

RELIGION AND ETHNICITY AMONG JEWS

BERNARD LAZERWITZ, PH.D. AND EPHRAIM TABORY, PH.D.

Department of Sociology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel

This article reviews research on the relationship of religion and ethnicity to neighborhood interaction in Israel and to involvement in the Jewish community in the United States. It highlights one major difference between Israel and the Diaspora. Whereas in Israel, ethnicity is a barrier to interaction that is reduced by a common religiocultural system, in the United States ethnicity is the foundation of Jewish involvement.

Israel's heterogeneous Jewish groups, their differences produced by centuries of social and geographic isolation from one another, are now coming into increasingly close contact. As this happens, how do Jewish ethnic differences combine with the Jewish religion to enable such different Jewish groups to relate to one another? And, when a very large Jewish community, such as that of the United States, becomes increasingly homogeneous, how does ethnicity combine with religion to better integrate Jews into their local organized Jewish communities? By reviewing research on ethnicity and religion in Jewishly heterogeneous Israel and in the relatively homogeneous United States, one can better understand how the Jews of today and tomorrow can use religion in combination with ethnicity to overcome communal barriers.

ISRAEL: A COMMON RELIGION AMIDST ETHNIC DIFFERENCES

In Israel today, the majority Jewish society (68% of the population within the borders of the original British mandate) includes such disparate ethnic groups as Jews from India to those from Ethiopia, from the Moslem countries stretching from Morocco to Afghanistan, as well as Jews from Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of

Independent States (formerly the Soviet Union), South Africa, Australia, and the Americas. Although professing a common religious origin, centuries of separation and the differential impact of modernization have greatly diluted, although not eliminated, the religious commonality that once existed among most Jews.

Much day-to-day interethnic contact takes place within Israel's condominium housing system, which houses an estimated 73% of Israel's population (Werczberger & Ginsberg, 1987). Israeli law requires the owners of apartments in condominium buildings to meet periodically to elect a building management committee from among their ranks. This committee has the task of maintaining the building. Often, before any atypically large expense is incurred, the management committee seeks the approval of a majority of the owner families. The assembly of all the building's families decides on the monthly family fees that are collected by the management committee.

This system operates on a voluntary basis. It also necessitates communication among residents. We surveyed residents of condominium buildings in two neighborhoods to examine the varying impacts of ethnicity and religion on their interaction.

Chaldea: A Prestigious Residential Neighborhood

In the Chaldea neighborhood are found four-story and larger condominium buildings. Generally, only one religiously

Presented at the 1991 meeting of the American Sociological Association.

observant (Orthodox) family lives in any one building.

The neighborhood population is largely middle and upper class. Just over 70% of the religiously observant and 40% of the less religious residents have a university education. About 90% of the respondents in both groups are in the labor force, and many of them are professionals.

In our survey, respondents were asked how often they did a variety of neighborly activities with persons of different levels of religiosity (for study details, see Tabory, 1989). Table 1 shows that most of them seldom have close social contacts with persons of different religiosity levels.

Religious inhabitants do not completely isolate themselves from their less religious neighbors. However, neither do they go out of their way to foster close relationships with them. Religious children in the neighborhood may be seen playing among themselves with practically no contact with less religious youngsters, even those of a similar age and sex who live in the same building.

Yet, the highly religious residents consistently state that they are satisfied with the neighborhood. Their main reason for possibly wanting to move is to live in an even larger apartment or in a free-standing house. If they were to move, they would either want to remain in the Chaldea neighborhood or move to one that is similar to it. They rule out the possibility of living in a neighborhood composed only of other highly religious families.

The religious residents are tolerant of the less religious behavior manifested in the community. Driving and using electrical appliances on Shabbat do not disturb them, and they do not protest against noisy parties as a desecration of the day of rest.

The less religious are also tolerant of the highly religious residents. The "Shabbat best" attire of the religious on Shabbat stands out in contrast to the very casual dress of the nonreligious residents, but little is made of these different dress patterns.

The religious residents also take up some of a building's parking space when they build Sukkot booths, but this too is not a subject of neighborhood contention (although there has been some vandalism of these booths by neighborhood youth in recent years).

Lion: A Working-Class Neighborhood

The Lion neighborhood contains major differences in class, ethnicity, family life cycle, and religiosity. Indeed, the design for this neighborhood deliberately built such differences into Lion.

Lion is a new public housing project built in the southern part of a large city. It occupies most of what was a squatters' village that, for the most part, has been eliminated by urban renewal. At the time the project was studied, it had been occupied for 2 years. It then contained 314 apartments in 31 buildings that were built in five elliptical rings. Three of the buildings are eight-story structures of 30 apartments each. The other buildings contain eight apartments within four-story walk-up structures.

The percentage of religiously observant families is twice as high in the Lion neighborhood as in Chaldea. The religious families in Lion are mainly working-class Sephardic Jews. The synagogues of Lion are often formed by those who come from the same Moslem community or country.

Although historically the Orthodoxy of Sephardic Jews has been less rigid than that of Jews from Eastern Europe, the secular person common to the Chaldea neighborhood is relatively rare in Lion. Few residents revolt against Oriental Orthodox Judaism. Even many of the less religious families follow the dietary laws. Therefore, religious and less religious families can readily live with each other. Participant-observation showed that children's play groups are formed much more on the basis of who lives near whom, without a split into religious and nonreligious play groups typical of Chaldea (for more information on Lion, see Lazerwitz, 1985).

Table 1.

COMBINED FREQUENCY OF HELPING, VISITING, OR GOING OUT WITH RELIGIOUSLY DIFFERENT PERSONS IN THE CHALDEA NEIGHBORHOOD

Frequency of Social Contact	Orthodox with Less Religious (n=79)	Less Religious with Orthodox (n=177)
Daily	6%	4%
Weekly	13%	3%
Several Times a Month	11%	5%
Several Times a Year	13%	4%
Rarely	57%	84%
Base	100%	100%

Table 2 shows the impacts of life cycle, class, religious involvement, and ethnicity upon a variety of relations among neighbors in Lion. In it, age of head of family is an indirect measurement of family life cycle, education of head is the measurement for class, and religiosity is measured by a respondent's self-classification as either a practicing Orthodox Jew, traditional (following some but not all the current practices of Orthodox Judaism), or not religious. Ethnicity is based upon whether a respondent's family derives from Europe or from an Asian-North African country.

The measures of residential integration are (1) an index reflecting the number of friendships formed with neighbors in the same building; (2) a negative-to-positive scale reflecting attitudes toward these same neighbors; (3) the same type of scale reflecting attitudes toward residents living in other Lion buildings; (4) a scale measuring the effectiveness of each of the building committees in maintaining their buildings; (5) respondents' judgments as to whether the Lion project has a negative, neutral, or positive effect on its youth; (6) a scale measuring pride in living in Lion; (7) whether or not respondents would recommend living in Lion to friends; and (8) the extent to which respondents were thinking about moving out of Lion (for statistical details, see Schwartz, 1986).

The multiple regression approach being

used gives the relationship between two variables while statistically controlling for all the other variables in the equation.¹ The statistical impacts show how much a dependent variable would change for one unit of change in an independent variable. For example, in Table 2, the relationship between the independent variable of education of the family head and the dependent variable of friendships with building neighbors is a positive .31 above and beyond the effects of age, religiosity, or ethnicity. It is positive because, as education of family head increases on its low to high scale, friendships with building neighbors increase from low to high on its measurement scale. Finally, for each unit increase in scale value for education, friendships increase by .31 in scale value.

Of the 32 impact values of Table 2, only 8 are less than 0.10, and 5 do not consistently increase or decrease. Fourteen have absolute values of .20 or more, which indicate strong impacts. Five are between .10 to .19 and thus indicate moderate impacts.

Effectiveness of a building committee is associated statistically with older husbands,

¹Impact is measured by "a dummy variable" multiple regression beta values computed by either the multiple classification analysis (MCA) or the multinomial scale analysis (MNA) techniques. For MCA see Andrews, et al., 1969; for MNA, see Andrews and Messenger, 1986.

Table 2.

"DUMMY VARIABLE" MULTIPLE REGRESSION EQUATION VALUES SHOWING THE IMPACTS OF AGE, RELIGIOSITY, EDUCATION AND ETHNICITY ON RESIDENTIAL VARIABLES (LOW-RISES ONLY)

Scale Direction	Age of Head Young=Old	Education of Head Hi-Moderate - Low	Religiosity Rel.=No Rel.	Ethnic Europe-Asian/ African
Friendships with building neighbors				
Lo-Hi	.04	.31	.08	.20
Attitude toward bldg. neighbors				
Neg.-Pos.	.27	.18	*.14	.05
Attitude toward Lion residents outside own bldg.				
Neg.-Pos.	.21	.26	.07	.26
Effectiveness of bldg. committee				
Lo--Hi	.16	*.11	.18	-.25
Attitude toward Lion neighborhood				
Impact of Lion on its youth				
Neg.-Pos.	.06	.02	*.15	.24
Pride in Lion				
No--Yes	.38	.20	.22	.06
Recommend Lion to friends				
No--Yes	.01	*.12	-.18	-.48
Thought about staying in or leaving Lion				
Stay--Leave	.18	*.32	.21	.29

*indicates failure to increase or decrease consistently.

less religiosity, and European background families. Education does not have a consistent increasing or decreasing relationship to building committee effectiveness. Finally, recommending Lion to friends as a place to live is associated with more religiosity and quite strongly with European background families.

Overall, the ethnic factor has the strongest impact, with six values of .20 or larger and just two values of .05 and .06. The other three basic variables — age, education, and religiosity — have similar impacts, with age having five values of .16 or larger, education having four values of .20 or larger, and religiosity having two of .21 and .22.

High-Rise Heterogeneity

Only 6% of the marriages in the low-rise buildings are between Israelis with Oriental

and European backgrounds. However, in the three high-rises there are a considerable number of such marriages — 35% of the 29 young couples are both of Oriental background, 29% are both of European background, and 36% are of mixed Oriental-European backgrounds.

The high-rise couples, as a group, engage in a lot of neighborly activities among themselves, but just about none with the rest of Lion. Hence, there is within the high-rise buildings a self-segregating group of almost exclusively native-born or socialized young Israeli couples of differing ethnic backgrounds. This group provides an excellent opportunity to explore social contacts across ethnic lines, as well as what occurs when a newly emergent group — couples of mixed ethnic backgrounds — enters into the picture (for study details, see Porat, 1985).

Table 3 examines the impact within the high-rises of ethnic background on friendships. It indicates that friendships between families of the two main ethnic groups, European background and Asian-African background Jews, are far from the rule. Both of these ethnic groups, however, do have considerable contacts with the group of couples having mixed ethnic backgrounds.

There is an additional tendency for couples to socialize according to the husband's ethnic background. Couples of European background concentrate 70% of their mixed couple friendship choices among those who are a combination of husband of European background and wife of Asian-African background. Couples of Asian-African backgrounds concentrate 75% of their mixed couple friendship choices among those who are a combination of husband of Asian-African background and wife of European background.

With education such an important variable with regard to friendship formation, additional exploration in this section of the impact of ethnicity upon high-rise friendships is limited to those families whose heads have at least a high-school degree. Also, friendship formation for those with high-school education but with or without children provides double controls, for education and life cycle, within which ethnicity can be observed. Of course, by this point, the number of respondents becomes small. Nevertheless, one can see whether friendship formations among the three types of ethnicity groupings become considerably less segregated.

Tables 4 and 5 indicate no dramatic shift in high-rise friendship formation patterns. Despite the relatively small data base of these tables, ethnicity is shown to continue to be a factor in friendship formation after controlling for education or life cycle. Those couples with mixed ethnic backgrounds continue to link with European or Asian-African background couples. Yet, it is not a simple case of ethnicity acting as a

barrier to friendship within the high-rise structures. If, indeed, sheer ethnic background was the dominant factor in friendship formation, one would expect much more segregation for the mixed background couples.

To what extent do these patterns of social segregation by life cycle, education level, and ethnic background affect within-building leadership? Were the heads of the several high-rise building committees handling day-to-day maintenance from any particular group? They were not — of the eight persons who had headed a high-rise building committee, three were from European background couples, two were from Asian-African background couples, and three were from mixed background couples.

Conclusions about Neighborhood Interaction in Israel

We have looked at the influence of religiosity upon social interaction in Chaldea, an elite neighborhood, and have studied the Lion neighborhood with its class, religion, life cycle, and ethnic mixtures.

Does the "living together - owning together" Israeli condominium system change the mental pictures that these different ethnic or religiosity groups have of one another? All the evidence we have from our work indicates that the answer to this question is "yes, but only within the same building." Residents of the same condominium building do form a more realistic, humane, and understanding picture of the other families living there. When their building committee organization is a more effective one, this realistic, sympathetic understanding of one another is improved.

The Chaldea neighborhood is fairly homogeneous in class and ethnicity. Its major differentiating factor is degree of religiosity. The quite religious inhabitants of this neighborhood segregate themselves from the other residents and have only instrumental interaction with them. They

Table 3.
FRIENDSHIPS BY ETHNICITY

Respondents by Ethnic Backgrounds	Two Most Friendly Families by Ethnic Backgrounds		
	European	Mixed	Asian-African
European background	60%	35%	5%
Mixed backgrounds	18%	59%	23%
Asian-African background	9%	59%	32%

Table 4.
FRIENDSHIPS BY ETHNICITY AMONG COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN AND WITH HEADS WHO ARE HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATES

Respondents by Backgrounds	Two Most Friendly Families by Ethnic Backgrounds		
	European	Mixed	Asian-African
European background	67%	28%	5%
Mixed backgrounds	24%	69%	7%
Asian-African background	50%	50%	0%

Table 5.
FRIENDSHIPS BY ETHNICITY AMONG COUPLES WITH CHILDREN AND WITH HEADS WHO ARE HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATES

Respondents by Backgrounds	Two Most Friendly Families by Ethnic Backgrounds		
	European	Mixed	Asian-African
European background	50%	50%	0%
Mixed backgrounds	12%	50%	38%
Asian-African background	0%	78%	22%

can not eat in the homes of the less observant residents; they discourage their children from playing with less religious children.

Yet, the majority of the less religious residents of Chaldea engage in many Jewish practices because they are steeped in the overall cultural and social traditions of Jews and of Israel. This common religious tradition narrows the gap between the quite religious and everyone else in Chaldea. It blocks the giving of social offenses, creating a "live and let live" social atmosphere.

In Lion, ethnicity is a major social

barrier. It limits social interaction considerably between adults and, to a lesser degree, among children. Yet, the residents of Lion are even more religiously observant, on the whole, than are those of Chaldea.

As with Chaldea, Lion religiosity is based on its residents being steeped in traditional Jewish customs and Israeli norms. This common religiosity, in turn, helps narrow the ethnic barriers of Lion.

The easiest ethnic differences to handle are those that involve minor religious and class differences, such as, for example, differences between American background

Jews and Dutch background Jews, none of whom is highly Orthodox. Then come limited variations in religiosity or family life-cycle differences. However, class differences or major ethnic differences, coupled with considerable religious differences, as found between (CIS) immigrants and Ethiopian immigrants, are substantially different. Quite difficult barriers can arise out of widely varying class-ethnic or class-religious combinations.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH SCENE

During the last quarter of a century there have been two large-scale national studies of American Jewry. The first survey, which included 5790 in-depth interviews, was done in 1970. The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey reported on 1905 interviews with Jewish respondents.²

The Israeli data presented here focus upon contacts across internal Jewish religious or ethnic barriers. The American data were gathered, in part, to examine the relationship of religiosity to Jewish communal involvement. The measures of concern are (1) *religious involvement*: frequency of synagogue attendance and extent of home religious practices; (2) *ethnicity*: the degree to which one's family or orientation, best friends, dating, and courtship experiences have been with fellow Jews and an index of the extent of activity in Jewish community voluntary associations; and (3) *participation in general community voluntary activity*.

1970 National Jewish Population Study (NJPS)

Analyses of the 1970 NJPS (Lazerwitz, 1978, 1981; Lazerwitz et al., 1988) have compared Jewish religiosity and ethnicity with Protestant localism as described in

work by Roof (1972, 1974, 1976, 1978) and Roof and Hoge (1980). Roof developed the concept of localism to help explain church-based religion in contemporary society. It holds that the maintenance of religious commitment in a highly differentiated modern society, with a variety of competing secular and traditional value systems, requires a localistic perspective shared by persons who interact frequently and support each other. Moreover, localism is regarded as the source both of religious commitment and Orthodoxy, on the one hand, and of nonliberal prejudice, on the other. Finally, communal enclaves function as support structures for involvement in formal religious organizations.

The localism concept suggests two general hypotheses: (1) localism is positively related to religiosity, and (2) localism inhibits political liberalism more than does religiosity or religious orthodoxy. The 1970 NJPS data regarding U.S. Jewry relevant to these hypotheses are found in Table 6.

The data do indicate that ethnicity (localism), in one form or another, is positively related to the measures of religiosity used in this study. However, only one ethnicity measure, Jewish primary group involvement, is directly related to each of the measures of religiosity. In contrast, the measure of general community activity is not directly related to any measure of religiosity. The second measure of Jewish ethnicity (or localism), Jewish community organization activity, is related to two measures of religiosity — synagogue membership and synagogue attendance — but not to home religious observance.

It seems then for Jews, as Roof and Hoge (1980) suggest is true of Roman Catholics in the United States, communal enclaves function as support structures for involvement in formal religious organizations. In other words, among Jews, religiosity is at most only indirectly a reflection of involvement in the general (local) community, but is directly associated with involvement in the Jewish (local) community and its primary group network of Jews.

²Overall, the 1990 survey obtained 2441 interviews with respondents who were Jews, or who were not Jewish but were married to Jews, or who were the non-Jewish children of intermarried Jews, or who had converted out of Judaism. For our purposes, analysis eligibility was restricted to respondents who were Jewish.

Table 6.
LOCALISM APPLIED TO 1970 NJPS DATA

Dependent Variables*	Independent Variables																	R2 (18)
	Demographic Block				SES Block			Parent Influ.			Localism Block			Religious Block				
	Sex ^a (1)	Age ^c (2)	Gen ^d (3)	Family life cycle ^e (4)	Educ (5)	Occu (6)	In- come (7)	Size of J. Comm (8)	J. Child Bkgrd (9)	J. Educ (10)	Gen. org act (11)	J. Comm org act (12)	J. prim groups (13)	Syn mem (14)	Syn attend (15)	Home rel observ (16)	Ortho- doxy (17)	
11 Gen. comm. org. act.	-.01	.09	-.20	.19 ^a	.10	.07	.21	.24 ^a	.04	.06								.23
12 J. comm. org. act.	-.10	.07 ^a	.02	.25 ^a	.09	.08	.08	.16 ^a	.08	.25	.24							.35
13 J. prim. groups	-.08	.07	.18	.19 ^a	-.05	.06	-.04	.24 ^a	.19	.16	-.08	.21						.39
14 Synagogue member.	-.06	.11	-.07	.14 ^a	.07	.13 ^a	.07	.26 ^a	-.07	.21	.05	.18	.14					.34
15 Synagogue attend.	.03	.07	.08	.14 ^a	.07	.06 ^a	.02	.15 ^a	-.07	.16	.03	.14	.19	.42				.48
16 Home rel observ.	.01	-.08	.12	.09 ^a	-.09	-.04	-.07	.18 ^a	.11	.22	.03 ^f	.05	.17	.08	.35			.53
17 Orthodoxy ^a	.03	.07	-.10 ^f	.08 ^a	-.11	.04	-.07	.13 ^a	.08	.02	-.05	.03	.14	.07	.14	.32		.42
18 Polit. liberal.	.02	-.08	-.10	.15 ^a	.27	-.05	-.09	.14 ^a	.04	.12	.05 ^f	.07	-.21	.06	-.10	.07	-.13	.30

A negative sign means:

- ^a Low index level larger on dependent variable than high index level.
- ^b Women higher than men.
- ^c Younger adults have values larger than older adults.
- ^d Third U.S. generation value is larger than first.
- ^e No denominational preference values more than Orthodox.
- ^f Orthodoxy decreases with generation in the U.S.
- ^a Not monotonic.

The data also lend general support to the hypothesis that a "localistic" orientation inhibits political liberalism and does so more than either religiosity or religious orthodoxy. In Table 6, Jewish primary group involvement has a strong negative impact on the index of political liberalism. There is also a weaker, negative link between religiosity, as measured by synagogue attendance, and political liberalism. Finally, religious orthodoxy, as measured by Jewish denominational preference, is also negatively related to political liberalism. That is, although political liberalism is most strongly inhibited by involvement in a

Jewish primary group network, it is also inhibited, although less so, by a measure of religiosity, (i.e., synagogue attendance) and by religious orthodoxy.

1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS)

A strong connection between religion and ethnicity appears in data from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey. In Table 7, survey data have been grouped by a combination of Jewish denominational preferences and synagogue membership. For each such grouping, there is presented a

Table 7.

RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC INVOLVEMENT PERCENTAGES BY ADULT DENOMINATIONAL PREFERENCES, NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION SURVEY, 1990

Involvement Items	Orth. syn. memb.	Conserv. memb.	Conserv. not memb.	Reform memb.	Reform not memb.	No preference not memb.
Attends syn. 25 times or more per year	76%	30%	7%	18%	2%	2%
Home relig. pract. ^a	91%	57%	23%	21%	10%	5%
J. primary grps. ^b	92%	57%	35%	31%	16%	10%
J. Org. Activ. ^c	74%	64%	26%	52%	21%	6%
Gen. Org. Activ. ^d	17%	42%	27%	44%	31%	41%
Intermarried	2%	12%	28%	34%	45%	62%
Politic. liberal	23%	40%	34%	39%	44%	56%

^a Has kosher home, lights Shabbat and Chanukah candles, says kiddush on Shabbat.

^b Most friends Jewish, regards neighborhood as Jewish, opposes intermarriage.

^c Jewish organizations, works 20 hours + per month for Jewish organizations, gives money to Jewish organizations.

^d Member of several general organizations, gives money to non-Jewish charities.

range of religious and ethnic items. This table lacks information on those Orthodox Jews who are not members of a synagogue and those Jews without any denominational preference who are members of a synagogue because the number of such cases were too few for statistical analysis.

In most instances, there is a direct relationship between synagogue membership and Jewish communal involvement. Synagogue attendance is increased by synagogue membership. Hence, Reform members attend more than Conservative-not members. Yet, these two groups are about the same in terms of home religious practices and Jewish primary group involvement. On activity in Jewish voluntary associations, the three synagogue membership groups hold the first three rankings, followed closely by Conservative-not members and Reform-not members, with the no preference group much lower.

In contrast, denominational preference (Orthodox to Reform) is inversely related to participation in general community voluntary associations but the relationship with synagogue membership is less clear. Reform and Conservative members and the no preference group have the highest levels

of participation, followed by similar percentages for the Reform-not members and Conservative-not members, with the Orthodox far lower. The percentage of intermarried and scoring liberal on a liberal-Conservative political scale also are inversely related to denominational preference (Orthodox to Reform); the intermarried percentage and synagogue membership are inversely related as well.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Several important conclusions about religion and ethnicity derive from the research studies presented above. Although the data involve Jews — Israeli and American — the close tie-in with the work of Roof permits the extension of these conclusions to American Protestants and Catholics. For the vast majority of religious adherents, religiosity seems to rest on and grow out of their ethnicity. When different ethnic groups possess the same religion (tempered by their different histories, ethnicities, and power conflicts), it operates as a unifying factor. Then, ethnicity becomes the particularistic factor and religion the universalistic factor.

It is a change in religious affiliation that enables the convert to shift his or her ethnic community. Yet, people in such conversion situations only slowly acquire the needed ethnic traits that root one in a new religio-ethnic community.

When different ethnic groups possessing a common religion come into close contact, marriages across ethnic lines grow increasingly common. Indeed, such marriages are difficult to oppose; the power of their common religion to overwhelm ethnic differences is clear. Those couples of mixed ethnic backgrounds but of a common religion form communication and contact paths between the involved ethnic groups. When the family status bearer, typically the husband, belongs to the higher status ethnic group, his wife and children are more readily accepted into that group.

Even when religiosity becomes a barrier to social interaction, as in the Chaldea neighborhood, the common cultural frame of reference possessed by families with different degrees of religiosity mitigate intergroup frictions considerably. Again a common religiocultural frame of reference becomes the universalistic factor binding together the religious and the nonreligious (Liebman & Don-Yehiya, 1983).

We are all born into families located in a particular social sector of a community. That sector is, in effect, an "ethnic" subcommunity. Such a subcommunity also possesses a subculture that includes a religion that functions most clearly on the level of daily life. Indeed, that is why such groups are referred to as religioethnic communities. On this daily level, religion customarily appears as a set of rituals with the range of observance set by the norms of a subcommunity.

Most people live with a fair degree of adherence to the local religious norms of their communities. Yet, small numbers seek to live at "higher" religious and ethical levels of their religion. These people become the "saints, sages, and prophets" and express the highest behavior

and value levels of their communities. They also create new behavioral and value standards that then affect ordinary community members.

A major function of those who embrace the higher religious levels is the development of more universalistic norms that reach beyond their communities. This reaching out extends such values and norms to people outside the original religioethnic community.

Another topic that has been neglected in the abundance of research on religion and ethnicity is the relationship among these two variables and the nation. Does citizenship in or identification with a given nation-state enhance or weaken religion and ethnicity? The literature on American ethnic and religious groupings, as well as the work done by Simon Herman (1970, 1971), indicates the importance of the correlations among these three factors. A minority ethnic group (differing in religion from the majority group that has established and created the culture and social structure of a nation-state) may well find a negative correlation between citizenship and membership in this minority ethnic group. However, the majority group will find its particular ethnicity and religion having a strong positive association with its nation-state.

For example, Herman's research indicates that most American Jews perceive either no relationship or a negative one between their feelings as Jews and their feelings as Americans. However, he finds that when Jews in Israel feel Jewish, it adds to the strength of their feelings as Israelis. We can similarly ask when an American Protestant feels Protestant religiously, what relationship does this feeling have to his or her feelings as an American?

Certainly, this triad — ethnicity, religiosity, and nationality — needs more careful study. Such study will relate being a majority or minority group member to a place in a nation and also will ask what a minority member has to change in order to

integrate better into his or her nation.

These findings also point out a major difference between the situation in Israel and in the Diaspora. In Israel, ethnicity is a Jewish barrier that is reduced by a common religiocultural system into which Israeli Jews are born (or migrate). This common religiocultural system is acquired in a nonvoluntaristic manner.

In the Diaspora, being a Jew and affiliating with an organized Jewish community and its religious expressions are voluntary acts. Such a voluntary affiliation is most strongly produced by the ethnic features of being a Jew. Indeed, given the considerable religious differences within most Diaspora Jewish communities, it is upon ethnicity that Jewish involvement must be built.

American Jewish communal workers need to work for strengthened ties with the various aspects of the organized Jewish community. Judaic expression will flow from such organized Jewish community ties. This need applies to both born Jews and those who enter the Jewish world via intermarriage.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, Frank & Messenger, Robert. (1986). *Multivariate nominal scale analysis* (fourth edition). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Andrews, Frank, Morgan, James, & Sonquist, John. (1969). *Multiple classification analysis*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Herman, Simon. (1970). *American students in Israel*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Herman, Simon. (1971). *Israelis and Jews*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Lazerwitz, Bernard. (1978, Spring/Summer). An approach to the components and consequences of Jewish identification. *Contemporary Jewry*, 4, 3-8.
- Lazerwitz, B. (1981, Winter). Jewish-Christian marriages and conversions. *Jewish Social Studies*, 43, 31-46.
- Lazerwitz, B. (1985, Spring). Class, ethnicity, and site as planning factors in Israeli residential integration. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 15, 233-243.
- Lazerwitz, Bernard, Winter, J. Alan, & Dashefsky, Arnold. (1988, September). Localism, religiosity, Orthodoxy, and liberalism: The case of Jews in the United States. *Social Forces*, 67, 229-242.
- Liebman, Charles, & Don-Yehiya, Eliezer. (1983). *Civil religion in Israel*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Porat, Naomi. (1985). Social interaction in a new integrative neighborhood. Master's Thesis, Department of Sociology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel (Hebrew).
- Roof, W. C. (1972). The local-cosmopolitan orientation and traditional religious commitment. *Sociological Analysis*, 33, 1-15.
- Roof, W. C. (1974). Religious orthodoxy and minority prejudice: Causal relationship or reflection of localistic world view? *American Journal of Sociology*, 80, 643-664.
- Roof, W. C. (1976). Traditional religion in contemporary society: A theory of local-cosmopolitan plausibility. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 195-208.
- Roof, W. C. (1978). *Community and commitment: Religious plausibility in a liberal Protestant church*. New York: Elsevier.
- Roof, W. C., & Hoge, Dean, R. (1980). Church involvement in America: Social factors affecting membership and participation. *Review of Religious Research*, 21, 405-426.
- Schwartz, Chaya. (1986). The organization process of a new heterogeneous urban neighborhood in a public project in Israel. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel (Hebrew).
- Tabory, Ephraim. (1989). Residential integration and religious segregation in an Israeli neighborhood. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 19-35.
- Werczberger, Elia, & Ginsberg, Yona. (1987, July). Maintenance of shared property in low income condominiums. *Housing Studies*, 2, 192-202.