

VOLUME VIII **Studies of Israeli Society**

Immigration to
ISRAEL

Sociological Perspectives

EDITED BY **Elazar Leshem**
Judith T. Shuval

Publication Series of
the Israel Sociological Society

SERIES EDITOR **Ernest Krausz**



Transaction Publishers
New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (U.K.)

Rhetorical Ethnicity of Permanent Sojourners: The Case of Israeli Immigrants in the Chicago Area

Natan Uriely

Introduction

Immigrants who perceive their stay in the host country as a temporary situation are known as sojourners. Various studies have indicated that Israeli immigrants in the United States refuse to accept their stay in the host country as a permanent situation (see Kass and Lipset 1982; Korazim 1985; Shokeid 1988). The sojourner orientation of Israeli immigrants is mainly attributed to the disapproval of emigration from Israel, both in Israel and in the Jewish world.¹ However, none of these studies has investigated developments in the sojourner orientation of Israeli immigrants who remain in the host country.

In this paper I analyze the relationships between types of orientation towards the place of residence and ethnic expressions of Israeli immigrants in Chicago. In terms of types of orientation towards the place of residence, I separate between "settlers" and "sojourners." However, I give close attention to Israeli immigrants who compromise on what I label as a "permanent sojourner" type of orientation. I argue that "permanent sojourners" express a unique form of ethnicity, which I call "rhetorical ethnicity." Moreover, I use the typology of orientations towards the place of residence in order to lay out potential developments in the sojourn experience after remaining in the host country for a substantial number of years.

The research is based on a field study of two discrete status group of Israeli immigrants in the Chicago area. The higher-status group con-

sists of highly educated professionals, and most of its members are of Ashkenazic descent.² Members of the lower-status group are self-employed in non-professional type occupations. They do not have a college education, and most of them are of Sephardic descent. The study relies on snowball sampling, through which I reached members of networks from the two separate status groups. The research is based on field work methods, such as in-depth interviews, participant observation, and archival data. The main source of data are 36 in-depth interviews (i.e. 19 interviews with members of the lower-status group and 17 interviews with members of the higher-status group). However, the data collection also consists of field notes that were taken over a period of two years, and written material, such as personal letters, leaflets, periodicals, and official documents of Israeli institutions in Chicago.

Theoretical Issues in the Study of Sojourners

The "Sojourner" concept was introduced by Paul Siu (1952) in his study of Chinese laundrymen in Chicago. These Chinese immigrants, who did not plan to settle permanently in the host country, were portrayed by Siu as a new type of stranger. The sojourner, who might be a foreign student, foreign worker, or any other kind of foreigner, is mainly characterized by his orientation as a temporary resident in the host country. Some examples of immigrant groups who express such an orientation are Chinese in America (Loewen 1971), Yemeni immigrants in Detroit (Swanson 1988), Japanese in America (Mahajani 1960: xix), Indians in South Africa (Klein 1990), or Indians in Malaya and Burma (Doston and Doston 1967).

Siu's portrayal of the sojourner as a distinct type of stranger is related to the well-established concepts of Simmel's "stranger" (1908; 1950; 1971), and Park's "marginal man" (1928). Park, who considered his "marginal man" as an equivalent to Simmel's "stranger," described the marginal man as a stranger who aspires to be assimilated but is excluded from full membership in both his old and new worlds. As a result, the marginal man suffers spiritual instability, restlessness, intensified self-consciousness, and malaise. By contrast, Simmel's "stranger" does not aspire to be assimilated. He is confident, successful, and an attractive human being. Simmel's stranger is "the potential wanderer who has not go over the freedom of coming and going." Hence, he is characterized more by duality than by marginality (see Levine et al. 1976). Siu, who followed Park's approach of marginality did not find aspects of marginality among the Chinese laundrymen in Chicago. Therefore, he referred to the sojourner as a distinct type of stranger. In

fact his findings suggest that unlike other immigrants who are members of minority groups, the sojourner represents a type of stranger which is closer to Georg Simmel's notion of the stranger than to Robert Park's notion of the marginal man. This relationship between sojourning, strangerhood, and marginality is one of the main interests of this paper.

The explanatory power of the "sojourner" concept rests on its definition as a type of orientation expressed by immigrants. When such an orientation characterizes groups of immigrants upon arrival, it is possible to view it as a product of social conditions in the country of origin. However, the sojourner orientation might also be perceived as a determinant of the immigrant's career in the receiving country. Such usage of the sojourner concept, as a condition that modifies the immigrant experience, is made by Edna Bonacich (1973) in her theory of middleman minorities. Bonacich argues that having the sojourner's orientation is a necessary condition for the social and economic formation of the middleman pattern. In short, the economic effects include a willingness to undergo short-term deprivation in order to fulfill the long-term goal, which is the return to the homeland. The social consequence of having the sojourner's orientation is the development of a high level of internal ethnic solidarity and the avoidance of establishing out-group relationships. This tendency is expressed in resistance to out-marriage, residential segregation, perpetuation of cultural traits, and a tendency to avoid local politics. The relationship between the sojourner orientation and ethnic expressions is another major interest of this paper.

At one point in her discussion on sojourners, Bonacich (1973) refers to immigrants who arrived with a sojourner's orientation but remain in the host country without any concrete plans of return. In so doing, Bonacich actually stresses the notion of a process in which the sojourner orientation might be altered from one situation to the other. Bonacich refers to these sojourners who remain in the host country as immigrants who are ambivalent towards their place of residence, and she suggests that remaining in the land of one's sojourn might be dealt with in two forms: a) One may relinquish dreams of the homeland and act toward integration in the accepting country. b) One can maintain the sojourner orientation in a mythical way. The latter option is presented as a type of orientation that mainly includes symbolic aspects with some concrete substance of ethnic attachment, such as sending funds to the homeland, occasional visits, and resistance to assimilation. This type of orientation might include mythical aspects of ethnic attachment, such as the Jewish expression "Next year in Jerusalem." A similar continu-

ing commitment to homeland was found by Sheldon Stryker (1959), who studied Parsi emigrants.

The scope of alternative responses to the situation described by Bonacich and the factors that determine the choice between these alternative responses are yet to be studied. In this paper I refer to Israeli immigrants who remain in the host country and maintain their sojourner orientation as "permanent sojourners." I stress the notion of the sojourn experience as a process, and I refer to the specific situation of remaining in the country of one's sojourn as a subsequent stage of the process.

New Forms of Ethnicity in the United States

The sociological literature on immigrants in America was dominated for many years by the "melting pot" theory. From this perspective American society is pictured as a melting pot in which different immigrant groups are assimilated structurally and culturally over a few generations. The "melting pot" perspective was challenged in the 1960s and the 1970s by scholars who heralded an ethnic revival in America (For example, see Glaser and Moynihan 1963; Greeley 1971, 1974; Novak 1973). This approach suggests that ethnic differences still exist and are manifested in the political and cultural dimensions of American society. The theoretical shift from the "melting pot" perspective towards the revival of ethnicity approach was expressed in the growing interest in forms and determinants of ethnicity.

Ethnicity—defined in terms of frequent patterns of association and identification with a common origin (Yancey et al. 1976)—is treated in contemporary works as a social phenomenon that can be manifested in various ways and altered by a variety of social conditions. Therefore, rather than focussing on cultural traits of different ethnic groups, current studies of ethnicity attempt to explore forms, levels, and determinants of ethnic attachment. Theoretical models, such as "emergent ethnicity" (Yancey et al. 1976), "reactive ethnicity" (see Hechter 1975, 1978, Nielsen 1985, Hwang 1991), and the "competition" model (see Hannan 1979; Olzak 1982; Portes and Bach 1985), are mainly focussed on the social conditions that mobilize expressions of ethnicity. Theoretical concepts, such as "situational ethnicity" (Etzioni 1959; Paden 1967; Okamura 1981), "dime store ethnicity" (Stein and Hill 1977), and "symbolic ethnicity" (Gans 1979), describe various forms of ethnic expression.

The interest in forms of ethnicity was raised in studies of descendants of turn of the century European immigrants in America. The socio-economic mobility and suburbanization of this population was followed by the appearance of new forms of ethnicity. Some analysts of ethnicity who noticed this development refer to it as the "new ethnicity" (see Waters 1990). Terms such as "situational ethnicity" (Etzioni 1959), or "dime store ethnicity" (Stein and Hill 1977) are products of theories that deal with the "new ethnicity." However, the most prominent theory about the "new ethnicity" is known as "symbolic ethnicity" (see Gans 1979; Alba 1990; Waters 1990). This concept has been applied to the later generations of turn of the century European immigrants (third, fourth and beyond) who have climbed the social ladder and become members of the American middle class. It is argued that for them ethnicity does not play a significant role in any aspect of life. Ethnicity does not affect their opportunities in life and it does not even take a significant role in their cultural lives. Their ethnic attachment is manifested solely in their self identity. Identifying with an ethnic origin in a symbolic way means that such identifications are not usually followed by ethnic activity other than eating ethnic food or celebrating one or two ethnic holidays in a year. It is suggested that identifying with ethnic origin is "costless" in social terms, and is a way of decorating a person's self-presentation. In addition, ethnic identity in this case is conceived as optional, or in other words as a voluntaristic social action.

In this paper I introduce a new form of ethnic attachment, as it is expressed by those Israeli immigrants whom I refer to as "permanent sojourners." This form of ethnicity, which I label as "rhetorical ethnicity," includes some of the main features of "symbolic ethnicity." However, it also consists of some key elements which are not found in other known forms of ethnicity.

Types of Orientations toward Place of Residence

The interviews reveal that Israeli immigrants in this study express three types of orientation towards place of residence. A typology of these orientations is presented in Table 1. Types of orientations are arranged on a vertical continuum by: (a) the presence or absence of general intentions of returning to the country of origin; (b) the presence or absence of concrete plans of returning to the country of origin.

The top row in this table presents my definition of a "sojourner" orientation. This type of orientation is characterized by the presence of

TABLE 1
A Typology of Orientations toward Place of Residence

	General Intentions of Returning to the Homeland	Concrete Plans of Returning to the Homeland
Sojourner's Orientation	yes	yes
Permanent Sojourner's Orientation	yes	no
Settler's Orientation	no	no

general intentions and concrete plans of returning to the homeland. Those who hold this type of orientation usually have a definite notion towards the time-period of staying in the host country. The middle row presents what I label as a "permanent sojourner" orientation. This type of orientation is characterized by the presence of general intentions of returning to the homeland, combined with the absence of concrete plans of returning to the homeland. Those who hold this type of orientation do not have a definite notion of the duration of their stay in the host country. The bottom row presents my definition of a "settler" orientation. This type of orientation is characterized by the absence of either general or concrete plans of returning to the country of origin. Those who hold this type of orientation consider their stay in the host country as a permanent situation.

The above described types of orientations towards place of residence might characterize different types of immigrant groups. The interviews reveal that most of the higher-status Israeli immigrants hold a "permanent sojourner" type of orientation, while most of the lower-status immigrants hold a "settler" type of orientation. By following the above described typology, 82 percent of the higher-status group interviewees could be defined as "permanent sojourners," 6 percent as "sojourners," and 12 percent as "settlers." By contrast, only 26 percent of the lower-status interviewees could be defined as "permanent sojourners," none of them as a "sojourner," and 74 percents as "settlers" (see Table 2).

In the following section I will lay out the manifestations of the "settler" orientation as expressed by the lower-status Israeli immigrants. However, in the remainder of this article I will focus on the higher-status Israeli immigrants in order to portray potential stages in the experience of sojourners who remain in the receiving country.

TABLE 2
Orientation towards the Place of Residence as Expressed
by Israeli Immigrants in Chicago

	Higher-Status Group	Lower-Status Group	Total
Sojourner	6 percent	—	3 percent
Permanent Sojourner	82 percent	26 percent	53 percent
Settler	12 percent	74 percent	44 percent

N=17 n=19 n=36

The Lower-Status Israeli Immigrants as "Settlers"

The lower-status Israeli immigrants in this study are characterised by their notion of a permanent move to the host country. For example, this is manifested in terms of their legal immigration status. Compared to 58 percent of the higher-status interviewees, 95 percent of the lower-status interviewees have acquired American citizenship or a "green card" (i.e. a legal status of a Permanent Resident). However, this pattern of permanency was mainly indicated by the accounts of the lower-status interviewees concerning their future plans. The following described accounts allow me to portray the lower-status Israeli immigrants as "settlers."

The interviews reveal that the lower-status Israeli immigrants who express a "settler" type of orientation explain it by referring mainly to economic circumstances. Most of the lower-status interviewees have succeeded to build a business of their own in the host country. Moreover, since most of them are not professionals, they do not have a secure job waiting for them in the home country. Therefore, they fear losing their economic security by giving up their business in the host country. For example, one of the lower-status interviewees, a self-employed contractor named Miki, have told me:³ "It is possible that I will stay here for good. I was able to establish good connections, and my business is moving in the right direction. On the other hand, I lost most of my connections in Israel, and at my age [40-years-old] it would be hard to start over. I just hope that I will be able to visit Israel more times than I have been."

A similar response was given by a painting-contractor named Yair. This immigrant, who arrived in America nine years ago, told me: "Al-

though I did not become reach, and although I went through “ups” and “downs” with my business I feel good here...I work hard, but I have a business that I have built and run by myself. As a man I feel proud about it, and I do not want to lose it.”

The same fear of economic insecurity in the homeland is expressed by many of the lower-status interviewees who told me that they do not intend to work if they return to Israel. Therefore, as they put it, “We need a lot of money in order to return to Israel.” This attitude is manifested in my conversation with an owner of an Israeli restaurant named Jack, who arrived in Chicago 22 years ago:

Q—“Do you plan to return to Israel?”

A—“I do not think so, I have to stay here for the business.”

Q—“People say that they come to your restaurant for your cooking. You could make the same good food in Israel. Did you consider the possibility of moving the same restaurant to Israel?”

A—“Israel is not a good place for business. There is too much competition, and ‘Mas-hachnasa’ [the national Israeli income-tax agency] is climbing on your back. I will not return to Israel unless I do not have to work anymore. For that I need about a half million dollars...\$200,000 in order to buy an apartment, and the rest of it should be working for me in the bank.”

Jack’s complaints about the Israeli income-tax represent a common notion held by the self-employed Israeli immigrants. Furthermore, many of them stated that the Israeli bureaucracy is one of the reasons for their stay in America. This attitude is manifested in the following account, offered by an owner of an auto-repair garage named Yaakov:

Five years ago I wanted to return to Israel. In order to open a similar business to the one that I have here, I had to get a license from the Ministry of labor and Industry. I went to their offices twice, but the clerk that I had to meet with was not at work. At the third time that I came, I said to the people in that office that I am not going home until someone will serve me.... To make a long story short, I did not get the required license. This is only one example of the problems you face in Israel when you are self-employed. Here, everything is easy, you can not open a business without going through a bureaucratic hell, and without having the government treating you as a potential criminal.

The interviews reveal that the “settler” orientation expressed by the lower-status interviewees is related to their circumstances of arrival in America. Most of the lower-status Israeli immigrants did not arrive in America under a time-limited job contract, or as students. Nor did they have in mind a definite duration to their stay in America. All of the

lower-status interviewees proclaimed that they were welcomed in Chicago by relatives or friends who invited them. Some of them told me that they came to travel in America, others came because of their spouse, and many of them said that they came to America "hoping to make money in America." However, compared to 84 percent of the higher-status interviewees, only 11 percent of the lower-status interviewees said that they had in mind a definite duration for their stay in America at the stage of arrival .

The "settler" type of orientation expressed by the lower-status Israeli immigrants is a central aspect of their adaptation to life in America. The findings of this study show that their notion of a permanent stay in the host country is followed by their readiness to assimilate to the Jewish-American community. However, the analysis of this process of assimilation to the proximal host group is beyond the scope of this paper.

The Sojourn Experience of the Higher-Status Israeli Immigrants

The interviewees' retrospective accounts indicate that most of the lower-status Israeli immigrants arrived in the host country without a definite duration for their stay in the United States. By contrast, all of the higher-status interviewees, who hold a "permanent sojourners" type of orientation, held a "sojourner" orientation upon their arrival in the host country. In other words, most of the higher-status interviewees arrived in the United States as "sojourners" and became "permanent sojourners" as the time of their residence in the host country lengthened. Therefore, I perceive their immigrant experience as a dynamic process, in which the above-presented types of orientation characterize different stages of it.

The "Sojourner" Upon Arrival in the Host Country

The findings show that almost all members of the higher status group of Israeli immigrants in this study arrived in the United States as students or as hired professionals. At the stage of arrival, most of them had in mind a definite duration to their stay in the host country, which was limited by the time-period of their work contract or their time-limited scholarship. At this initial stage of the process, the sojourner holds what I call the "sojourner" orientation. The sojourner has a definite notion towards the time-period of staying in the host country and concrete plans of returning to the homeland. Examples of those who

are in this stage of the sojourn experience are members of the Israeli consular staff, delegates of Israeli international companies, students, and visiting professors in Academic Institutions. Members of these categories tend to exclude themselves from the stigmatized group of "yordim," on the grounds of their concrete plans of returning. For example, this tendency is expressed by a spouse of a delegate in an Israeli Bank in Chicago: "We do not face the problem of most Israelis who live here. From the beginning we knew that we had come for five years at most. Hence, it was much easier for us in all respects."⁴

This statement also indicates that the sojourn experience at this stage is free from aspects of discomfort. Like Siu (1952), who did not find aspects of marginality among the Chinese sojourners in his study, I argue that Israeli "sojourners" do not resemble Park's "marginal man." They do not wish to be accepted as members of the host society, they are not yet stigmatized in their homeland as "yordim," and they do not show signs of restlessness or intensified self-consciousness. Moreover, the findings suggest that Israeli "sojourners" perceive their stay in the United States as a gratifying experience, and believe that being abroad for a while adds a cosmopolitan flavor to their image at home. For example, a spouse of an Israeli student said to me: "I feel lucky, because I have the opportunity to experience life in another country. I believe that many of my friends in Israel envy me because of that."

This positive view towards the sojourn experience is related to the notion that the situation of living out of the homeland is just a limited episode.

Becoming a "Permanent Sojourner"

The initial stage of the sojourn experience usually ends with the termination of the originally planned period for staying in the host country that the sojourner had in mind. Remaining in the host country after that involves a change of orientation toward the place of residence. As suggested by Bonacich (1973), there is a possibility that the sojourner will renounce his plans of returning to the homeland and decide to stay in the host country. In such a case, the sojourn experience ends, and the "sojourner" becomes a "settler" who wishes to be integrated in the host society. However, the findings of this study show that 82 percent of the interviewees from the higher status group are sojourners who remain in the host country and do not adopt a "settler" orientation. Instead, they enter a new stage in their sojourn experience, which could be charac-

terized by the presence of an ambivalent orientation towards their place of residence. These immigrants, whom I label as "permanent sojourners," maintain their general intentions of returning to Israel. However, they do not have any concrete plans of returning and cannot point to a specific finite duration for their stay in the host country. When asked about specific plans or expected time of returning to Israel, they tend to give vague answers, such as "when I have enough money for that" or... "when I get a good job offer in Israel" or... "in about three or five years." Moreover, it seems that some of their concrete actions indicate their intention of remaining in the host country. My findings show that 52 percent of the interviewees from the higher status group hold U.S. citizenship, and that 87 percent of them bought a house or an apartment in the United States. When asked about these facts, they claim that these steps are instrumental and do not contradict their intentions of returning to Israel. For example, an Israeli who just bought an apartment says: "My decision to buy this apartment is an economic one, and it is not related to my intention to return to Israel in the future. Whenever I want to return I can sell the apartment, and for the time being, I prefer to pay rent to myself."

The findings show that unlike the initial stage of the sojourn experience, and similar to the immigrant experience of Park's "marginal man," the state of being a "permanent sojourner" involves elements of psychological discomfort. One aspect of discomfort is the sense permanent sojourners have of being full members neither to the country of origin, nor to the host country. Israeli "permanent sojourners" in this study fear being excluded from membership in Israeli society. They wish to be considered as Israelis who temporarily live abroad, and they express high sensitivity towards the "yordim" stigma.⁵ Most of them deny that they are "yordim" and state that the use of the term "yordim" annoys them. In addition to their sense of being excluded from membership in their country of origin, they choose not to be full members in the host country. For example, an Israeli speech therapist, who has already sojourned in America for twenty one-years, said to me: "As a professional I know that living in a place without a sense of belonging might cause psychological distress, such as depression, lack of control, or anxiety. However, I purposely do not get involved in American life, and do not try to feel that I belong here, because I want to return to Israel."

Moreover, Israeli "permanent sojourners" experience embarrassment, guilt feelings, and anxiety as a result of the dissonance between their expressed plans of returning and their continuing stay in the host coun-

try. These aspects of psychological discomfort are especially intensified in reference to the difficulties of their children. A good example of the kind of discomfort which characterizes "permanent sojourners" is the account of an interviewee who has lived in Chicago for twenty years and just decided to prolong her stay:

We always thought of ourselves as temporaries here, and we always asserted our plans to return to Israel in about two or three years...I feel embarrassed because everybody knows us as "those who will return in two years." Although we still think of going back to Israel, I have decided not to talk about it anymore...I blame myself and my husband for always stressing our intention to go back, because it hurts our son who always believed that we would go back to Israel, and therefore avoided deep contacts with Americans of his age. The notion of being temporaries hurts us as well...It created a barrier that kept us out of community life, and after so many years of being centered around my family and my close friends, I feel the need of being involved in a larger community.

Being a permanent sojourner is not necessarily a permanent situation in the sojourn experience. My findings indicate that although most of the permanent sojourners in this study maintain their wish of returning to Israel, some of them express doubts, even concerning their general intentions of returning to Israel. These Israeli immigrants are in a stage transition from being "permanent sojourners" toward becoming "settlers." The following examples represent the beginning of uncertainty in the general intention of returning to Israel. An Israeli immigrant who arrived in America thirteen years ago says: "I used to deny the possibility of staying here for ever; I always wanted and still do want to return to Israel. However, I am aware that it is not so simple anymore. Hence, I would like to give it a try for one year, and for that to happen we need the extra money for one year in Israel."

Such changes in the general intention of returning to Israel might also take the form of a compromise on dual residence. An Israeli who emigrated from Israel twenty four years ago says: "Our business always forced us to stay outside of Israel for long periods, and I do not see how it's going to change. After so many years we are willing to accept the possibility of living part of each year in Israel and parts of it in Chicago...and in fact we have done it more and more in the last few years."

It should be stated that the above described order of stages in the sojourn experience represents a potential but not a necessary direction of change in the orientation towards the place of residence. For example, the sojourner might not go through the "permanent sojourner" experience. That might happen if the sojourner returns to his or her homeland after the extermination of the originally planned period for

staying in the host country, or if the sojourner who remains in the host country adopts a "settler" type of orientation. Moreover, it is possible that an immigrant who arrives with a "settler" orientation will adopt a "permanent sojourner" or a "sojourner" type of orientation. However, only few of the Israeli immigrants in this study experienced such a direction of change in their orientation towards their place of residence. As mentioned above, most Israeli "permanent sojourners" in this study arrived in the host country as "sojourners."

Rhetorical Ethnicity

The findings indicate that the discrepancy between the general intentions and the concrete plans of returning is just one aspect of the form of ethnic attachment expressed by Israeli "permanent sojourners." This form of ethnicity, which I label as "rhetorical ethnicity," involves a strong commitment to the country of origin at the symbolic level, but with almost no manifestations of ethnicity in terms of community activities, membership in ethnic organizations, or ethnic neighborhoods.

The strong commitment to the country of origin is manifested in the level of ethnic identity. Israeli "permanent sojourners" maintain a distinctive ethnic identity, which relies on their homeland nationality. They tend to perceive themselves as "Israelis who live abroad" and resent any identification as Americans, or Israeli-Americans. Even those Israelis who have American citizenship deny it as a part of their identity: "I am an Israeli with an American passport" suggests one of them. "When I went to get my American citizenship, I did not sing the American anthem...I felt uncomfortable, but it makes things more convenient" says another.

The Jewish source of ethnic identity, which could lead them towards assimilation into the American Jewish Community, is denied as a religious source of identity or as a major component of their ethnic identity.⁶ The following comment, made by an Israeli "permanent sojourner," represents a common notion toward the Jewish part of his identity: "yes I identify myself as a Jew, but that is more an integrated part of my being Israeli than a religious identity. I also feel different than Jewish-Americans, although we are all Jews."

Symbolic commitment to Israel is also expressed by the following: being exposed to and aware of news from Israel, discussing the political situation in Israel at home and with friends, expressing the longing to return to Israel, sending the children to an Israeli Sunday school,

eating Israeli food, listening to Israeli music, and participating in a few organized cultural activities, such as Israeli folk dancing, and reading-groups of Israeli literature.

In contrast to the strong and asserted ethnic attachment at the symbolic level, Israeli "permanent sojourners" are not affected by their ethnicity in terms of occupation, place of residence, membership in formal organization, or exposure to ethnic discrimination. In terms of occupational integration, Israelis in Chicago are spread over different occupations without any connection to their ethnicity. In terms of place of residence they do not tend to live in segregated Israeli neighborhoods, but in mixed neighborhoods with a relatively high concentration of Jews. Most of them are not affiliated with voluntary Israeli organizations, and they do not tend to get services, such as health or insurance, from other members of their ethnic group. Their integration is also manifested by the existence of social ties they have with native colleges, and by their statements that they were not exposed to discrimination or prejudiced attitudes by members of the host country.

It should be stressed, however, that Israeli "permanent sojourners" are committed to their statements of ethnic attachment, even when their real wishes or concrete actions indicate the opposite. For example, when asked about their social ties with Americans they referred to it as "only instrumental" and argued that they have "real friendship" only with fellow Israelis. Moreover, when asked about the possibility of sending their children to serve in the Israeli army one interviewee says: "to tell you the truth, I would not be very happy about it, but I would not say no after all these years of talking about my service in the army."

Conclusions

In this study I analyzed the relationships between types of orientation towards the place of residence and ethnic expressions of Israeli immigrants in Chicago. In addition to the distinction between the "sojourner" and the "settler" types of orientation, I point on a group of immigrants who compromise on what I call a "permanent sojourner" type of orientation. The findings suggest that this type of orientation is usually expressed by immigrants who held "sojourner" type of orientation upon their arrival in the host country. Therefore, I argue that the sojourn experience should be analyzed as a dynamic process that includes two different stages.

The initial stage of the sojourn experience is characterized by the presence of the "sojourner" type of orientation. The findings indicate that those who are in this stage of the sojourn experience perceive it as a gratifying experience. It is suggested that the positive view towards the sojourn experience at this stage is related to the notion that the sojourn experience is just a temporary episode. The second stage of the sojourn experience is characterized by the presence of a "permanent sojourner" type of orientation. This stage of the process is experienced by sojourners who remain in the host country but do not adopt a "settler" type of orientation. The findings indicate that in contrast to the initial stage in the sojourn experience, being a "permanent sojourner" involves psychological aspects of discomfort. Israeli "permanent sojourners" in this study go through embarrassment, guilt feelings, longing to return to the homeland, and a sense of not being a full member of either the homeland society or the society of the host country. The findings also indicate that some of these aspects of discomfort result from the ambivalent nature of the "permanent sojourner" type of orientation.

The above described stages of the sojourn experience suggest that the sojourner concept, as it was introduced by Paul Siu (1952), should be more specified. Both, the "sojourner" and the "permanent sojourner" fit Simmel's notion of the stranger as "the man who comes today and stays tomorrow" (1908; 1950; 1971). However, I argue that in all other respects the "sojourner" upon his arrival in the host country is not the same type of stranger as the "permanent sojourner." The "sojourner" of this study, is more similar to Simmel's "stranger," who basically enjoys his position as a stranger, while the "permanent sojourner," is more similar to Park's "marginal man" (1928), who suffers psychological discomfort.

The form of ethnicity expressed by Israeli "permanent sojourners" is just one of the possible reactions to the situation of remaining in the country of one's sojourn. This form of ethnic attachment shares some similarities with other known forms of ethnicity, yet it represents a distinctive type of ethnicity. The above described characteristics of what I labeled as "rhetorical ethnicity" are quite similar to the characteristics attributed in the literature to "symbolic ethnicity." In both, ethnic identity is optional; it is costless in terms of social mobility and ethnic activities are mainly symbolic. However, although "rhetorical ethnicity" is also expressed only at the symbolic level, it involves a higher level of ethnic commitment, than "symbolic ethnicity." In terms of ethnic identity, the "rhetorical ethnicity" of Israeli "permanent sojourners" is

not just a marginal component of their self identity, as it is for those who practice “symbolic ethnicity,” but a central component of their self-identity. These two forms of ethnicity also differ in terms of the carriers, and the circumstances of their evolvement. “Symbolic ethnicity” is practiced by members of the third and fourth generations of turn of the century European immigrants, who search for additional sources of self-identity. “rhetorical ethnicity” is expressed by members of the first generation of Israeli “permanent sojourners,” who face psychological discomfort as a result of remaining in the country of their sojourn. Hence, it seems that while “Symbolic Ethnicity” is a strategy applied by those who search for sources of identity, “Rhetorical Ethnicity” could be a reaction of those who fear the threat of losing their ethnic or national identity.

Notes

I would like to thank Peter Kivisto, Moshe Semyonov, and R. Stephen Warner for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

1. The phenomenon of Israeli emigration has come to be known in Israel as “yerida” (descent) and its participants as “yordim” (those who go down). These terms denote the opposite of “aliya”(ascent) and “olim” (those who go up) and represent the official and mainstream Zionist ideology which encourages immigration of Jews to Israel and delegitimizes emigration from Israel. Therefore, the sojourner orientation, which is expressed by Israeli immigrants in the United States is explained as a denial of the “yordim” stigma.
2. The distinction between “Ashkenazim” and “Sephardim” is the main ethnic distinction within the Jewish population of Israel. “Ashkenazim” are Jews of European or American descent, and “Sephardim” are Jews of African or Asian origin.
3. All quotes from interviews are translated by me from Hebrew.
4. All quotes from interviews are translated by me from Hebrew.
5. I was a witness to several occasions in which Israelis who hold a “permanent sojourner” orientation manifested their desire to remain full members of Israeli society. One of these occasions was a meeting of Israeli immigrants of the higher status group with an Israeli consul in Chicago, during the Gulf War. Some of the Israeli immigrants in that meeting complained that the consulate ignores the presence of an Israeli community in Chicago. They asked to be involved in pro-Israeli activities, and argue that they can be better representatives of Israel than members of the local American Jewish community.
6. All of the interviewees from the higher status group considered their Jewish identity as a part of their Israeli identity. However, 47% of the interviewees from the lower status group consider themselves first of all as Jews, and then as Israelis.

References

- Alba, Richard D. 1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*. New Haven and London. Yale University Press.

- Bonacich, Edna. 1973. "A Theory of Middleman Minorities" *American Sociological Review*. 38:583-94.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1959. "The Ghetto—a Re-evaluation." *Social Forces*. 39:225-62.
- Gans, Herbert. 1979. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 2:1-20.
- Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Moynihan. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- Greeley, Andrew M. 1971. *Why Can't They Be Like Us*. New York: Dutton.
- . 1974. *Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance*. New York: Wiley.
- Doston, Floyd and Lillian Doston. 1967. "Indian and Coloreds in Rhodesia and Nyasaland." Pp. 77-95. in Milton L. Barron (ed.) *Minorities in a Changing World*. New York: Knopf.
- Hannan, Michael T. 1979. "The dynamics of ethnic boundaries in modern states." Pp. 253-75. in John W. Meyer and Michael T. Hannan (eds.) *National Development and the World System*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hechter, Michael. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hechter, Michael. 1978. "Group Formation and the Cultural Division of Labor" *American Journal of Sociology* 84:293-318.
- Hwang, Sean-Shong. 1991. "Ethnic Enclosure or Ethnic Competition: Ethnic Identification Among Hispanics in Texas," *The Sociological Quarterly*. 32:469-476.
- Kass, Drora, and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1982. "Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1967 to the Present: Israelis and Others." In *Understanding American Jewry*, edited by Marshal. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Kass, Drora, and Seymour Martin Lipset 1984. "Israelis in Exile" (in Hebrew) *Tfutsot Israel*. Vo. 22 No. 2 pp. 109-119.
- Klein, Gary D. 1990. "Sojourning and Ethnic Solidarity: Indian South Africans" *Ethnic Groups*. 8:1-13.
- Korazim, Joseph. 1983. "Israeli Families in New York City: Utilization of Social Services, Unmet Needs and Policy Implications." *Ph.D. diss.* Columbia University, School of Social Work.
- Mahajani, Usha. 1960. *The Role of Indian Minorities in Burma and Malaya*. Bombay: Vora
- Nielsen, Francois, 1985. "Toward a Theory of ethnic Solidarity in Modern Societies" *American Sociological Review*. 50:133-149.
- Novak, Michael. 1973. *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies*. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Levine, Donald N., Ellwood Carter, and Eleanor Gorman. 1976. "Simmel's Influence on American Sociology" *American Journal of Sociology*. 81: 813-45
- Loewen, James W. 1971. *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Okamura, Jonathan Y. 1981. "Situational Ethnicity" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 4 (November)452-65.
- Olzak, Susan, and Elizabeth West. 1991. "Ethnic Conflict and the Rise and Fall of Ethnic Newspapers" *American Sociological Review*. 56:458-73.
- Paden, John N. 1967. "Situational Ethnicity in Urban Africa with Special Reference to the Hausa." Paper presented at African Studies Association Meeting in New York. November.
- Park, Robert E. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man" *American Journal of Sociology*. 33 (May) 881-93.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Robert Bach. 1985. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in The United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

542 Immigration to Israel: Sociological Perspectives

- Simmel, Georg. 1908. *Sociologie*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humbolt.
- . Georg. 1950. "The stranger," in K.H. Wolff (ed.), *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.
- . Georg. 1971. *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Siu., Paul, C.P. 1952. "The Sojourner." *American Journal of Sociology* 58(July):34-44.
- Shokeid, Moshe. 1988. *Children of Circumstances: Israeli Immigrants in New York*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Stein, Haward F., and Robert Hill. 1977. *The Ethnic Imperative: Examining the New White Ethnic Movement*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Stryker, Sheldon. 1959 "Social Structure and Prejudice" *Social Problems*. 6:340-54.
- Swanson, John C. 1988. "Sojourners and Settlers in Yemen and America." in *Sojourners and Settlers: The Yemeni Immigrant Experience*. Ed. by Jonathan Friedlander, Ron Kelly, and Sheila Pinkel. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Yancey, William L., Eugene Ericksen and Juliani Richard 1976. "Emergent Ethnicity: A Review and Reformation." *American Sociological Review* 41:391-403.