
Book Reviews

Ravitch, Diane, and Goodenow, Ronald K., Edited by. *Educating an Urban People: The New York City Experience*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1981. viii, 287 pp. \$19.95.

American Jewish history is not geographically confined to New York City, but for a significant proportion of America's Jews, New York City has been the starting point of their (or their immediate forebears') encounter with the New World. As the major port of entry for successive waves of Jewish and other immigrants in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the home, at least temporarily, for more than two-thirds of all Jewish immigrants, the city became the "school" within whose walls immigrant Jews began their lessons in America. In its public schools and in its streets and factories, the immigrant parent and child began the slow and tortuous process of adaptation to a new social, cultural, linguistic, and economic environment. The many who moved on to other sections of the United States carried with them vestiges of the city's culture, including the initial (and lasting) impression of America as it was received through the prism of New York City.

To better understand the Jewish encounter with and adaptation to America, we need to better comprehend the nature and substance of the Jewish immigrant experience in New York City, especially the processes whereby immigrants learned the ways of their new homeland, its language and its culture. *Educating an Urban People*, edited by the respected educational historians Diane Ravitch and Ronald Goodenow, is an appropriate place to commence such an investigation. The fifteen essays in the collection range in time from the early nineteenth century up to the present but with their center of gravity in the first third of the twentieth century. They include discussions of the educational experiences of blacks, Jews, Italians, Catholics, and women, and of teacher organizations. Allusions are made to other cities, but the book is firmly rooted in New York City.

These essays were originally presented in December of 1978 at a conference at Teachers College, Columbia University, which had as a major goal the bringing together of people to share ideas and reinforce interests concerning the city's educational history. The publication of these essays serves to extend the sharing to an interested reading public beyond the confines of New York City. Confronting a series of individually authored essays, however, is like gazing at the reflections in a multifaceted mirrored globe. Isolated portions of the entire scene are illuminated and highlighted, but the interstices are highly visible, creating sharp disjunctions between images. Of necessity, integrative force is sacrificed to the high relief of particular points. One cannot help but be aware of the missing connections. Questions posed in one piece serve to interrogate a second. Hypotheses advanced in another hint at new ways of ordering and interpreting information presented in a neighboring paper. Taken as a whole, however, the essays present exciting fragments of the whole, provocative opening wedges, and suggest an ambitious research agenda. They provide a forum for the sharing of questions and tentative answers, and enable subsequent research to be undertaken with an awareness of the questions herein raised.

To better comprehend the Jewish educational experience in America, the present volume places the educational experience of New York's Jews within a relevant comparative perspective. It suggests the nature of the "setting," the pressures, values, and goals at particular times in New York's history, the "ideas" then in the air, the ways in which power was distributed within and outside of education, and the various purposes assigned to public education.

David Ment explores the education of blacks in nineteenth-century Brooklyn. His perceptive article underlines the importance of examining and carefully documenting the particular experience of specific groups. This often leads to a questioning of commonly held assumptions, as it does in Ment's essay, where he attacks the notion of black passivity, and establishes that there was early direct involvement of the black community in shaping the education of its children.

Vincent Franklin, investigating the "Continuity and Discontinuity in Black and Immigrant Minority Education," questions the comparability of these two sets of experiences and concludes that differences outweighed similarities. However, once we document the unique as-

pects of each group's encounter, we need to persist in the search for potential underlying commonalities. If we suspend our search (temporally or geographically) for generalizations, our understanding of human events will be doomed to fact-gathering.

Franklin calls attention to the importance of identifying the social purposes to which education has been put by different groups. He suggests that Hungarians, Czechs, Slavs, and others were primarily concerned with using education to transmit and preserve their ethnic heritage rather than to promote economic advancement and upward mobility. Jews, he argues, used the schools to facilitate social and economic mobility, and blacks sought to do the same, but were inhibited by structural and individual prejudices in American society.

Thomas Kessner also treats the issue of upward mobility and the role, if any, played by schools. Kessner, in his innovative study of the comparative economic mobility of Jewish and Italian immigrants in the pre-World War I period, *The Golden Door*, demonstrated how disciplined quantitative analysis could be used to frame and test historical hypotheses. The present essay carries his analysis of the socio-economic mobility of immigrants into the depression era. He affirms the incremental nature of mobility. The gradual improvement of immigrants' economic conditions served as a launching pad for further improvements by their offspring. By the thirties the American-born children of Italian and Jewish immigrants, especially the latter, had moved in increasing numbers into white-collar occupations, and for the Jews this included many in teaching and educational administration. Kessner argues that the higher economic status of American-born offspring (compared to foreign-born children of immigrants and to adult immigrants) attests to the strong combined effect of native English-language fluency, schooling, and socialization (Americanization).

Selma Berrol examines whether and how Jews used schools as ladders of upward mobility. While noting the propensity for Jewish immigrants to embrace the public schools, and the high value Jewish culture placed on learning, she concludes that the relative economic success of the first immigrant generation was not directly related to education and schooling. This success, however, enabled their offspring to realize considerable social and economic benefits from schooling. "Members of the second generation, because they were able to extend the

number of years they spent in school, were more likely to achieve further mobility by educational means" (p. 113).

Paradoxically, the essay which has the greatest potential for advancing our understanding of the Jewish educational experience in New York, and which is most helpful in identifying research needs, is James Sanders's paper on "Roman Catholics and the School Question in New York City." He persuasively argues that for a true understanding of the origins and evolution of both the public and parochial school systems in New York City and elsewhere (notable examples are drawn from his work on Chicago and Boston), they must be studied comparatively-contrastingly. The questions he raises with regard to Catholic schooling are also most appropriate for the study of Jewish schooling. Why did certain individuals (and groups) select private/religious education and others public? Did ethnic and religious groups seek to affect the content of public schooling? To what degree were the public schools in a given locality willing to accommodate themselves to ethnic/religious groups, and to what degree did they seek to de-ethnicize their children? To what extent do ethnicity and class reinforce rather than differentiate one another, and did their interactive effect vary among ethnic groups or for a given group in different urban contexts? Students of immigrant accommodation to American society need to be familiar with Sanders's highly fruitful lines of questioning.

The interactive effects of the encounter of immigrants and the city's schools, especially those related to the Jewish experience, can be traced in several papers in this volume. Lana Muraskin, in a fascinating study of the Teachers Union (1913-1935), found that "some Jewish teachers chose . . . to create or maintain Jewish or Jewish-dominated associations [to provide access to jobs via patronage and political activity], but a substantial group, raised on socialist principles and trade unionism, and schooled in reform ideology, formed a general teachers' organization, progressive in outlook and consciously opposed to the traditional way of gaining jobs and promotions" (p. 220). As Muraskin perceptively discerned, "the Union promoted its own interests not by insisting on Jewish access to school jobs but by arguing fiercely for the removal of any ethnic or religious influence in the schools" (p. 222). To understand contemporary conflicts over the issue of ethnic/racial-group access to teaching and administrative positions, one must be conscious of the Teachers Union's historic cham-

pioning of the “merit plan,” featuring ethnically, racially, and politically “blind” hiring and promotion practices.

The two essays dealing with women and education in the city underline the need to look specifically at how, what, and where women “learned,” compared to their brothers. Ellen Condliffe Langemann argues that women served as informal mentors to each other, and that these “learning exchanges” should be systematically examined. Her paper raises implications for the study of Jewish women immigrants. What role did these “exchanges” play in the redefinition of Jewish womanhood within the American context?

The closing essays suggest a research agenda for New York City and other cities. Martin Lazerson and Carl Kaestle argue in their essays that ethnicity *and* class must be studied in order to better comprehend the differences in behavior both within and between groups. Lazerson also urges looking into the interaction of public agencies and voluntary associations, a fertile field of inquiry for Jewish urban studies. In particular, we need to know how values and needs shaped by voluntary-philanthropic groups became translated into government programs. For example, turn-of-the-century Jewish philanthropists attempting to deal compassionately and efficiently with the enormous wave of immigration soon saw that the size and scope of the task were beyond private means. Many Jewish leaders turned to the political arena and to lobbying for government to assume responsibility in many areas, especially health and education. Leaders such as Jacob Schiff and Felix Warburg, and agencies such as the Educational Alliance, increasingly turned to the New York City Board of Education to assume a central role in the English-language instruction, health, guidance, and vocational training of immigrant children. These pressures, many of which eventuated in major school programs, helped to transform the function and shape of public education, and of government services in general.

The fifteen essays here assembled reflect simultaneously how much and how little we know about education in New York. As Kaestle states, “we don’t yet know very much about the relationship of ethnic, religious, and racial group culture to the process of public schooling [in New York City]” (p. 254). This set of essays goes far toward leading us into this critical but not well charted area, and does well in raising good questions. The editors have provided us with an extensive

bibliography which can help us continue our search for good answers.

—Stephan F. Brumberg

Stephan F. Brumberg is Associate Professor of Education at Brooklyn College, City University of New York. He is currently at work on a book concerned with the encounter of Jewish immigrants and the schools in turn-of-the-century New York, to be published by Praeger Publishers in 1984.

Friess, Horace L. *Felix Adler and Ethical Culture: Memories and Studies*. Edited by Fannia Weingartner. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981. xi, 272 pp. \$22.50.

Felix Adler (1851–1933), son of Rabbi Samuel Adler of New York's Temple Emanu-El, was one of the more dynamic, innovative, and productive social progressives at the turn of the twentieth century. His noteworthy practical accomplishments in the arena of social, educational, civic, and religious reform, his intellectual acuity, and his high-minded ethical idealism—often labeled “prophetic”—were acknowledged by many of his contemporaries; certainly, the prestigious positions which he came to occupy reflected the abiding respect he gained from his peers. Hence, one cannot but be struck by the relative neglect which Adler has received from published historical scholarship over the years. Perhaps this new book, together with my own, *From Reform Judaism to Ethical Culture: The Religious Evolution of Felix Adler* (HUC Press, 1979), will begin to reverse the trend.

Whereas my work focused on Adler within the Jewish social context and traced his religious departure and its ultimate impact on the American Jewish community, the scope of this posthumous study by Horace Friess, Adler's son-in-law, is more sweeping. It combines biography with a critical evaluation of Adler's developing philosophical positions; it depicts his activities and outlines his thought against the broad canvas of events and trends in New York, the United States, and in the world. Occasionally, Friess recalls his own interactions with Adler and interjects subjective impressions of his father-in-law which lend a welcome personal tone to the book.

As biography, the book provides much useful information. Although the subjects of its early chapters—Adler's adolescent years, educational training, and personal and religious maturation—are more analytically probed in my own monograph, the Friess account continues the historical narrative and conveys clearly the broad range of Adler's multifarious social involvements. It portrays Adler's zealous work on behalf of Ethical Culture, his forceful support of industrial laborers, his anti-Tammany campaigning for reform in municipal

government, and his many successful efforts to promote better health and educational opportunities for the industrial poor. It also highlights Adler's active intellectual life, revealing his interactions with some of his illustrious contemporaries: John Dewey, F. H. Giddings, William James, Josiah Royce, Arthur Lovejoy, Charles A. Strong, and Woodrow Wilson. Friess reminds us that Adler in his day acquired distinction as a philosopher and thinker. Editor of the *International Journal of Ethics* in the 1890's, he was appointed Professor of Political and Social Ethics at Columbia University in 1902; participated in the Philosophy Club, open only to the philosophical elite, between 1904 and 1929; was appointed Theodore Roosevelt Exchange Professor in Berlin in 1908; and gave the Hibbert Lectures at Manchester College, Oxford, England, in 1923.

The most notable contribution of the book, however, lies not in biography but rather in Friess's lucid, thoughtful, and graceful exposition of Adler's evolving ethical ideals and of the latter's attempt to apply them to all aspects of the human experience. Adler tried to work out a coherent ethical orientation to social and personal interrelationships. He wanted to instantiate the Moral Ideal and to create a comprehensive ethical "community of humanity" in which groups and individuals would interact for the ethical good of each other and of the larger community. He therefore sought the correct ethical ideal in all spheres of human society, and in the process, formulated ethical approaches on the most compelling contemporary issues: labor unrest and problematic industrial relations, public education, vocational training, the preservation of the family, the role of women, socialism, racism, American foreign policy, World War I, and, to a lesser extent, Zionism. But Adler did not conceive his ethical concerns as emanating merely from a humanitarian stance; rather, he grappled in his mature stage with ways to ground his ethical orientation in a solid religious-philosophical foundation, and Friess's depiction and assessment of all this is very well done. Friess also makes a telling observation: while Adler's ethical ideals pointing to concrete actions were understood, and often lauded, his increasingly abstruse religious-metaphysical conceptualization of them made virtually no impact on anyone—not on his Ethical Culture Society members, not on his Columbia students, nor on his philosophical colleagues, who eschewed his brand of religious-philosophical idealism in favor of the regnant temper of prag-

matism, naturalism, and humanism. One gains the impression of Adler as a compassionate, caring individual, successful as an institution builder, but one who failed miserably in philosophical impact.

Useful and insightful, the book nevertheless suffers from several shortcomings. Generally, the book manifests an unevenness of voice; much of it reads like a history of ideas within a biographical framework which at times does not have sufficient biography and at other times does not correlate biography to ideas. This comment is intended less to criticize Friess—a distinguished philosopher but not a historian by profession—than to point out that the definitive biography of Felix Adler remains to be written. One wonders what connection exists between Adler's inner life and his philosophic ruminations, what personal factors molded his intellectual convictions. For instance, to what extent does the stress on the motif of overcoming frustration and failure in Adler's final ethical formulations emerge from his personal frustrations and failures as his own isolation from the Ethical Culture Society increased? Conceptual historical questions also are often not asked. How is it that a man who seemed to command such great respect from his intellectual peers in the last decades of his life had so little intellectual impact? Moreover, while Friess is particularly adept in describing a specific historical problem or phenomenon and placing his cogent analysis of Adler's views on that problem within its context—this is done repeatedly in the second half of the book—the historian wants more: How were his views received? With what kind of dissent? The reader often receives no historical follow-up and does not see Adler active in the fray. Historians seeking a psychological or psychoanalytic interpretation of the man will also be disappointed.

One wishes that Friess had commented more on the complexity and often paradoxical nature of Adler's views and personal sensibilities. One can discern a fascinating dualism or dialectic in Adler's social and intellectual orientations which belies any simple categorization or labeling of his thinking. For example, Adler certainly was a philosophical idealist who believed in the Moral Ideal and in the transcendent power of humans to do the good and to overcome evil despite its persistence; nonetheless, he was also a pragmatist whose realistic assessment of social and personal differentiation led him to dismiss Kant's categorical imperative as the uniformly applicable ethical ideal and to modify drastically Kant's transcendental ethical approach.

Adler was a universalist in ethical outlook, yet a firm advocate of individuality and a proponent of distinct nationalities. He was a confirmed liberal and democrat, but a vociferous opponent of the traditional definition of democracy in terms of laissez-faire liberalism, which in his opinion violated true ethical relationships because it presupposed the individual as an end in himself. On ethical grounds, he reluctantly supported American entry into World War I; however, on ethical grounds, he adamantly opposed the Versailles Treaty and Wilson's platform for a League of Nations. Adler favored group interaction and the appearance of a "cooperative society," but he opposed socialism, which he felt submerged the individual completely. Sometimes his synthesis or affirmation of seeming antithetical attitudes made him appear radical and conservative at the same time and seemed to reflect inconsistency. Thus, he strongly endorsed the intellectual elevation and education of women, which put him among contemporary progressives; yet he opposed giving women the vote and still envisioned their primary vocation as child rearing, aligning him with society's more conservative elements. He espoused nationalism and the enhancement of national cultures, since each nationality possessed unique excellences which should be developed for the sake of humanity, but he opposed the Zionist movement. In retrospect, this is all the more ironic since Israel, through its Labor Zionist emphasis, actualized some of Adler's major ideals on creating an ethical society. The Histadrut, for example, fits perfectly his suggestion that labor unions become employers themselves and achieve group ownership of industries for public service.

Notwithstanding the criticisms of this work, it does illuminate vital aspects of Felix Adler's life and thought and contributes significantly to our understanding of his accomplishments and our awareness of his limitations. As an interpretive work on Adler's intellectual and ethical-religious thought, the book is particularly good, and is recommended to serious students of American and American Jewish history.

—Benny Kraut

Benny Kraut is Associate Professor of Judaic Studies at the University of Cincinnati.

Geipel, John. *Mame Loshn: The Making of Yiddish*. London and West Nyack: The Journeyman Press, 1982. xii, 113 pp. \$9.00.

This is a difficult book to review. It was written with the best of intentions to present a popular history of the Yiddish language and to demonstrate to the lay public once again that Yiddish really is a language like all other languages. That information about the nature of grammar generally, regional dialects, word borrowing, and the like, is still very much *terra incognita* for many educated persons can be amply attested from my own experience not only with attitudes toward Yiddish but also in relation in any language that comes under discussion. The constant bombardment of the American public with newspaper articles (including some regular columns) and books by self-appointed guardians of the English language who warn us about our "mistakes" in English hardly needs documentation. These same writers are on the whole quite ignorant of the history of the language and of the study of language and languages generally. But this does not inhibit them in any way from making their pronouncements. However, Geipel's book itself contains a number of such misconceptions, and in the valiant attempt to set the record straight about Yiddish with generally quite accurate information, he manages also to include a large number of inaccuracies, errors, and misstatements of fact.

It would be an interesting exercise in what has in recent decades come to be known as the field of "sociolinguistics" to try to determine why it is that there is still such a strong negative feeling about this one language, Yiddish, even among Jews. It has long been observed that people have attitudes toward their own or other languages that can be put on a value-scale ranging from high prestige to low disdain. Generally speaking, it is probably not far from correct to suggest that the languages of the socially and economically low strata of any population are the languages that are stigmatized. In this category, we can include the creole and pidgin languages of the world, despite the fact that we now have a large amount of excellent data and analyses that demonstrate to all who care to examine the evidence that these languages too work like the high-prestige languages of the world in terms

of structure, complexity, and the like. In the Jewish world, of all the Jewish languages spoken and written today that I know anything about, it is only Yiddish that continues to be stigmatized, often by persons who know nothing whatever about the language. The negative stereotype is still quite strong. What is even more surprising is that Jews who are Yiddish speakers themselves often display precisely the same kinds of negative attitudes toward the language, charging it with the fault of having no grammar (an obvious contradiction, since every language has a grammar), or condemning it for having a variety of regional forms (what language does not?), or accusing it for the “impurity” of its lexicon, since it has so many loanwords from so many different languages (just check the etymologies of English words on any one page of any English dictionary).

The author does well in trying to prove all of these points in relation to Yiddish and to rehabilitate the language, so to speak, for his reader. There are some excellent maps and charts that inform us about the history of Yiddish. And for these we can be grateful. But there are too many inaccuracies throughout the book. In addition, Geipel does not restrain himself from the common tendency of many lovers of Yiddish to tell jokes. Leo Rosten has made a name for himself with lexical jokebooks about Yiddish. And Geipel seems to have been unable to resist the temptation, thereby continuing the same self-hating tradition that holds the language to ridicule.

Let me now list some of the more glaring inaccuracies (the numbers in parentheses give the page number where the item occurs):

- The word “German” is used when what is really meant is “Germanic” (12). Similarly in most instances, “Hebrew” or “Hebrew-Aramaic” would be preferable to “Semitic.”
- It was not “uncommon” (contra 16) in Europe for speakers of quite different dialects of Yiddish to marry.
- A Galician-Yiddish speaker does not say *vukh* for *vokh* “week” (16). On the same page, Geipel misinterprets the spelling in Joseph Heller’s novel *Good as Gold*: *luch in kup* “hole in the head.” Such orthographies are by no means to be treated as if they were phonetic transcriptions. There can be little doubt that what is intended is precisely *lokh in kop* even for a Galitsianer—the *u* representing the same vowel pronunciation as the *o*, i.e., a mid-back lip-rounded vowel similar to English *but*, though more retracted. We are dealing here with the

u spellings in an attempt to render a foreign pronunciation in an English-based orthography. (A much worse case is to be found in the recently published novel *Temple* by Robert Greenfield, in which there are numerous Yiddish sentences of which hardly a single one is correct grammatically and otherwise.)

- “It must be obvious, however, that the concept of a ‘standard’ Yiddish, accepted by all speakers and equivalent to, say, the form of English traditionally favoured by Oxbridge and the BBC, is an unattainable ideal; the idea of a ‘Queen’s Yiddish’ is as preposterous as it sounds—as inconceivable today as it has ever been” (17). I would like to let Geipel in on a secret: the Queen’s English of Oxbridge and the BBC is also an unattainable ideal and a preposterous but widely believed and exalted myth.

I confess to being put off by the jokey-hokey use of such chapter titles as “English/schminglish” (57) and “How to shmooze a bissle” (86). (Note the inconsistency of *sch* and *sh* for one and the same consonantal sound.) The latter chapter offers the reader a two-and-a-half-page distillation of Yiddish grammar, two pages of conversational expressions, and seven amusing Yiddish anecdotes with English translation. All of this is really quite unnecessary and detracts from the work as a whole. Surely it is inconceivable that anyone will learn much of the language from this chapter.

The book concludes with a glossary of Yiddish words (95–100) with indications of their Hebrew, Slavic, Germanic, or Laaz (= Romance) origins; a list of “Yiddishisms in current use in English slang” (101–105), about which the less said the better; and a three-page bibliography. The two glossaries are full of errors—transcriptional mistakes, inconsistencies, and mistranslations. Some examples:

- The common form is *borsht* not *borshtsh*.
- Words such as *diaspora*, *Karaites*, *khazars*, *Krimchaks* are not Yiddish and do not belong in this glossary.
- I do not know *galkhe* as a Yiddish word meaning “letter of the Latin alphabet,” nor is there, as far as I can check, a Hebrew word *galkha* in the same meaning. There is a Yiddish word *galkhes* “Latin alphabet” (from Hebrew *galkhut*).
- *goles* might also have been glossed “exile” and not only as “diaspora.”
- *khazn* “cantor” not *khozn* (except in Ukrainian Yiddish).

- *kheyn* “charm” not *khen*.
 - There is no reason to capitalize the word *khosid*.
 - *kishke* means “intestine”; but the only gloss given here is “stuffed intestine,” a meaning that is in itself unclear. The word as applied to the particular culinary delicacy wherein a bovine intestine serves as a casing for some variety of tasty stuffing is a specialized meaning.
 - *misnaged* not *mitnagd*, and surely the gloss should not be “observant Jew.”
 - *nakhes* is “pleasure, satisfaction” and not “pleasure from another’s achievements.”
 - *os* not *oys* for “letter of the Hebrew alphabet”; the plural is *oyses*.
 - *pletsl* “often referred to by American Jews as ‘Byalies’ [*sic*].” Quite wrong. A *byali* is a very different phenomenon. It also has onions on it, but does not have poppyseeds (usually), and the shape and consistency bear no relation to a *pletsl*.
 - Why *sephardi* and not *sefardi*?
 - *shabes* “Sabbath” not “Sabbeth.”
 - *shokeln* means “to shake” and not just “to sway while praying.”
 - *shul* also means “school.”
 - *talmud* not *talmid* for “basic body of Jewish oral law.” Would not a gloss like “Talmud” or “Gemara” have been better? Surely these terms are widely understood by now by many English speakers.
 - *talmid* means “student, pupil.”
 - *tkhine* is sufficient; *t’khine* is quite unnecessary as a transcription, especially since two words later on the same page we have *treyf* and not *t’reyf*.
 - *tsholent* is not made just from “potatoes, groats, and fat.” It also contains meat and, depending on local custom, various kinds of beans.
 - *tsene ‘rene* is not a “Yiddish translation” of the Pentateuch by any means.
 - *tsimes* is not merely a “carrot and fruit dessert, served as side dish with Sabbath or festive meals.” Any experienced eater of *tsimes* knows that there are many varieties, made with other ingredients as well, and often eaten on ordinary days of the week. A carrot-*tsimes* is often an accompaniment to a main meat dish and not a dessert.
- In general, the marking of stress in the transcriptions is quite inconsistent.

As a whole, this book has some merit, but it is too marred by inaccuracies to be recommended. The \$9.00 price borders on the irrational.

—Herbert H. Paper

Herbert H. Paper is dean of the School of Graduate Studies at the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati.

Brief Notices

Cohen, Robert. *The Jewish Nation in Surinam*. Amsterdam: S. Emmering, 1982. 103 pp.

This volume is a most welcome one. Historians often overlook the fact that the Jewish community in Surinam was once one of the most important in the western hemisphere. Eight scholars have contributed seven important essays on the Jews of Surinam, and the book includes a useful bibliography on Surinam Jewry.

Glick, Edward Bernard. *The Triangular Connection: America, Israel, and American Jews*. Winchester, Mass.: Allen & Unwin, 1982. 174 pp. \$12.95.

To state that the relationship between America and Israel, American Jewry and Israel, and the American government and American Jewry is both a complex and confusing situation is to understate the obvious. Yet Edward Bernard Glick's perceptive and challenging book is perhaps the clearest assessment to date of the complexity and confusion which surround this triangular connection. Acting as both historian and devil's advocate, Glick has managed to show us how the triangular connection developed and, now that it is an established fact, what the potentials and limitations might be for its successful continuation.

Goldberg, Itche. *Eseyen* [Essays]. New York: Yidisher Kultur Farband, 1981. 451 pp.

The Yiddish essays in this volume reflect the multiple interests of Itche Goldberg, the long-time editor of the internationally known journal *Yidishe Kultur*. Goldberg's writings range from a discussion of the historical importance of the 1908 Czernowitz conference on Yiddish to analysis of such Yiddish writers and poets as Kalman Marmor, Y. L. Peretz, Isaac Manger, and Isaac Bashevis Singer.

Goldberg, Judith N. *Laughter Through Tears: The Yiddish Cinema*. East Brunswick: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1983. 171 pp. \$22.50.

The Yiddish cinema is an all-but-forgotten chapter in the history of a people and a culture that too few Jews understand and even less remember. Like its equivalent art form, the Yiddish theater, the Yiddish cinema had its melodramatic tearjerkers and its artistic masterpieces. Like the Yiddish theater it played to small groups of weary people who yearned only for some moments of rest and the opportunity to be surrounded by *Yiddishkeit*. The highpoint of Yiddish cinema in Poland, Austria, America, and the Soviet Union, the countries where the films were made, was just over a decade (1930-41), and its decline in the fires of the Holocaust was even more brief. The Holocaust destroyed a people and a culture. Now the fifty or so Yiddish films that have been preserved must serve to fill the void of missing faces and voices that once made up the culture and the lives they portray.

Gottlieb, Moshe R. *American Anti-Nazi Resistance, 1933-1941*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1982. xxi, 426 pp. \$35.00.

One of the bright spots in the history of the American Jewish response to Nazism was the involvement of several American Jewish agencies in the worldwide effort to boycott Nazi goods and services. The boycott movement was designed to deal a crushing blow to the German economy, so that its destabilization would lead to Hitler's fall. Even though the boycott movement began shortly after Hitler's rise to power in 1933 and lasted until 1941, the movement never really had a chance for success. A number of factors were arrayed against it: the struggle for power and position among many different groups within the boycott movement; the political struggles of prominent personalities, including Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, who was founding the World Jewish Congress at about the same time; and the efforts on the part of the Nazi government to undermine the boycott by holding the Jews of Germany, desperate to leave the country, as pawns. Moshe R. Gottlieb has addressed some of these problems in a convincing, if less than comprehensive, manner.

Jewish Book Annual. New York: JWB Jewish Book Council, 1983 (volume 41). 291 pp. \$18.00.

The 1983-84 edition of the *Jewish Book Annual* includes articles by Murray Baumgarten on the modern American city and American Jewish fiction, and by Ellen S. Fine on Elie Wiesel's literary legacy, as well as detailed bibliographies on new books in American Jewish fiction and nonfiction.

Levy, B. H. *Savannah's Old Jewish Community Cemeteries*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1983. 118 pp. \$10.95.

Few people are as close to the spirit of Savannah's glorious Jewish past as B. H. Levy. He is a master of its history and a supporter of and active participant in its scholarly historical reconstruction. In this, Georgia Jewry's two-hundred-and-fiftieth year of existence (1733-1983), it is most appropriate that B. H. Levy's volume on one of the most fascinating groups of Jewish cemeteries in America should appear, and that Levy himself should lead the official statewide effort to pay tribute to an important occasion in the history of American Jewish life.

Mankowitz, Wolf. *Mazeppa: The Lives, Loves, and Legends of Adah Isaacs Menken*. New York: Stein and Day, 1982. 270 pp. \$16.95.

"Adah Isaacs Menken didn't know who she was, and no one has ever found out." So ends Wolf Mankowitz's highly entertaining biography of America's first great international star. Born in Louisiana of unknown or unproved parentage, Adah Isaacs Menken (?-1868) became in the short space of a decade an internationally acclaimed stage performer and America's "first great international sex symbol." Her friends and lovers numbered among them such names as the artist Rossetti, Mark Twain, Walt Whitman, Bret Harte, and Alexander Dumas. She studied Hebrew with Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, wrote poetry, and published articles in the Cincinnati *Israelite* protesting the kidnapping of Edgar Mortara and pleading for the right of Baron Lionel de Rothschild to be seated in Parliament.

Above all, she shocked, scandalized, and titillated stage audiences in America and abroad with her portrayals of characters ranging from Ivan Mazeppa to Lola Montez. Who was she?

Was she Jewish by birth, conversion, or sympathy? She was brilliant, beautiful, and free-souled. This much we know. But who was she really? For the sake of those who love the mysterious and the never-to-be-known certainty, Wolf Mankowitz has responded magnificently: "Of course, I haven't found out who she was."

Malino, Frances, and Albert, Phyllis Cohen, Edited by. *Essays in Modern Jewish History: A Tribute to Ben Halpern*. East Brunswick: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1982. 343 pp. \$27.50.

In dedicating this *festschrift* to Professor Ben Halpern upon his retirement from Brandeis University, the two editors of this volume refer to Halpern as a "seminal thinker and an enduring mentor." These are terms not easily applied, and they reflect the measure of Ben Halpern's scholarly and teaching careers. Of special interest in this volume are articles by Isaac Neustadt-Noy on B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Congress movement, 1915-1918, and by Deborah Lipstadt on the early Zionist career of Louis Lipsky.

Sklare, Marshall, Edited by. *Understanding American Jewry*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Transaction Books, 1982, xiv, 310 pp. \$21.95.

The twelve essays in this volume were delivered as papers at the Planning Conference for a Center for Modern Jewish Studies which took place at Brandeis University in 1979. The scholars who are featured and the papers they have published are a veritable who's who and what's what of the diverse areas of the American Jewish experience. Goldscheider on demography, Liebman on American Judaism, Elazar on the community as polity, Sklare on sociology, and S. M. Lipset on Jewish immigration to America—these and more await the reader of this important volume.

Zernik, Charlotte E. *Im Sturm der Zeit. Ein persoenliches Dokument*. Duesseldorf: Econ Verlag, 1977. 120 pp.

The year 1983 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of Jewish immigration from Nazi Germany to America. Historians of this period are only now beginning to examine the experiences of "ordinary" German Jews, those who did not make up the well-documented saga of the "refugee intellectuals." Charlotte E. Zernik's memoirs are a useful contribution to the history of this immigration, an important chapter in the American Jewish experience.