Dachau, but himself survived three years in prison camps to establish the “Third Viennese School of Psychotherapy.” Frankl named that school of existential analysis “Logotherapy,” the “therapy of meaning.” If Freud focused on the “will to pleasure” and Adler on the “will to power,” Frankl has understood humanity in terms of its preeminent “will to meaning,” and tested that very thesis in his work with fellow prisoners at Auschwitz. The book describing his Auschwitz experience and the Logotherapy that emerged is Man’s Search for Meaning. Translated into many languages since its publication in Germany in 1946 and in English in 1959, that little volume has sold more than 9 million copies and was designated by the Library of Congress in 1991 as “one of the 10 most influential books in America.”

More than 20 years ago I wrote a paper comparing Frankl’s employment of healing anecdotes to the “koan” used by the Zen masters of Asia. I remember with fondness being introduced to Frankl at the Third World Congress of Logotherapy in Regensburg, Germany, in 1983, and having him put his arms around me, pat me on the back and announce, “So this is the man who thinks I’m a Zen master disguised as a humble therapist!” Since then I have treasured the several notes he has sent me calling my attention to new publications or ideas that bolster that “Asian connection.” I am constantly amazed by the zeal and energy with which Frankl has lectured around the globe, written some 32 books and sought to inspire an entire generation to the creative quest for meaning in an age whose “collective neurosis” is a sense of meaninglessness that has expressed itself in apathy, materialism and violence. Any who have missed Frankl’s Man’s Search for Meaning might well give it a serious reading now.

But what are the contributions of these two volumes just published? For me, they are part of a puzzle of publishing in our day.
NOTEWORTHY BOOKS

Editor's Note: The following is a list of books received from publishers but, as of this printing, have not been reviewed for Menorah Review.

And Peace Never Came. By Elizabeth M. Raab. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
The Iconography of Job Through the Centuries. By Samuel Terrien.
From the Unthinkable to the Unavoidable: American Christian and Jewish Scholars Encounter the Holocaust. Edited by Carol Rittner and John K. Roth. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
The Wisdom of Love. By Alain Finkielkraut. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
mentals” who in their attacks on Judaism and the existence of a Jewish State, on the one hand, and Western values and United States diplomatic influence, on the other hand, seek to frame guidelines for dealing and/or not dealing with one’s enemies.

A second article examining the word usages of “Zionism” vs. “Judaism” by both earlier and later Palestinian historians offers us some useful insights into the different political periods of Arab-Jewish relations and the Israeli-Arab conflict itself. As Joseph Nevo concludes regarding Palestinian writers, “The major difference is between the older ones, who were born and grew up in a ‘Muslim’ atmosphere and the younger ones who were raised in an ‘Arab’ environment. The former were inclined to ‘overuse’ the terms ‘Jews’ and ‘Judaism’ while the latter tended to use ‘Zionists’ and ‘Zionism.’”

Yehoshua Frankel’s “Jewish Sources for the History of Morocco” introduces insights into the role Jewish writers played in reporting on the political trauma of Morocco’s 17th-century history. According to Frankel, Jewish accounts of these civil wars and political intrigues offered the most authoritative reporting of these events available today to scholars. What was particularly fascinating involved the revelation that these historical accounts were hidden in comments that were appended to theological writings and other Jewish community documents. The presence and use of this political material were of only secondary interest to the Jewish writers, whose obvious intent was to address the religious needs and aspirations of the Jewish communities of North Africa.

On a more general scale, this book introduces a highly specialized field with which this reviewer is not particularly familiar. The value and benefit of such a publication and the announced series to follow can certainly enhance the scope of knowledge and access of information associated with Islamic-Jewish relations. The scholars identified with this text represent primarily Israeli and British academic institutions and none appear to be, in fact, Muslim. It might be of value to access scholars from the Islamic world as well to provide their professional expertise and perspectives. Further, joint collaboration on these subject matters would add immeasurably to our general understanding of common documents, shared and separate religious practices, and comparative analysis of historical events and personalities.

This material generally stayed clear of the primary conflicts and major events that have shaped the Muslim-Jewish connection. These concerns will need to be accessed if this planned series is to gain broader attention and recognition. Issues associated with Muhammad’s interaction with Jews and Judaism, an analysis of how Jews and Muslims co-existed at various times under differing political conditions, and an examination of such questions as the uses of anti-Semitism in Islamic fundamentalist theology and politics ought to be explored. Ron Nettler’s own academic credentials as a scholar in this field should help launch this initiative and permit us to benefit from the intellectual richness as well as the political diversity that marks this special interreligious relationship.

Steven Windmueller is director of the School of Jewish Communal Service, Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles, and a contributing editor.