

THE URBAN ECOLOGY OF JEWISH POPULATIONS:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Vivian Z. Klaff

Introduction

"If you would know what kind of Jew a man is, ask him where he lives; for no simple factor indicates as much about the character of the Jew as the area in which he lives. It is an index not only to his economic status, his occupation, his religion, but to his politics and his outlook on life and the stage in the assimilative process that he has reached." (Wirth, 1928, pp. 57-71).

This statement was written by Louis Wirth in the 1920's. Despite the fact that Wirth often misrepresented the sociological implications of spatial patterns (because of his ideological viewpoint), the issue he raises in this quote is as important today as it was for Chicago in the early years of the 20th century, and for European cities in past centuries. The 19th and 20th centuries have not only been a period of rapid world-wide population growth, but have also seen extensive population movements of people within and across country boundaries. The settlement of large cities by population groups from widely different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds and their subsequent distribution patterns within the city has been a subject of increasing interest for social scientists as well as social planners. Researchers have concentrated their efforts in examining the various demographic transitions of Jewish populations with attention currently being given to the low fertility of Jews. It is time to add to our general analysis of Jewish populations the "ecological transitions" which contribute in no small measure to the development of Jewish communities.

In many towns of medieval Europe, and more recently in those of much of Asia and North Africa, the urban fabric is physically divided into areas referred to as wards and quarters. The pattern of residential differentiation and segregation in the modern city may be less obvious than is generally the case in the pre-industrial community, but the absence of walls and other physical signs of demarcation by no means implies any lessening of social differentiation. Similar populations cluster together and come to characterize their areas. The residential differentiation of the urban population takes place in terms of many attributes and in many ways. Research indicates that almost any criterion differentiating between individuals and groups may become the basis for their physical separation (LaGory and Pipkin, 1981).

Much of the ecological research on ethnic groups implies that there is a special relationship between the minority group and the wider com-

munity. Lee (1977, p. 5), for example, states that "residential segregation is basically a spatial phenomenon; but it is one which has economic, social and cultural causes and ramifications. Thus, residential segregation may symbolize and reflect social rejection and social isolation, but it may also reflect the relative economic standing of different groups and their access to power in the community." Also in their analysis of the impact of residential segregation on the process of social integration, Marston and Van Valey (1979) state: "The question of the residential patterning of racial and ethnic groups is clearly one of the most significant and sensitive problems facing society today." Although the research on residential distribution patterns of minority groups is quite extensive, there have been few attempts to conduct a comparative cross-cultural investigation of a specific group in order to examine issues related to the urban ecology of minority groups. The Jewish group is generally considered to be an essentially urban population and study of Jewish populations in different historical and cultural settings can assist us in examining strategies of environmental adaptation used by a minority group.

The task here is to examine the shape of Jewish distribution in cities. Preliminary evidence available based on a literature review, suggests the following generalizations:

1. Jews traditionally represent a highly urbanized population.
2. The Jews traditionally represent a highly centralized population. That is, a community concentrated in the inner areas of cities.
3. Jewish immigrants to the West have begun their stay in highly segregated areas in the inner city, but have dispersed in future generations.
4. As Jews become socially upwardly mobile they tend to move out of immigrant areas, and a process of decentralization occurs.
5. Jews tend to retain their affinity to the inner city to a greater extent than non-Jews.
6. Jews, when they move out of inner city areas, tend to re-concentrate in other areas through a process of leap frogging, or of sectorial expansion, rather than expansion in concentric circles.

This essay is in large part based on deliberations held during the 1980/81 academic year by a group at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. We raised many issues which will be the subject of future research. As yet there are many questions, little data and few clear answers. This overview focuses on 4 issues which appear to be crucial in understanding the urban ecology of Jewish populations.

- A. Do Jews differ in their residential distribution pattern from other ethnic groups and to what extent do they differ? The answers to the above questions involve measurement of residential differentiation (segregation).

- B. How do they differ? This involves an analysis of how the Jews conform to the models of internal structure of cities, and mobility patterns of immigrant populations.
- C. Why do they differ? Here we need to investigate, first, settlement ideologies as they effect Jewish populations and second, the determinants and functions of residential differentiation.
- D. What are the consequences of specific patterns of residential distribution? This involves investigation of the social, psychological and institutional consequences of distribution patterns.

Residential Segregation

General

The study of urban ecology has since its inception focused on the patterns of residential segregation between groups. Ecological investigations of the residential segregation of sub-groups (ethnic, social class, religion, etc.) have led to the conclusion that the residential dissimilarity of sub-groups is present in many different cultural settings. Studies utilizing the index of dissimilarity, which is a summary measure of the divergence between two population distributions, have shown that large proportions of the varying populations which constitute cities in the developed world would need to change their place of residence if all are to share the same residential pattern. In the case of complete similarity of distribution patterns the index will be zero; in the case of complete dissimilarity - where no members of the one population live in any areas inhabited by the other - the index will be 100 (Duncan and Duncan, 1955a).

In an analysis of U.S. cities, Taeuber and Taeuber (1965) found that the average index of dissimilarity between blacks and whites is 87.3 at the city block level and 79.3 at the census tract level. Subsequent research by Sorensen et al (1975) and Van Valey et al (1977) have demonstrated continued racial segregation in U.S. cities into the 1970's. There is also convincing evidence that residential segregation persists among ethnic immigrant groups in U.S. cities. Lieberman (1963), for example, indicates that in 1950 the average index of ethnic concentration for 12 foreign-born groups in 10 American cities was 39. Kantrowitz (1973) demonstrates the continued existence of high index values for European migrant groups in New York, 40 years after the cessation of large scale immigration. Uyeki in a study of Cleveland which covers a 60 year span (1910-1970) points out that "...correlations suggest historical continuity in the intergroup relationships set down at an early period in Cleveland history" (Uyeki, 1980, p. 401). A striking demonstration of the configuration of ethnic and racial residential segregation which exists in American cities can be found in Sweetser (1962) for the city of Boston in 1960.

Studies have been carried out in a variety of cultural contexts including studies by Jones (1969) in Melbourne; Warwick (1966) in Singapore; Musil (1968) in Prague; Mehta (1968) in Poona, India; Darrock and Marson (1971) in Toronto; Klaff (1973) in Tel Aviv; Poole and Boal (1973) in Belfast; and Lee (1977) in London. Each of these studies demonstrates the existence of residential differentiation between population subgroups within large urban areas. There are also many examples of residential segregation of populations classified by socio-economic variables. The classic work was carried out by the Duncans in 1955 where they demonstrated that there are definite patterns of residential distance between different occupational groups (Duncan and Duncan, 1955). This research has been replicated and expanded on in a number of contexts by Uyeki (1967), Simkus (1978) and Bleda (1979).

When one reviews all the above works one finds ample evidence for Park's statement that "social realtions are...frequently and...inevitably correlated with spatial relations" (Park, 1955, p. 77) i.e. spatial distance becomes an indicator of social distance.

Jewish

The classical model of Jewish immigrant residential distribution is represented by the ghetto. In a study of Jewish immigrant population of Chicago the sociologist Louis Wirth stated that "West of the Chicago River, in the shadow of the crowded central business district, lies a densely populated rectangle of crowded tenements representing the greater part of Chicago's immigrant colonies, among them the ghetto" (Wirth, 1928, p. 195). Historically, according to Wirth, the ghetto traces its ancestry back to a medieval European urban institution by means of which the Jews were involuntarily segregated from the rest of the population. In modern times, however, the term *ghetto* applies not specifically to the place of officially regulated settlement of the Jews, but rather to those local cultural areas which have arisen in the course of time or are voluntarily selected or built up by them.

The ghetto is constantly referred to in the literature as representing the segregation of Jewish communities (Johnson, 1971). There are in fact many examples of the Jewish ghetto in Eastern and Central Europe. These areas of extremely high segregation of Jews from non-Jews represent an important phase in Jewish urban ecology (Bloch, 1977; DellaPergola, 1981a). Specific examples can be found in historical data for Warsaw (Bloch, 1977), Rome (DellaPergola, 1981b). There is also evidence that Jews' communities tended to be segregated in the cities of Asia and N. Africa, where we find reference, for example, to the mellahs of Morocco. Recent census material analyzed by Schmelz and DellaPergola also points to patterns of segregation in Latin America, particularly Buenos Aires where Jews were concentrated in the inner city area.

The significance of this historical investigation of Jewish social segregation lies in its ability to provide a framework for examining the Jewish communities of modern cities. The majority of Jews in the cities we will examine have their cultural and demographic origin in the 18th and 19th century cities of Europe. The evidence on Jewish residential segregation in the 20th century is sketchy due in part to the scarcity of census data being available according to religion and in part to the lack of appropriate statistical techniques to undertake comparative analyses. The data for North American cities do suggest, however, that patterns of Jewish clustering have persisted beyond the period of initial immigrant status.

A number of studies in the U.S. have found that Jews (after the initial settlement period) moved at a surprising rate from the working class to the middle class, but there was less of a trend toward residential integration. Glazer and Moynihan (1963, p. 143) point out that "Jewish residential concentration is not confined to the immigrant generation or the poor. It is characteristic of the middle and upper-middle classes and the third generation no less than the second." For example, the Chicago "ghetto" referred to by Wirth (1928) is seen over time to have spread westward in the 1930's and then we find the Jewish population leap-frogging northwards to specific neighborhoods in the mid-20th century. Jaret in a recent study of Jewish residential mobility in Chicago concludes that "among Jews the desire to live in close proximity to group members is still strong. Jews tend to live clustered together in residential areas in much greater density than their percentage of the population" (Jaret, 1979).

We find similar patterns of clustering in New York (Horowitz and Kaplan, 1959) and Boston (Fowler, 1977). A series of index of dissimilarity matrixes prepared for Cleveland by Uyeki (1980) for the years 1910 through 1970 shows that the average index of segregation of Russians (a predominantly Jewish group) from other European immigrant groups have (with few exceptions in the earlier years) been consistently the highest of all the intergroup averages. While these are obvious problems with the use of Russian foreign stock data as a proxy for Jews, due to the aging of the population, the Cleveland data and similar analyses of other large U.S. cities confirm continuing segregative tendencies of Jewish groups (Kantrowitz, 1979; Guest and Weed, 1971).

Some examples of residential segregation of Jews in non-U.S. cities are also available. Although the Jews accounted for 1.5% of Melbourne's population as a whole in 1961, they were heavily concentrated in a small number of areas which had much higher percentages than the average. Seventy-five percent of Melbourne's Jewish community lived in 100 of the 611 ACD's which contained only 16% of the total population of the city. In these 100 areas they averaged 7% of the resident population (Jones, 1969). Evidence shows that in Winnipeg, Canada, in 1941, three-fourths of the Jewish population lived in 5 census tracts in the North End, where they originally settled in the

1880's (Driedger and Church, 1974).

Evidence from a census tract analysis carried out by Darrock and Marston (1971) demonstrates that significant levels of residential segregation existed in 1961 between European immigrant groups in Toronto. They concluded that: "There is a rather low level of segregation between any pair of the five groups originating from northern and western Europe. Those from southern and eastern European origins are more highly segregated not only from the former, but also from each other. The Asiatic, Other and Other European (predominantly Jewish: 60%) are less segregated from the northern and western European groups than those of southern and eastern European heritage." (P. 496). In addition the Russian-born immigrants (predominantly Jewish) are seen to have the second highest average rates of segregation from all other groups, behind the Italian group. These results confirm the work carried out by Rosenberg (1954) for the 1951 census and Murdie (1969) for both the 1951 and 1961 census. Rosenberg's data show that although the Jews were not isolated in one particular neighborhood in the early 20th century there was a significant concentration in the inner city downtown area. By the 1950's, however, the Jewish population had decentralized to quite an extent in a northern direction.

The tendency has been toward wider dispersion throughout the city as population became increasingly integrated in the economic and cultural life. As decentralization took place, with Jews moving to the northern residential suburbs, we still note that the Jews tend to be more centralized than the total population up to 1951, but the 1961 data suggest that Jews are decentralizing at a rapid rate, even faster than non-Jews. In 1951 Jews comprised 6.7% of Toronto City population and 2.1% of outer suburbs. By 1961 the city had declined to 2.8% and the outer suburbs increased to 7.2%. In 1961 less than one-tenth of Toronto's Jewish population resided in the traditional reception area for immigrants, about 13% lived in Forest Hill village and more than 50% lived in North York township. According to Mudie (1964), unlike the Italians, the Jews remained segregated largely by choice so as to be near friends, synagogues and grocery stores. The Jews have moved northward in sectorial fashion. Preliminary evidence from the geo-statistical analysis of Toronto data (Bachi and Klaff, 1981) confirms the clustering of Jewish population in the area leading from the north part of the central city and heading into the northern suburbs.

Data for Johannesburg, South Africa, prepared from research carried out by Dubb and DellaPergola (1978) point to definite areas of Jewish residential concentration. Kosmin (1981) has pointed out that "we can see a spreading Jewish population in London over time but it remains surprisingly concentrated and conservative as regards residential movement by regional standards." He also states that: "The borough pattern of residential distribution fits a core-periphery model. The Jewish core in Hachney and Ilford tops out at about 40% of the total popula-

tion of Jews, and around 4,500 Jews per ward. In Edgware in the 1960's. again the Jews were about 40% of the total. This is interesting, since the Jewish proportion in the borough as a whole is 20% in Barnet, 14% in Hackney and 9% in Redbridge. The Jewishness of the average Jews' environment due to such local densities was 24% in Hackney and 17% in Redbridge. The density level was 1.8 times the expected in the inner area of secondary settlement and 2.0 times the expected in the tertiary suburban area. Moreover the Redbridge Jewish population is 94% British-born."

This raises the important issue of the extent to which Jews live in areas which are predominantly Jewish. Evidence for Amsterdam analyzed by Cohen (1981) from 1930 data shows that about 40% of all Jews lived in A 5, but only 19% of the area was Jewish. However, in A 13, which contained 19% of all Jews, the area had a Jewish majority. It is clear that these two areas represent different ecological situations for the Jewish population. Examples might range from the ghetto situation with a high degree of isolation to areas where Jews are evident in significant numbers, but are a small minority of the area.

Characteristics of Residential Distribution

General

The classical ecological model of social morphology presented by Park and Burgess in the 1920's (Burgess, 1925) for large industrialized American cities states that the city center was the water shed for poor immigrants who used the security of dense inner city neighborhoods close to the economic center of the city as their initial point of settlement. In time these immigrant groups moved onwards and were replaced by new immigrant groups. This model, commonly referred to as the concentric zone model suggests that the socio-economic status of the urban population increases as we move from the center of the city to the periphery. Competing models have been developed which suggest that population and housing characteristics differ according to wedges running from the center to the periphery (Sector Model, Hoyt, 1928), or that several nuclei serve as organizing foci for the city's development with subgroups arranged according to concentric or sectorial configurations around each nuclei (Harris and Ullman, 1945).

The analysis of residential distribution patterns can be viewed from a *static* perspective: where do people live?, or a *dynamic* perspective: how and where do people move? Ecological models of residential patterns suggest that immigrant groups initially cluster in ethnic neighborhoods, but eventually are absorbed into wider society. In general, in industrialized societies the 20th century has seen a phenomenon of decentralization of population, more generally known as suburbanization. There is evidence, however, that racial and ethnic subgroups behave differently in terms of their patterns of physical mobility

(Schnore, 1972; Berry and Kasarda, 1977; Frey, 1980). Comparative analysis of cities has raised a number of questions concerning these location models. It has been suggested that cities are at different stages of development and that as they move from pre-industrial to industrial the location model moves from high socioeconomic concentration in the center to the periphery of cities (Schnore, 1972; Hawley, 1971).

Another question asked is whether different subgroup characteristics are differentially distributed over the urban space of the city. For example, there is evidence that in less industrialized cities economic status, family cycle and immigrant status characteristics of subareas overlap, while in more industrialized cities these variables tend to become more independent. It has also been suggested that some characteristics are distributed according to the zonal model, while others are distributed according to the sectorial model. Evidence suggests that immigrant ethnic groups in U.S. cities are distributed in a sectorial spatial pattern, while the population characterized by economic status is distributed concentrically.

Jewish

A common feature of the settlement patterns of minority groups is their tendency to move towards the periphery of the city. These centrifugal movements do not necessarily imply a concomitant breakdown of segregation as it is possible for segregation patterns to re-emerge in new areas. It is suggested that the North American pattern of Jewish residential mobility is outwards, but concentrated, where new areas are settled, re-establishing Jewish concentrations around new institutions. Despite increasing out-movement the evidence for Western Europe and North America suggests that Jews remain over-represented in the inner areas of cities when compared to the general population.

A recent analysis of approximately 20 cities in Europe by DellaPergola (1981a) shows that in comparison with non-Jewish populations the Jews tend to be more centralized in the inner areas of these cities, and more specifically in the intermediate ring between the center of the city and the outer suburbs. Evidence by Jan Herman (1980), for Prague (between 1869-1939) demonstrates that the spatial distribution of Jews differed from that of the general population. While there was decentralization and outmigration from the ghetto (after 1859) Jews remained fairly concentrated in center part of town. Jews did, however, move to newly established middle class districts of Greater Prague. According to Bok (1980:163) Jewish households concentrated in the center of Brussels area (66% as against 53% of general population). In suburbs Jews were 10% as against 18% of general population. Analysis of data for Warsaw between 1922 and 1931 by Bloch (1977) shows the development of suburbs indicated major decentralizing trends among the bulk of the non-Jewish population, but hardly any such trends among the Jews. Not many Jews moved out to the suburbs, but rather to those parts of the city which were situated out-

side the nucleus (of the Great Ghetto).

In a study of Providence (USA) in the 1960's Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) found a central "ghetto" with a strong concentration of Jews, but also Jews scattered through the suburbs. According to them the general trend in the years 1951-63 has been "a more general residential integration of the Jewish community into the larger population of the metropolitan area." They represented the immigrant ghetto community as breaking down - movement to suburbs - and assimilation into American life. Goldstein in his article entitled "The Jews in the U.S.: Perspectives from Demography" (in the 1981 American Jewish Year Book) makes the point that Jews in the U.S. are suburbanizing at a significant rate. But the question of concentration, or intra-city movement is left open.

A study on Jewish residential mobility in Chicago covering the years 1960 to 1974 (Jaret, 1979) reports that the desire by Jews to live in close proximity to groups members is still strong. Some specific findings are that Jews have been suburbanizing along with the rest of the population, but till the major proportion of moves by Jews can be classified as *within* city moves, and Jews moving to suburbs tend to be less concentrated in areas, but still concentrated in blocks (along certain streets).

A preliminary analysis of Boston data suggests that in the early decades of the 20th century the Jewish population was heavily concentrated in the central city (Fowler, 1977). However, we note that in the late 1950's and early 1960's the Jewish population was predominantly dispersed in the North and West, but by the mid-1970's there had been further decentralization and large reductions in the Jewish total in Boston City had occurred. Little is known, however, of levels of concentration or segregation due to the limited nature of the data. In Cincinnati a study by Varady et al (1981) concluded that there is a strong tendency for the Jewish population to move within the same community, but that of those moving outwards the general pattern is sectorial in nature. The early settlers were close to the central business district (CBD) and with time Jewish clusters have appeared in a northerly direction away from the CBD.

A word of caution needs to be issued here concerning the impact of recent in-migration of a minority group into an area. It is important to be able to differentiate between decentralization of Jewish population and the settlement of Jewish immigrants in peripheral areas. We need to be aware of the fact that the period of immigration may have an important impact on the residential distribution pattern of immigrant groups. Decentralization must not be confused with settlement patterns of groups who arrive at different points in time. New groups may settle in peripheral areas, thus giving the impression of decentralization.

Determinants of Residential Distribution

General

The empirical investigation of patterns of residential distribution provides us with important information. The residential clustering of population subgroups, however, is neither a random nor a non-rational process. Although the classical ecological approach to explaining location decisions is based on the outcome of economic competition for space and the trade-off between time and space, it is evident that we cannot ignore the importance of values and the many other influences, subjective and objective, on decision making. Of particular importance is an understanding of settlement ideologies. Both the receiving host society and a particular minority group generally have a perspective on the process of interaction in a society and on their ideological commitment to this model of interaction.

The vast majority of writings about the impact of residential distribution of racial, ethnic or other minority groups on social integration use the assimilationist model, which suggests that a) residential isolation is an important indicator of the lack of assimilation, and b) minority groups desire assimilation into the mainstream culture of the society. Researchers have maintained that the degree of residential segregation is an acceptable indicator of, or a proxy for, assimilation. An ethnically enclosed residential experience insulates a group from important mechanisms of assimilation, limits cross-culture contacts that affect the socialization of the young, and has serious implications for subsequent experiences such as intermarriage, upward job mobility, and the formation of social ties. Specifically it is suggested that segregation restricts social mobility, and has particularly negative effects on the psychological development of a group who are segregated. Thus, the lower the degree of segregation the greater the likelihood that a group is experiencing assimilation. Desegregation is then likely to result in a dissipation of the subordinate status, and therefore, assimilation of the subjugated group into the mainstream society.

Early studies on immigrant groups and the black population in the U.S. suggest evidence of a distinct ethnic community or group, and incomplete dispersion of these groups within the various institutional spheres of the society (Hartmann, 1948). As social policy, emphasis was placed on social proximity as well as dispersal within the formal institutional sphere as conditions for successful integration (Warner and Srole, 1945; Schermerhorn, 1949). In 1944 Myrdal stated "We assume it is to the advantage of American Negroes as individuals and as a group to become assimilated into American culture, to acquire the traits held in esteem by the dominant white Americans" (Myrdal, 1944, p. 929).

Investigation of societies with ethnic minorities reveals, however, that in most of these societies residential segregation persists and in

many situations ethnic group identity has persisted and become more salient (Glazer and Moynihan, 1970; Newman, 1973). This represents a different model leading to alternative forms of social interaction. In some societies, the trend is toward preservation of elements of culture within the national unity of the society. It is suggested that residential segregation is an important element in the maintenance of this pluralist model of integration in that ethnic residential clusters in cities perform certain positive functions. Also ethnic minority groups can be seen as interest groups engaged in a struggle with other groups for public resources.

Where people are in conflict or feel threatened, the functions of segregated areas may be one of the following:

- People seek each other's company for defense and security and the community can be seen as a place to provide a haven for new immigrants.
- The clustering may be due to a desire to preserve identity of the group and to provide a complete set of services for members.
- Clustering can use the resources of a common territory to gain additional resources and power.

An interpretation of the pluralist model as applied to residential distribution patterns would suggest that ethnicity or minority group status can in fact be one of a number of characteristics on which a territorial group can base their sense of solidarity. The discussion of the pluralist model in the general ecological literature is extremely complex, however, for it is difficult to disaggregate the contributions of voluntary from involuntary forces contributing to segregative tendencies. On the one hand Greeley (1974) and Matzger (1971) make a strong case for the positive aspects of ethnic pluralism as a strategy of community adaptation to a new or hostile social environment. On the other hand, the evidence collected by social scientists is quite persuasive in its conclusions that a considerable amount of residential segregation is created and maintained by discriminatory procedures, both legal and informal, which makes it difficult for minority groups to voluntarily settle in certain residential areas, and involuntarily assigns them to other areas (Hawley and Rock, 1973; Pearce, 1976; Thigpan, 1976).

A final point which is important in the investigation of determinants of segregation concerns the possibility that people of different ethnic groups are differently distributed because they are of different socioeconomic status, and the cause lies in their differential access to resources, rather than in ethnicity. In the U.S. a number of studies have pointed out that socioeconomic differences between racial groups do not explain the degree of residential segregation. Karl Taeuber, in an extensive analysis of the relationship between economic factors and racial patterns of American housing, stated that: "These sample analyses demonstrate that poverty has little to do directly with Negro residen-

tial segregation in the Cleveland metropolitan areas. They demonstrate that if incomes were the only factor at work in determining where white and Negro families live, there would be very little racial residential segregation" (Taeuber, 1968, p. 12). Hermalin and Farley report that "data from the census of 1970 reveal that economic factors account for little of the concentration of blacks within central cities, their absence from suburbia or the residential segregation of blacks from whites in either cities or suburbs" (1973, p. 595).

On the other hand, there is evidence in New York which concludes that residential segregation between European origin ethnic groups can be explained by their differential socioeconomic status. In a number of studies covering different times and settings we find a clear correspondence between the ordering of occupational categories in terms of their general social standing and that produced by their residential patterning. Also, the greater the prestige distance between two occupational populations the less likely are they to nominate each other as friends and the more dissimilar are their residential distributions. The relationship between ethnicity and socioeconomic status is seen as strong, and areas with high ethnicity also tend to be areas with low status. The interpretation of this relationship is more complex, and both ecological and individual characteristics need to be taken into account.

Jewish

In some situations discrimination and voluntary self-segregation may be opposite sides of the same coin, and difficult to disentangle. Where the host society controls the housing market either overtly by means of segregative settlement policy (e.g., Jews only allowed to live in a certain area) or covertly by means of institutional barriers (e.g. loans not available to Jews), the consequences are high levels of involuntary separation. The traditional Jewish ghettos in Europe and North Africa are good examples. However, there are many examples of minority groups who, unilaterally or by mutual agreement with the host society, choose to remain segregated. Where do the Jews fit? Bloch (1977, p. 229) for example, suggests that in Warsaw following the emancipation of the Jews in 1862 the expected great exodus from the "ghetto" by law before 1862 remained there voluntarily. He suggests that this was partly due to the desire to retain a sense of Jewish community and partly due to the hostility of the surrounding population.

As recently as 1971 a book by Johnson (as influential writer in urban sociology) made the statement that "The Jews are the usually quoted example of a minority group who have chosen to continue to live in ghetto situations" (Johnson, 1971, p. 273). Although Johnson uses Louis Wirth's definition of ghetto, the evidence to support this claim needs to be re-examined in the light of recent data. Wirth's analysis of the Chicago Jewish "ghetto" and the behavior of the population suggests a gradual process of cultural assimilation, but one where the Jews

leaving the "ghetto" are followed by others, creating a new concentration (Wirth, 1956, p. 261).

Finally we need to examine whether Jews are segregated or concentrated because of a desire to be close to their own group, or because of some other factor such as socioeconomic status. Studies in North America have found that Jews moved at rapid rates from working class to middle class. Associated with this it was discovered that Jewish residential concentration was not confined to the immigrant generation or the poor. The pattern of concentration was found to be characteristic of the middle and upper class and the third generation no less than the second generation.

Rosenthal (1961) in a study of Jewish assimilation in Chicago states that "A modicum of Jewish education and voluntary segregation are two parts of a three part device designed to forestall large scale assimilation. The third is residence in a high status area...Settlement there removes the stigma that is usually attributed to a separate ethnic community...Residence in a high status area indicates the voluntary nature of the settlement of Jews as well as non-Jews and lifts the burden of alienation from the younger generation in particular." Referring to Leeds, England, according to Drausz, "working and middle class Jews do not move to working and middle class areas. The aim is to move to a better area and not a non-Jewish area. The Jew belonging to his own elite appears to be happy living with other members of the Jewish elite" (Krausz, 1964, p. 26).

The question of whether ethnic groups are residentially segregated because of their ethnicity (ethnic status model) or socioeconomic status (class model) is an important research issue (Guest and Weed, 1971). Darrock and Marston (1969) have found that in Toronto social class segregation within ethnic groups exists. Very little empirical information is available concerning differential residential distribution of socioeconomic subgroups within the Jewish population of cities. A comprehensive review of the determinants of the distribution patterns and functions, both positive and negative, for the Jewish group is crucial to our understanding of the urban ecology of minority groups.

Consequences of Residential Distribution

The issue of the consequences of residential distribution patterns is highly complex, for this involves subjective perceptions of the meaning of territory. It is, however, important for groups or community leaders to understand the dynamics of settlement patterns. On the one hand a group may view increased spatial distribution of its members as a successful process of integration. Others, however, may see the need for a critical mass of group membership to maintain viable communal and religious facilities.

According to data put together by DellaPergola most European Jewish

communities, while still being more concentrated than non-Jewish populations, "face a pattern of location of the main Jewish services and facilities in the central city, and of increasing redistribution of Jews toward the periphery of metropolitan areas, where opportunities for Jewish communal life are poorer" (DellaPergola, 1981a).

The question of the relative good for the individual versus the good for the community must also be seen in societal context. There is, in fact, an important connection between territory and institutions. Minority groups often move their ethnic institutions and it is suggested that maintenance of institutions in a new location is crucial to the continuation of residentially segregated areas. It has been noted that those ethnic groups who maintain a strong identity generally have succeeded in creating and maintaining a comprehensive set of ethnic institutions. Also, a number of studies have found that those ethnic minorities with the highest degree of institutional completeness display the highest levels of residential segregation.

The community literature has documented the existence of feelings of group identity and the recognition that local communities are viable entities with increasing socialization and political functions. The emphasis which urban ecologists have placed on the processes leading to social integration characterizes the immigrant ghetto, or ethnic village, as temporary, potentially distintegrative and a barrier to eventual assimilation. Residential proximity increases the probability of social interaction, and persons with similar social positions, values, and expectations tend to locate in relatively close proximity so that group interaction can be maximized and group norms maintained (Marshall & Jiobu, 1975). Over time the different residential areas of a city acquire a social evaluation reflecting the social characteristics of their resident populations, and spatial distance becomes an indicator of social distance. The persistence or emergence of racial and ethnic concentrations in cities should be investigated both as an instance of this general process of residential differentiation among urban populations, and as an aggregate effect of socioeconomic and cultural differences.

It has been suggested by some observers of the urban scene that a combination of high personal mobility and modern communication techniques has rendered the notion of territorial constraints on human association obsolescent. To proponents of this view the concept of community itself becomes devoid of territorial content. To ecologists and geographers, on the other hand, location remains a major determinant of interaction patterns and the concept of community is firmly anchored on a territorial base. Developments in transport and communications technology may have lessened territorial constraints, but place of residence is seen as a major factor in allocating life chances and determining interaction patterns. The whole notion of a territorial base to services (local and other) ensures that locality will continue to be of vital importance in

the organization of society.

Although the research on residential distribution patterns of minority groups is quite extensive, there have been few attempts to conduct a comparative cross cultural investigation of a specific group in order to examine issues related to the urban ecology of minority groups. The Jewish group is generally considered to be an essentially urban population and study of Jewish populations in different historical and cultural settings can assist us in examining strategies of environmental adaptation used by a minority group.

References

- BACHI, R. and V. KLAFF, "L'ecologie Urbaine des sous populations", *Comptes-Rendus du Colloque Démographie et Destin des sous-populations*, Liège, Association Internationale des Démographes de Langue Française, 1981.
- BERRY, B.J.L. and J.D. KASARD, *Contemporary Urban Ecology*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1977.
- BLEDA, S.E., "Socioeconomic, Demographic and Cultural Bases of Ethnic Residential Segregation", *Ethnicity*, Vol. 6, 1979, pp. 147-167.
- BLOCH, B., "Spatial Evolution of the Jewish and General Population of Warsaw: 1792-1939", *Papers in Jewish Demography 1973*, Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, Jewish Population Studies, 1977.
- BOK, W., "Some Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Jewish Population in Greater Brussels", *Papers in Jewish Demography 1977*, Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, Jewish Population Studies, 1980, pp. 163-178.
- BURGESS, W., "The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project", in: Park, R.E., E.W. Burgess, and R.D. McKenzie (eds.), *The City*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- COHEN, R., "Urban Ecology of the Jews in Amsterdam", Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, Institute for Advanced Studies, Working Paper, May 1981.
- DARROCK, A.G. and W.G. MARSTON, "The Social Class Basis of Ethnic Residential Segregation: The Canadian Case", *American Journal of Sociology*, 1971, pp. 491-510.
- DELLAPERGOLA, S., "Toward a Typology of Jewish Population Distribution in European Cities", Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, Institute for Advanced Studies, Working Paper, March, 1981a.

DELLAPERGOLA, S., "Urban Geography of the Jews in Rome and in Milan", Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, "Institute for Advanced Studies, Working Paper, May, 1981b

DRIEDGER, L. and G. CHURCH, "Residential Segregation and Institutional Completeness: A Comparison of Ethnic Minorities", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Vol. 11,1, 1974, pp. 30-52.

DUBB, A.A. and S. DELLAPERGOLA, *Geographical Distribution and Mobility*, South African Jewish Population Study, Advance Report No. 9, Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, 1978.

DUNCAN, O.D. and B. DUNCAN, "Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20, 1955a, pp. 210-217.

DUNCAN, O.D. and B. DUNCAN, "Occupational Stratification and Residential Distribution", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 50, 1955b, pp. 493-503.

FOWLER, F.J., *A Study of the Jewish Population of Greater Boston*, Boston, The Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, 1977.

FREY, W.H., "Black in Migration, White Flight - the Changing Economic Base of the Central City", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 85, No. 6, May, 1980.

GLAZER, N. and D.P. MOYNIHAN, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1963. (Pg. 143 reference to Jewish residential distribution.)

GLAZER, N. and D.P. MOYNIHAN, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, 2nd. ed., Cambridge, MIT Press, 1970.

GOLDSTEIN, S., "Jews in the United States: Perspectives from Demography", *American Jewish Yearbook*, Vol. 81, 1981.

GOLDSTEIN, S., and C. GOLDSCHIEDER, *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1965.

GREELEY, A., *The Demography of Ethnic Identification*, Chicago, Center for the Study of American Pluralism, University of Chicago, 1974.

GUEST, A.M. and J.A. WEED, "Ethnic Residential Segregation: Patterns of Change", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 81, 5, 1976, pp. 1088-1111.

HARRIS, C. and E. ULLMAN, "The Nature of Cities", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 242, 1945, pp. 7-17.

HARTMANN, E.G., *The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant*, New York, University of Columbia Press, 1948.

HAWLEY, A.H. and V.P. ROCK (eds.), *Segregation in Residential Areas*, Washington, National Academy of Sciences, 1973.

HERMAN, J., "The Evolution of the Jewish Population in Prague, 1869-1939", *Papers in Jewish Demography, 1977*, Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, Jewish Population Studies, 1980, pp. 53-68.

HERMALIN, A.I. and R. Farley, "The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 38, (October), 1973, pp. 595-610.

HORWITZ, C.M. and L.J. KAPLAN, *The Estimated Jewish Population of the New York Area: 1900-1975*, New York, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, 1959.

NOYT, H., *The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1928.

JARET, C., "Recent Patterns of Chicago Jewish Residential Mobility", *Ethnicity*, Vol. 6, 1979, pp. 235-248.

JOHNSON, R.J., *Urban Residential Patterns*, London, Bell and Sons, 1971.

JONES, F.L., *Dimensions of Urban Social Structure: The Social Areas of Melbourne, Australia*, University of Toronto Press, 1969.

KANTROWITZ, N., *Ethnic and Racial Segregation in the New York Metropolis, 1961*, New York, Praeger, 1973.

KANTROWITZ, N., "Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation: Boston 1830-1970", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 441, January, 1979, pp. 41-54.

KLAFF, V., "Ethnic Segregation in Urban Israel". *Demography*, Vol. 10, 2, May, 1973, pp. 161-184.

KOSMIN, B., "The Urban Ecology of London Jewry", Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, Institute for Advanced Studies, Working Paper, May, 1981.

KRAUSZ, E., *Leeds Jewry: Its History and Social Structure*, London, W. Heffer & Sons, 1964.

LAGORY, M. and J. PIPKIN, *Urban Social Space*, Belmont, California, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1981.

- LIEBERSON, S., *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*, New York, Free Press, 1963.
- MARSHALL, H. and R. JIOBU, "Residential Segregation in United States Cities: A Causal Analysis", *Social Forces*, Vol. 53, 3, March, 1975, pp. 449-460.
- MARSTON, W.G. and T.L. VAN VALEY, "The Role of Residential Segregation in the Assimilation Process", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 441, January, 1979, pp. 13-25.
- MEHTA, , "Patterns of Residence in Poona (India) by Income, Education, and Occupation", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 73, 1968, pp. 496-508.
- METZGER, L.P., "American Sociology & Black Assimilation: Conflicting Perspectives", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 76, 4, January, 1971, pp. 627-645.
- MURDIE, R.A., *Factorial Ecology of Metropolitan Toronto, 1951-1961*, Chicago, Department of Geography, Research Paper No. 116, University of Chicago, 1969.
- MUSIL, G., "The Development of Prague's Ecological Structure", in: R.E. Pahl (ed.) *Readings in Urban Sociology*, New York, Pergamon Press, 1968.
- NEWMAN, W.M., *American Pluralism: A Study in Minority Groups and Social Theory*, New York, Harper and Row, 1973.
- PARK, R.E., "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and Moral Order", in: R.E. Park, *Human Communities*, New York, The Free Press, 1952.
- PEARCE, D., *Black, White, and Many Shades of Gray: Real Estate Brokers and their Racial Practices*, unpublished, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1976.
- ROSENBERG, L., *The Changes in the Geographic Distribution of the Jewish Population in the Metropolitan Area of Toronto, 1851-1951*, Canadian Jewish Population Studies, Jewish Community Series, No. 2, 1954.
- ROSENTHAL, E., "Acculturation Without Assimilation? The Jewish Community of Chicago, Illinois", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 66, 1961, pp. 275-288.
- SCHERMERHORN, R.A., *These Our People*, Boston, D.C. Heath, 1949.
- SCHNORE, L.F., *Class and Race in Cities and Suburbs*, Chicago, Markham Publishing Company, 1972.

SIMKUS, A.A., "Residential Segregation by Occupation and Race in Ten Urbanized Areas, 1950-1970", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 43, (February), 1978, pp. 81-93.

SORENSEN, A., K.E. TAEUBER, and L.J. HOLLINGSWORTH, JR., "Indexes of Racial Residential Segregation for 109 Cities in the United States, 1940 to 1970", *Sociological Focus*, Vol. 8, 2, 1975, pp. 125-142.

TAEUBER, K.F., "The Effect of Income Redistribution on Racial Residential Segregation", *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, Vol. 4, 1968, pp. 5-14.

TAEUBER, K.E. and A.F. TAEUBER, *Negroes in Cities*, Chicago, Aldine, 1965.

THIGPEN, P., "Blacks in the Housing Market: The Politics of Exclusion", in: R.C. Mendelson and M.A. Quinn (eds.), *The Politics of Housing in Older Urban Areas*, New York, Praeger, 1976.

UYEKI, E.S., "Residential Distribution and Stratification, 1950-60", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 69, 1964, pp. 491-498.

UYEKI, E.S., "Ethnic and Race Segregation, Cleveland, 1910-1970", *Ethnicity*, Vol. 7, 1980, pp. 390-403.

VAN VALEY, T.L., ROOF, W.C., and J.E. WILCOX, "Trends in Residential Segregation: 1960-1970", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 82, 4, 1977, pp. 826-44.

VARADY, D.P., S.J. MANTEL, JR., C. HIRTZ-WASHOFSKY and H. HALPERN, "Suburbanization and Dispersion: A Case Study of Cincinnati's Jewish Population", *Geographical Research Forum*, No. 3, May, 1981, pp. 5-15.

WARNER, W.L. and L. SROLE, *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1945.

WARWICK, N., "Singapore: Ethnic Diversity and its Implications", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 56, 1966, pp. 236-253.

WIRTH, L., *The Ghetto*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1928.