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THE Ghetto—A RE-EVALUATION

AMITAI ETZIONI
Columbia University

THE republication of The Ghetto by Louis Wirth\(^1\) seems to be an appropriate occasion for a re-evaluation\(^2\) of his thesis. It is of importance to state at the very beginning of this discussion that, although some concepts and conclusions of Wirth will be sharply criticized, in general this is one of the most important studies of the sociology of the Jews, a much neglected field.\(^3\)

Wirth's study presents a theory as well as considerable evidence which disproves it. The theory applied in The Ghetto is Park's model of a natural history of race and ethnic relations. The pattern of interaction among different ethnic groups passes through the stages of isolation, competition, conflict, and accommodation. Eventually the last stage is reached, at which minority groups become completely assimilated. This scheme can be criticized from several points of view. First, like many theories of natural history, it is not sufficiently specified to be tested.\(^4\) It is formulated in such a manner that different and even contradictory data can be interpreted to support the theory. The term "eventually," often used by Park,\(^5\) is a good indicator of this fallacy. When an ethnic group is assimilating, it is suggested that the hypothesis is supported; if an ethnic group is not assimilating, it is suggested that it has not yet reached the stage of assimilation. "Eventually," one can still hold, every ethnic group will be assimilated. As no time interval is mentioned and the sociological conditions under which the process of assimilation will take place are not spelled out, the whole scheme becomes unscientific.

It is necessary to distinguish carefully between the description of the stages and the processes which take place at each stage on the one hand, and the analysis of the forces which cause the processes to proceed from stage to stage on the other. This is especially important in understanding Park and Wirth, for their natural history is not presented as a continuous process but assumes that there is a limited number of stages at which intergroup relations can reach an equilibrium. In case no accumulation of changing forces occurs, the system will not move to the next stage. The factor of change which transfers groups from the first to the second stage is the diffusion of civilization which brings hereto isolated societies into contact. Whether one accepts this proposition or not is irrelevant. The point is that one is confronted with a clear hypothesis concerning the nature of the factors of change.

The forces further changing the pattern of interaction are much less clear. According to the theory, contact although it first causes competition and conflict, eventually creates a division of labor and modus vivendi among the groups. Open conflict ceases, and a relationship based on cooperation in some spheres and on segregation in others is established. But here the theory runs into difficulties. It is clear that under some conditions this process does not take place, while under others it does. What are these conditions? Park and Wirth seem to have no systematic hypothesis on this point.

This criticism applies even more strongly to the last step, the transition from accommodation to

---


\(^4\) This fallacy is discussed by Kingsley Davis in "Malthus and the Theory of Population," in The Language of Social Research, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (eds.), (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953).

assimilation. The processes of assimilation are clearly analyzed; the major mechanism being intermarriage and conversion. Also peaceful interaction at the accommodation stage leads to the taking over of others’ attitudes, intense communication, and mutual understanding. But what are the conditions under which the processes of assimilation are triggered or blocked? Park and his disciples introduce ad hoc factors which delay the “natural” process. For Jews, the European tragedy of Hitler is mentioned. An establishment of a Jewish state is considered by Wirth as such a factor. But these factors are not an integral part of the conceptual scheme. Historical accidents can always be found to explain away any data which do not fit the theory. Consequently any alternative to assimilation can be defined as a delay only.

While groups are often forced into contact by the process of technological, economic, and social change, and perhaps this is an unavoidable process, the remaining stages should be seen as alternative situations rather than links in an evolutionary process culminating in assimilation. Groups are either in conflict or accommodation or assimilation. It is the task of social science to inquire into the conditions under which this or that alternative is chosen. The a priori assumption that there is no alternative in the long run is not justified by the data and leads to an evaluative approach in which certain processes are defined as natural and others as delaying. Assimilation, it seems, is not more probable than accommodation. Wirth seems to prefer it on non-scientific grounds.

Wirth, who closely follows Park, maintains that the Ghetto, and with it the Jews, are bound to assimilate and to disappear sooner or later as a distinct group.

The children seem generally to carry the de-Judaization a step farther than their parents. [Note the unilinear assumption.] The Ghetto demonstrates the subtle ways in which this cultural community [the Jews] is transformed by degrees until it blends with the large community about it, meanwhile [italics supplied] reappearing in various altered guides of its old and unmistakable atmosphere. . . . Not only does the Ghetto tend to disappear, but the race tends to disappear with it.9

Wirth describes and analyzes the process in detail. Assimilation is a double process of external conditions and internal development. First, emancipation breaks down the formal barriers between the Jewish community and the society at large. This in turn causes increased communication between the heretofore isolated group and society. The internal process, which is just the complementary side of the same process, is a development from an orthodox religious attitude (first generation) through Conservative, then Reform Judaism (second and third generation)9 to, finally, intermarriage, coupled with joining the Unitarian Church, and/or conversion to Christianity.10 The change is accompanied by general acculturation.

If the Jews still exist as a distinctive group, the theory goes, this is to be explained by two factors: (a) influx of new immigrants, (b) revival of racial prejudice. If the process of immigration should cease, assimilation would “blend” the Jews into the large community in a few generations. If immigration should continue the “menace” of the Ghetto would survive as long as the reservoir of orthodox Jewish immigrants is not exhausted. The revival of anti-Semitism (in Wirth’s days) is also only a temporary delaying factor. It is a part of the price of assimilation. Wirth discusses several factors responsible for the new increase in anti-Semitism. But he chooses to emphasize one factor: the assimilating Jews, too anxious to assimilate, are pushing too hard.

Prejudice from without has revived the ghetto wall, less visible, perhaps, than before, but not less real. . . . As the Jew emerges from the ghetto and takes the character of humanity in the outside world, the ghetto declines. But as this freedom is restricted, generally [italics supplied] as a result of too massed or hasty an advance, distances between Jews and non-Jews arise and the retreat to the ghetto sets in.11

If the Jews leaving the Ghetto would relax, be less sensitive, act more naturally in their relations with non-Jews, one important factor delaying assimilation would be removed. Wirth compares right and wrong behavior. The Jew “. . . sensitive as he generally is even to the slightest gestures of those of whom he is not yet a part has difficulty in acting without restraint

---

9 The Ghetto, pp. 256.
7 Ibid., p. 5, see also pp. 9, 128, 74.
8 Ibid., p. 125.
and with poise.”

But this can be overcome, and the right behavior achieved: “His [the Jew’s] personality expands and he relaxes somewhat in his studied manners and courtesies, just to be natural and act the part of one who is at home and feels at home.” Assimilation may take time, but in the long run there is no way back to the Ghetto, and only one way away from it to assimilation. One should not lose one’s courage and escape back to the Ghetto when some difficulties arise on the way out. One should “face the music” of racial hostility; sooner or later it will subside.

So far we have discussed the theoretical scheme; we shall turn now to the facts presented by Wirth. We suggest that much of the evidence does not support and sometimes even contradicts a good part of the theoretical scheme. Wirth analyzes life histories and other “human documents” and dedicates a whole chapter to demonstrate that the Ghetto and the race do not disappear, even in places where immigration has stopped. Third generation Jews return to the Ghetto and to Judaism, some “even” become Zionists. Wirth analyzes with great insight the psychological and sociological factors causing this return. He realizes that not only the Jewish immigration and the Jewish rush to assimilate maintain the “race” but also that the contact with others and others’ culture makes the Jew conscious of the positive values of his own tradition. The Ghetto is a source of “warm” intimate social life. When the Jew, who is used to this Gemeinschaft life, comes into contact with the external, “cool” impersonal life he misses his Jewish home and realizes its value. But Wirth’s theory points to assimilation (“the race disappears”), which he seems to approve, while his evidence shows that the very generation (third) which is supposed to be on the highway to conversion is on the main road back to the Ghetto.

The study of the natural history of the Jews is focused around the concept of the Ghetto, which is problematic in itself. The Ghetto in Wirth’s book is both a geographical-physical unit and an ethnic group (a group based on common origin and carrying a separate subculture). It is a place and a state of mind, an area and an institution. This fusion is misleading at a decisive point, namely when the cultural group ceases to be confined to specific geographical boundaries. Wirth sees the geographical criterion as essential. Following Park he assumes that a group which is not concentrated in one area disappears, i.e., assimilates. The third generation Jews seem to be, as Wirth himself demonstrates, a cultural group, based on tradition, organization, and communication, which maintains contact and consciousness of its members without their necessarily being concentrated. The ecological approach reaches its limitations at the same point where the race-relations theory does not suffice. Neither concedes that members of the third (and later) generations of an ethnic minority may maintain a particular subculture, not lose their identity, although they are neither isolated nor concentrated in specific ecological areas.

Wirth analyzes two Ghettoes, the European Middle Age Ghetto of Frankfurt and the modern, rapidly changing Ghetto in Chicago. In analyzing the second case, the relationship between area and race are explored in an elaborate manner. The failure, therefore, is only more obvious. Maxwell street is the Ghetto area—the area of the first generation’s Orthodox Jews. Lawndale (“Deutschland”) is the second area of settlement. Wirth shows that many norms and values have changed in the transition from the first to the second area. Jews in the second area are usually second generation in the United States, secular or Conservative, and much more Americanized. They are already “partially assimilated.” The third stage still has a clear geographic designation, although not one clear center like the ones Wirth was able to point out for the first and second stages. The third generation’s area is the territory of Reform Jews, a highly Americanized group on the verge of assimilation. But when we reach the “embarrassing” phenomenon of Jews who refuse to give up the “shadows of the Ghetto walls” for the new lights, Wirth fails to find a habitat for this group. These self-conscious Jews do not have a place in the ecology of the city and therefore they seem to Wirth not to have a “place” at all. He tries to find an area for them by suggesting that their return to Judaism (Ghetto as a cultural group) is accom-

---

12 Ibid., p. 267.
13 Ibid., p. 265.
14 For this concept see Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), pp. 286-297.
panied by a physical return to the area of settlement (Ghetto as an ecological area).

Jews... whose life begins in the Ghetto and after moving in a circle, finally ends somewhere not far from its starting point.15

Wirth who as an ecologist is always ready to name streets and quarters is compelled here to remain somewhat vague. The reason may be that he extended his theory a little too far. Obviously Jews return to Judaism without returning to the physical Ghetto, without returning to the immigrant slums. They return to a group without an ecological base, a phenomenon which Wirth's conceptual scheme does not cover.

Using Wirth's data, we would like to suggest that a group can maintain its cultural and social integration and identity, without having an ecological basis. The mechanisms which enable the group to maintain its integration are many and complex. Only further research can specify them in a satisfactory way. Still, one can find in Wirth's material some important clues on the nature of these mechanisms. One of the most important seems to be the common tradition reinforced by communication which is not as diffuse as the communication in primary groups, but also not as specific as communication among strangers or persons who have in common only membership in a formal organization.16 There is common identity, tradition, values, and consciousness.17 Often there are common sentiments and interests based on past experience, education, and communication. The common bond is reinforced through ethnic newspapers, organizations,18 clubs,19 and synagogues, where members meet, even though they do not live next to each other and are not concentrated in one ecological area.

Jews and some other ethnic groups in America seem to pass from ecological, traditional, immigrant "totalistic" groups (which are concentrated in "natural areas" and are based on face-to-face contacts, informal communication, and primary loyalties, limited exclusively to in-group members) to non-ecological, nontotalistic, modern groups. If the following terms are preferred, the process might be described as transition from a membership to a reference group which is maintained by communication and activated in limited social situations and core institutions (e.g., synagogues). A fuller discussion of this process is far beyond the scope of this paper. The main point is that what seems to Wirth a temporary delay in the inevitable process of disintegration of the minority group can be viewed as a process of social change and adjustment, and hence of enduring nature.

By stating that a group is non-ecological, it is not implied that the group is completely randomly distributed in space. Most ethnic groups are relatively concentrated on certain levels of stratification. The stratification structure uses space as one way of segregating groups and symbolizing distance and prestige. Thus Jews are disproportionately members of the middle class20 which is concentrated in certain residential districts. But this does not mean that these areas are habitats, "substructures" on which social relations are "super structured",21 or that there is a one to one relationship between habitat and culture or "race," an assumption which Wirth and Park make as a basis of their discussion. Even if the class factor is held constant and a concentration of third generation Jews is still found, this does not show that these areas are "Jewish habitats," in which Jews live a Gemeinschaft life, and thereby maintain their self-consciousness, identity, etc.

It seems that third generation Jews—primarily those who "return to the Ghetto," i.e., try to maintain their ties with their ethnic group—are attracted to certain suburbs. Although there

15 The Ghetto, p. 263.
16 For an analysis of communication processes from this point of view see Amitai Etzioni, "Work Groups in Collective Settlements," Human Organization, 16, (Fall 1957), pp. 2–6.
18 It is of interest to note that Jewish organizations are a recruiting ground for a Jewish professional elite, which has strong vested interests in maintaining and expanding the ethnic consciousness. See Solomon Sutker, "The Jewish Organizational Elite of Atlanta, Georgi," Social Forces, 31 (Dec. 1952), pp. 136–43.
seems to be no conclusive evidence, one may suggest that they usually look for a suburb in which there are at least some Jews but not much more than a third of the population. The reasons for the lower limit may be that they prefer not to live in an area in which there is no synagogue, no Jewish Sunday school, no opportunity to have Jewish friends and Jewish mates for their children. Some may not go to a completely non-Jewish suburb because they do not want to have the feeling, or do not want others to have the feeling, that they are hiding their Jewishness. These suburbs may also be less open to Jews. The reasons for the upper limit may be that they would prefer not to live in an area which is clearly identified as Jewish or is about to become predominantly Jewish. Living in such an area would give them a feeling of segregation, of living in a Ghetto.

In the suburbs themselves we would expect Jews not to be concentrated in certain blocks but to be dispersed in them, maintain neighbor relations with non-Jews, participate in local activities such as the country club, PTA, municipal government, etc.—all bases for face-to-face relations between Jews and non-Jews. If these Jews still maintain a group life and self-consciousness, it is of a non-ecological nature. It is a reference group, realized and reinforced in certain social situations, rather than a community or even a subcommunity.

Ecological ethnic groups are often less integrated into society than non-ecological ethnic groups. Ethnic groups concentrated in geographic areas, have often, but by no means always, been a major source of tension and have been considered disloyal to the political regime and endangering the consensus about supreme values. The Germans in Austria and Czechoslovakia were a well-known case. The Arabs in Israel are another.

This might be explained in two ways: (a) The power organization of every society is ecological. The supreme political organization, in most cases the state, aims to maintain a monopoly of power in a certain territory. Every group which concentrates in one part of this territory, and also has a different value system, potentially endangers the monopoly by being able to organize an independent political unit. A group which is ecologically dispersed, on the other hand, has no monopoly over any area and is therefore in no position to create a monopoly of power. (b) An ecological group has higher chances to avoid intimate contacts and informal communication with out-groups than has a non-ecological group and hence can more easily withhold loyalty from the society at large.

Park and Wirth, following the mass society theories, assume that eventually every Gemeinschaft will become a Gesellschaft. Ecological groups are communal in their nature and therefore will disintegrate. Segregation is therefore evaluated negatively as a source of all that is "sectarian" and "provincial," and assimilation as a progressive force. There is no third alternative between community and "society," between segregation and assimilation. This approach overlooks the pluralist nature of modern society, the importance of partial segregation combined with partial assimilation, not as a transitional stage, but as a basic form of social organization.

Some sociological reasons may be suggested as explaining the long run existence of non-ecological ethnic groups. Ecological groups may be dysfunctional, for reasons discussed above, and therefore under social pressure become acculturated or disintegrate. Groups which refuse may be penalized by limitation on their "success," as Wirth puts it, i.e., by receiving a smaller share of social rewards for the same effort. Non-ecological groups, on the other hand, especially when partially acculturated, do not have the above mentioned dysfunctions. The dysfunctional nature of "totalistic" groups is a consequence of their ability to withhold loyalty from society; members of "partial" groups on the other hand

22 Some impressions may be gained from the following discussions, John R. Seeley, R. Alexander Sim, Elizabeth W. Loosely, Crestwood Heights (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956); Herbert J. Gans, "Park Forest: Birth of a Jewish Community," Commentary, (April 1951). Sklare brings the following material: "According to Rosenthal, Jews constituted 67% of the total population of North Lawndale in 1931. In third settlement areas the ratios are very different during the same period: 8% for Uptown, 12% for Humboldt Park, and 19% for Hyde Park." M. Sklare, Conservative Judaism (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955), p. 265.


are more likely to form primary and reference relations which cross-cut the boundaries of every single group. This is a source of social cohesion and consensus. Thus ethnic groups of this type are less likely to be dysfunctional. Moreover, they may fulfill important social functions.

The American society is not a “society” (in Tönnies’ sense, which is close to what is often called a secondary group), and is not a universal melting pot, into which all ethnic groups “blend” sooner or later, by accepting the dominant culture of the one “real” American tradition. It is, as has often been pointed out, a pluralistic society, with many subcultures and subgroups. All integrated groups accept some values, the universal values of American society, but at the same time hold their own particularistic tradition and values; they also maintain their segregating norms in many spheres in which the American society is open to alternative values and norms of behavior. Religion is the classic example. Attitudes toward work, leisure, sex, clothing, food, etc., are all highly differentiated, often along ethnic lines. Therefore, a group may pass from more or less complete segregation to partial segregation (a transition which is often accompanied by a change from an ecological to a reference group); it may change from a relatively dysfunctional to a more integrated group without losing its identity and maintaining a subculture.

These groups have important functions in preserving the American society as it is. Their functions are comparable to those of occupational groups, professional associations and voluntary organizations in general. They are sources of the pluralism which is the basis of an open, democratic society. They are sources of consolidation of competing centers of power, which is a vital condition for the maintenance of the democratic process. Moreover, ethnic groups, which cut across other social groups—most important of which are social classes—are an important factor for maintaining the solidarity of American society and avoiding class consciousness and class conflict. If the major ethnic groups will assimilate, American pluralism will be undermined. If at the same time the racial groups will not assimilate—and it seems to be agreed that their rate of assimilation is at least much slower than that of ethnic groups—and their stratificational location will not change drastically, American society will be cut into two by a clear class-race cleavage, a situation which, for instance, prevails in some Latin American countries and is considered detrimental to a balanced society in general and a democratic regime in particular. Park himself, in a different context, points to the South, as a case of a “bi-racial” society. Others have analyzed the not too democratic nature of the southern states.

Although American pluralism is not based on ethnic groups alone, the latter constitute a major component of it, since they cut across class lines and elicit a high degree of involvement. It is therefore questionable if the other factors of pluralism would be strong enough to maintain the structure in case the ethnic groups would be weakened considerably. Others have frequently pointed out that an unlimited melting pot is undesirable from a cultural point of view.

A functional analysis always requires a complementary analysis of the mechanisms which lead to the fulfillment of these functions. The fact that there are functional needs for pluralism in American culture and democracy does not explain what causes these functions to be fulfilled. Wirth himself points to a major mechanism which leads to the fulfillment of these needs. He shows that

---


27 This is empirically demonstrated by Lubel, who shows that ethnic groups vote on some issues according to their ethnic norms, while on other issues they follow a different line, e.g., their class, their generation, their trade union, etc. See Samuel Lubel The Future of American Politics (New York: Harper and Bros., 1952), p. 78, on Jewish voting, pp. 207-208, 229.

28 For a general discussion see Brewton Berry, Race Relations (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951), pp. 327-333.

29 Park and Wirth were, of course, aware of the pluralistic nature of American society. But it seems that they did not relate the process of assimilation to the problems of maintaining pluralism in a way which would show that the two are contradictory.

30 Park, op. cit., p. 220.


emancipation can often be merely formal because Jews trying to pass are still rejected. This makes the Jew self-conscious, and he tends to return to the flock and become an ardent "Jew" and sometimes even a rapid advocate of orthodoxy and Zionism as the only fitting answer to a world that excludes him and insults him.\textsuperscript{33}

Wirth obviously disapproves. He believes that the rejection is temporary. We would suggest that the rejection might be a long-run phenomenon, an offspring of the American tradition of pluralism, which expects everyone to accept certain universal values, but beyond that, to keep his own tradition and identity.

The third generation is often viewed as a kind of test case. Are they one step nearer to assimilation or are they less assimilated than their parents? If it is shown that they view their subculture with more pride and less self-hatred the next question is: Is this a temporary return or a lasting process?\textsuperscript{34} Park and Wirth assume a unilinear process of assimilation, each stage being nearer to this end than the previous one. "Returning" to Judaism is therefore not in line with this basic process. This assumption, we suggest, lacks sound ground. A social process may take many forms and assimilation must not necessarily be the last stage. Lacking sound evidence, one is forced, in this speculative stage, to rely on others' insight and personal experience. On these bases, it seems that some children of converted Jews or mixed marriages return to Judaism. A mixed couple or a convert may be socially rejected as much and even more than a Jew. One way out of this highly marginal position is to return to one's legitimate ethnic group. In the past, at least, there seems to have been little room for "universal Americanism," for Americans who did not have a particular ethnic background. There have been attempts to create social institutions for mixed couples, converts and other assimilationists which legitimize assimilation or serve as institutional bridges from the minority to the majority group. These institutions seem bound to fail since they rapidly become known as such. When their latent function becomes manifest, it can no longer be fulfilled.

Assimilation not only means rejection of one's own particularism but also acceptance of some other particularism, usually of a group which is considered superior, a group for instance whose values dominate the society. Now it is only natural for such a group to defend its superior status by defending its exclusiveness. This is done by (a) preventing outsiders from achieving the ascribed status by conversion, intermarriage, and joining intimate activities of the group. Hence, for such a group at least, a converted Jew may still be a converted Jew, not a true Episcopalian, etc., and a mixed couple may be classified as such and not according to the higher status of one spouse. As these attempts to assimilate are strongly connected with aspirations and efforts of upward mobility, their partial failure may be related with defense mechanisms of a higher group which opposes too much upward mobility.\textsuperscript{35} We emphasize partial failure, because even if mobility succeeds in some areas but fails in the "social" area, the purpose of assimilation has failed. Successful assimilation is based on balanced mobility, including social acceptance by the target group. One cannot lose his old identity, unless one is accepted by a new group, which has the identity sought. When such acceptance is denied we find often a phenomenon which lacking a better term will be referred to as the "intimate kick." Starting with secondary and semi-primary relations with members of the target group (calling them by their first names, participating in non-intimate parties of the group, etc.) the assimilationist tries to move closer, to convert these relations into full-fledged primary relations, which are considered the sign of full acceptance and the basis of "blending" into the new group. But here, at least quite often, the superior group's liberalism reaches its limits. Somewhere along the social distance scale there is a limit,\textsuperscript{36} and when it is passed, rejection en-

\textsuperscript{33} Wirth, op. cit., pp. 267–268.

\textsuperscript{34} This problem is often discussed in Commentary. See especially M. L. Hansen, "The Third Generation in America" reprinted in Commentary (November 1952); Nathan Glazer, "The Jewish Revival in America" Commentary (December 1955 and January 1956); Herbert J. Gans "American Jewry: Present and Future," Commentary (May and June 1956).


\textsuperscript{36} The best evidence for this may be found in the low rate of intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews, which may, of course, have other important causes as well. See Ruby Reeves Kennedy, "Single or
The more liberal the society and the period, the nearer to the intimate pole the line is drawn, the more intimate the relationship becomes before it breaks down. The more intimate the relationship, the more involved are the parties and the more frustrating the rejection. The return to the ethnic group is therefore only more emotion-laden and more strongly motivated. Those “returnees” may become, as Wirth suggests, fanatically orthodox and Zionists.

This might be a basis for a cyclic process; one generation tries to assimilate, the next returns and so on; the process may take place in one

Triple Melting Pot?” The American Journal of Sociology, 49 (January 1944), pp. 331–339. The main point for our discussion is: “Jews almost always choose Jewish mates.”

37 W. L. Warner and P. S. Lunt describe these processes in The Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941).

38 The more intimate the relation, the more informal it becomes and the more unclear is the border line. This is another factor in sustaining the unrealistic aspirations of the assimilationist, which lead him to the mistake of trying to force the issue, to bring about full assimilation.

39 One may suggest that the relationship is asymmetric, the rejected party is more involved than the rejecting one, and the break is therefore more painful for him.

lifetime and create conscious and active members of the ethnic group (the blocking of personal mobility often leads to collective activity). A group may learn. Something may go down into its tradition, a warning to following generations not even to try, to save themselves the frustration of rejection. Heine’s biography, for instance, served as such a myth for some German-Jews. To sum up, the third generation may be a temporary delay on the way to assimilation but it may also be the first generation of a long-run process of revival and enhancement of solidarity and ethnic self-consciousness.

At any rate, a theory should not be formulated in a way which does not take into account the problems of pluralism versus complete assimilation; return to Judaism versus conversion; and the problem of the long-run existence of an ethnic group, versus temporary delay in the process of disintegration. The conditions under which one or the other of these phenomena emerges, should be specified, and the functional significance of both explored. An a priori preference of one of them cannot be accepted. Considering the empirical evidence collected by Wirth and some of the studies conducted since The Ghetto was first published, one may be inclined to accept the pluralist, rather than the assimilationist point of view, as being more adequately supported by the data.

Southern Sociological Society

The twenty-second annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society will be held April 16 to 18, 1959, in Gatlinburg, Tennessee, with headquarters at the Mountain View Hotel. Arrangements have been made for the following program sections: The Family—Chairman, Ira L. Reiss, College of William and Mary; Intergroup Relations and Social Structure—Chairman, Lewis W. Jones, Tuskegee Institute; Anthropology—Chairman, Marion Pearsall, University of Kentucky; Research Methods—Chairman, Bryce Ryan, University of Miami; Demography—Chairman, John C. Belcher, University of Georgia; Teaching of Sociology—Chairman, E. W. Gregory, Jr.; The Impact of Southern Urbanisation (joint meeting with the Southeastern, Lower Mississippi, and Kentucky-Tennessee Chapters of the American Studies Association)—organized by C. Hugh Holman, University of North Carolina; Sociology and Social Work—Chairman, Earl E. Klein, Louisiana State University; Social Psychology—Chairman, John T. Doby, Emory University; Stratification—Chairman, C. Arnold Anderson, University of Chicago; Medical Sociology—Chairman, John C. McKinney, Duke University; Social Theory—Chairman, Leonard Reisman, Tulane University; Sociology of Occupations—Chairman, Joseph H. Fichter, Loyola University of the South; Sociology of Religion—Chairman, Earl Brewer, Emory University; Community—Chairman, Willis A. Sutton, University of Kentucky. Professor Meyer F. Nimkoff, Florida State University, will preside over the General Session on Friday night. At this session, Professor Harold F. Kaufman, Mississippi State University, will deliver his presidential address on “Toward a Recognition of Community,” and Dr. William F. Ogburn will speak on “Influences Shaping the Future of Sociology.”