

# JEWISH ACADEMICS IN THE UNITED STATES: THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS, CULTURE AND POLITICS

by Seymour Martin Lipset, *Harvard University*,  
and Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., *University of Connecticut*

INTELLECTUALISM has long been associated with Jewishness. Many have commented on the major contribution of Jews to learning and intellectual life. Even in societies which have discriminated in various manifest ways against them, Jews have formed a disproportionately large segment of those attending higher schools. *Numeri clausi* designed to limit Jewish access to privileged positions in both Czarist and Soviet Russia have allowed for a slightly larger percentage of Jews in universities than in the general population, but much fewer than would qualify in an open competition.<sup>1</sup> And whenever discriminatory barriers against

---

*Note.* We wish to acknowledge our debts to Dr. Clark Kerr, Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the sponsor of the survey on which this article is based; to Professor Martin Trow of the University of California, Berkeley, who directed the administration of the survey; and to their colleagues. The interpretations expressed here are solely the responsibility of the authors.

For publications in which we have developed other aspects of the analysis of the survey, see ". . . and What Professors Think," *Psychology Today*, November 1970, pp. 49-51+; "The Divided Professoriate," *Change*, May/June 1971, pp. 54-60; "The Politics of American Political Scientists," *PS*, Spring 1971, pp. 135-144; "American Social Scientists and the Growth of Campus Political Activism in the 1960s," *Social Science Information*, April 1971.

<sup>1</sup> In 1881, before the *numerus clausus* took effect in Russia, at a time when the great mass of Jews did not yet speak Russian, "8,200 Jewish boys accounted for 12 per cent of all the students in the gymnasiums and progymnasiums": Patrick L. Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), p. 122; see also pp. 130-132, 139 for data on the effect of government policies in reducing Jewish enrollments. The quotas were temporarily lifted after the Revolution of 1905, but were restored in 1908. During this brief period "the influx of Jews to the higher schools had been very great, so that their number was now vastly in excess of the established norm, [thus making it] necessary [for the higher schools] to bar completely all new candidates. . . . Once more, bands of 'martyrs of learning' could be seen wending their way toward

them have broken down, within one generation Jews have poured into educational institutions and formed a major segment of the intellectuals.

The United States has been the most important example of a free society from the point of view of the Jewish community. But even here, Jews were held back from educational and job opportunities within the university system. Important private universities had quotas limiting the number of Jewish undergraduates until the end of World War II.<sup>2</sup> Relatively few Jews were able to secure employment on the faculty of these schools. The change in favor of Jewish participation at the summit of American higher education in the past 25 years has been so extensive and totally accepted that some indication of how different the situation was at the beginning of the careers of the current generation of senior professors would seem to be in order.

Overt anti-Jewish prejudice within academe seemingly was at a high point in the 1920's and 1930's, when large numbers of the children of immigrants began to enter college. This pressure led many schools to impose quotas on the admission of Jews to both undergraduate and professional schools. A. Lawrence Lowell, as president of Harvard, and Nicholas Murray Butler, when president of Columbia, openly defended Jewish quotas.<sup>3</sup> And as late as 1945 Ernest M. Hopkins, then president of Dartmouth, justified the use of a quota at his institution on the grounds that "Dartmouth is a Christian college founded for the Christianization of its students."<sup>4</sup> These restrictions carried over even more intensely to faculty appointments.<sup>5</sup> Ludwig Lewisohn reported in his *Memoirs* how he was prevented from teaching English; Edward Sapir was told by his graduate-school professors that as a Jew he could not expect an appointment and had to go to Canada; Lionel Trilling

---

the universities in foreign lands": S. M. Dubnov, *History of Jews in Russia and Poland*, Vol. 3 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1920), p. 158. For Soviet policies and Jewish educational statistics, see Alec Nove and J. A. Newth, "The Jewish Population: Demographic Trends and Occupational Patterns," in Lionel Kochan, ed., *The Jews in Soviet Russia Since 1917* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 145-148, 154-157.

<sup>2</sup> Heywood Broun and George Britt, *Christians Only* (New York: The Vanguard Press, 1931), pp. 72-124.

<sup>3</sup> Carey McWilliams, *A Mask for Privilege: Anti-Semitism in the United States* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1948), pp. 38-39; Broun and Britt, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-89; Dan W. Dodson, "College Quotas and American Democracy," *The American Scholar*, Summer 1945, pp. 270-271.

<sup>4</sup> Lawrence Bloomgarden, "Our Changing Elite Colleges," *Commentary*, February 1960, p. 152.

<sup>5</sup> C. B. Sherman, *The Jew Within American Society* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961), pp. 174-178.

recalled in an article in *Commentary* that he was the first Jew appointed to the English department in Columbia; the Harvard Law School did not appoint another Jew after Felix Frankfurter until 1939, when Paul Freund and Milton Katz were named assistant professors. The City College of New York became one of the first schools to open its doors to Jews, but even CCNY was charged with discrimination at the beginning of the 1930's. Heywood Broun and George Britt pointed out that "only five [Jews] have the rank of full professors. . . . All five are men of exceptional attainments. The percentage of Jews in the lower orders . . . is much higher than among the more desirable positions. Even in a friendly college, the openings for Jewish professors are distinctly limited."<sup>6</sup> Seven years later, a report in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK described the national situation in dramatic terms.

It is very difficult these days for Jews to become full professors in the leading universities. In order to attain such rank, they must have achieved distinction in their respective fields of national and international character. While Jews constitute a considerable proportion of the student bodies in the colleges and universities throughout the land, certainly much more than their numerical proportion, they represent but an insignificant proportion of the faculties.<sup>7</sup>

The limitations in the academic job market were often used by graduate departments as a justification for admitting few Jewish students to graduate work. The old (vicious) circular reasoning legitimated the refusal to enlarge the body of Jewish graduate students on the grounds that to do so would mean training people who would not get jobs. Soon after the end of World War II, Albert Sprague Coolidge of Harvard told a Massachusetts legislative committee, "we know perfectly well that names ending in 'berg' or 'stein' have to be skipped by the board of selection of students for scholarships in chemistry." And he explained this practice as stemming from the department's understanding that there were no jobs for Jews in chemistry.<sup>8</sup>

Since that time, however, the situation has changed startlingly on both student and faculty levels. Schools which were notorious among Jews for their restrictionist policies suddenly opened their doors.<sup>9</sup> And now, at the beginning of the 1970's, Jews form a heavy proportion of

<sup>6</sup> Broun and Britt, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

<sup>7</sup> Maurice J. Karpf, "Jewish Community Organization in the United States," in AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 39 (1937), pp. 61-62. See also Broun and Britt, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-187.

<sup>8</sup> McWilliams, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-139.

<sup>9</sup> Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot* (2nd ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1970), pp. 156-159.

academe.<sup>10</sup> The large national sample (60,000) of faculty who filled out questionnaires for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in 1969 contained close to 6,000 who reported that their parental family was Jewish. Jews constituted 9 per cent of the weighted sample.<sup>11</sup> Their proportion has increased dramatically over time, as evidenced by the data in Table 1. The professorial generation which entered academe in the 1920's is today less than 4 per cent Jewish; by the first post-

TABLE 1. RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND OF AMERICAN PROFESSORIATE, BY AGE  
(Per Cent)

		<i>Jewish</i>	<i>Catholic</i>	<i>Protestant</i>	<i>Other &amp; None</i>	<i>Total</i>
65 years and over	(n=1446)	3.8	13.7	79.0	3.6	100
60-64	(n=3067)	4.9	13.6	77.1	4.3	100
55-59	(n=4028)	6.7	16.3	73.2	3.8	100
50-54	(n=5648)	7.3	17.2	70.8	4.7	100
45-49	(n=7569)	9.1	16.6	67.6	6.7	100
40-44	(n=8831)	9.7	18.3	63.9	8.1	100
35-39	(n=9971)	9.4	20.0	62.6	8.1	100
30-34	(n=10212)	9.3	19.6	63.1	8.0	100
26-29	(n=7990)	9.6	21.6	62.2	6.5	100
25 years and under	(n=1266)	11.9	21.3	60.7	6.1	100
All Faculty	(n=60028)	8.7	18.6	66.0	6.8	100

<sup>10</sup> Administrative positions were the last to be opened to Jews, but during the late 1960's, these restrictions were also broken. Chicago, Cincinnati, Dartmouth, MIT, Pennsylvania, and Rutgers recently appointed Jewish presidents. In line with the Broun-Britt complaints about CCNY, it did not get a Jewish president until 1969. The first Jewish dean of the Harvard Law School, and the first in the university's history, was designated in 1971.

<sup>11</sup> In 1969 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education initiated several large-scale national surveys of students, faculty, and administrators. These studies were administered by the Survey Research Center of the University of California, Berkeley, with advice and technical assistance from the Office of Research of the American Council on Education. Financial support was provided by the Carnegie Commission and the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. A disproportionate random sampling procedure was used to select colleges and universities, to obtain adequate numbers of institutions of various types and characteristics. The 303 schools thus chosen included 57 junior colleges, 168 four-year colleges, and 78 universities. Next, a six-in-seven random sample of faculty was drawn from the rosters of the included institutions, yielding a sample of 100,315. A very high return of 60,028 completed questionnaires (60 per cent) was achieved. The returned questionnaires, finally, were differentially weighted, adjusting the data for the disproportionate sampling of institutions and the unequal rates of response. Tabulations from the weighted data of this survey, then, may be taken as reasonably representative of the entire population of teaching faculty at colleges and universities in the United States.

World War II generation, however, the Jewish proportion had climbed to 9 per cent, at which point it leveled off. The most recent group of young faculty, those under 25, include 12 per cent Jews. Whether this represents a new major increase, or possibly reflects the fact that Jews are able to complete their graduate work and enter teaching earlier than their Gentile compeers, cannot be determined from our data.

The increase in Jewish faculty has been even greater at the more important centers of learning, as Table 2 indicates. At Ivy League

TABLE 2. RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND OF AMERICAN PROFESSORIATE, BY AGE, ELITE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ONLY\*  
(Per Cent)

		<i>Jewish</i>	<i>Catholic</i>	<i>Protestant</i>	<i>Other &amp; None</i>	<i>Total</i>
65 years and over	(n=439)	9.3	9.1	74.8	6.6	100
60-64	(n=1012)	10.4	9.0	73.2	7.4	100
55-59	(n=1317)	14.4	9.5	69.5	6.1	100
50-54	(n=1756)	16.1	10.9	66.2	6.8	100
45-49	(n=2425)	20.0	11.7	58.3	10.0	100
40-44	(n=2749)	22.6	11.6	54.8	11.0	100
35-39	(n=3322)	20.3	14.9	54.4	10.5	100
30-34	(n=3398)	20.2	15.4	54.4	10.0	100
29 years and under	(n=2673)	20.6	18.7	51.8	8.8	100
All Faculty in Elite Colleges and Universities	(n=19,092)	19.0	13.4	58.3	9.3	100

\* An institution was classified as *elite* on the basis of a three item index, including selectivity (Scholastic Aptitude Test scores required for admission), affluence (revenue per student), and research activity (research expenditures per student).

schools, one group of the elite colleges, the proportion of Jews among professors in their fifties (18 per cent) is over twice that among faculty in their sixties, while about a quarter of those under 50, all of whom entered the professoriate after World War II, are Jewish.

### *Location of Faculty*

The entry of Jews into academe has followed, in part, along certain traditional lines. Their geographic distribution shows the same pattern as the Jewish population generally. Most Jewish professors are located in the Northeast. They are the most underrepresented in the South, and are relatively strong in the West (Table 3).

More interesting is the distribution of the different religious groups among the various disciplines (Table 4). The largest concentration of

TABLE 3. REGION WHERE RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL IS LOCATED  
(Per Cent)

	Northeast	South	Midwest	West	Total
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	56.2	10.2	19.5	14.1	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	36.2	19.6	26.4	17.8	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	22.5	30.5	28.2	18.9	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	28.7	25.8	26.7	18.8	100

Jews is in the two major free professional fields, medicine and law.<sup>12</sup> Clearly, the early penchant of Jews for these two areas, which have been both prestigious and least subject to the prejudices and whims of employers, has carried over into teaching and research. It is noteworthy that within the natural sciences they are most heavily represented in the two fields having the strongest links to medical problems, biochemistry and the complex of bacteriology: molecular biology, virology, and others. This finding is paralleled by the very heavy involvement of Jews in clinical psychology, perhaps the closest field to medicine among the social sciences.<sup>13</sup> It is impossible to tell from the data how much of the attraction of these "health"-linked fields has been a substitute for fulfilling the Jewish dream of becoming a "doctor." Probably, many Jews who were unable to attend medical school picked such subjects as a "second choice."

The considerable presence of Jews in social science departments (and schools of social work), in comparison to most of the humanities and natural sciences, may be related to the disposition of secularized Western Jews for reform-oriented politics, to be discussed later. A variety of studies of undergraduate career choices indicate that the more left-disposed students are more inclined than others to an academic career, particularly in the politically relevant social sciences.<sup>14</sup> As the newest

<sup>12</sup> On Jewish overrepresentation in these fields, see Ernest van den Haag, *The Jewish Mystique* (New York: Stein and Day, 1969), p. 23.

<sup>13</sup> Proportionately there are more Jews in psychiatry than in any other medical speciality. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>14</sup> Ian D. Currie, *et al.*, "Images of the Professor and Interest in the Academic Profession," in Ronald M. Pavalko, ed., *Sociology of Education* (Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1968), pp. 540-541, 549-550; Martin Trow, "Recruitment to College Teaching," in A. H. Halsey *et al.*, eds., *Education, Economy and Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 609-617.

TABLE 4. RESPONDENT'S PRINCIPAL TEACHING FIELD\*  
(Per Cent)

		<i>Jewish faculty</i>	<i>Catholic faculty</i>	<i>Protestant faculty</i>	<i>Other &amp; None</i>
Social Sciences	(n=6845) <sup>b</sup>	14.6	16.9	60.5	8.0
Anthropology	(n=444)	12.2	9.0	67.3	11.5
Economics	(n=1469)	15.0	16.7	60.0	8.3
Political Science	(n=1230)	12.6	14.4	65.3	7.7
Psychology	(n=2046)	16.5	17.8	58.5	7.2
Sociology	(n=1004)	12.7	20.0	58.5	8.8
Humanities	(n=9546) <sup>b</sup>	7.5	24.5	61.6	6.5
English Language and Lit.	(n=3307)	7.4	21.3	64.9	6.5
Modern European Languages and Literature	(n=1601)	7.2	29.5	56.4	6.9
History	(n=1955)	8.8	20.2	66.2	4.7
Journalism	(n=308)	5.9	10.5	72.5	11.1
Philosophy	(n=761)	7.6	36.4	49.9	6.1
Religion and Theology	(n=523)	1.0	30.9	65.3	2.7
Fine Arts	(n=3732)	7.2	15.5	70.6	6.7
Architecture	(n=499)	9.2	20.5	63.4	6.9
Art	(n=808)	4.4	22.7	65.0	7.9
Drama and Speech	(n=933)	9.3	13.0	72.9	4.9
Music	(n=1317)	6.5	11.0	76.7	5.7
Physical Sciences	(n=7599)	8.2	16.7	66.8	8.3
Chemistry	(n=1834)	6.3	17.9	69.1	6.8
Earth Sciences	(n=786)	3.6	13.2	74.8	8.3
Geography	(n=390)	2.3	15.1	75.3	7.2
Mathematics and Statistics	(n=2831)	8.6	18.5	65.0	7.9
Physics	(n=1662)	13.8	14.2	60.1	11.9
Biological Sciences	(n=4403)	9.8	14.3	67.7	8.2
Bacteriology <sup>c</sup>	(n=788)	14.1	15.8	60.7	9.4
Biochemistry	(n=643)	20.6	10.9	58.6	9.8
Botany	(n=339)	3.7	14.7	75.0	6.7
Physiology	(n=927)	9.4	16.8	65.5	8.3
Zoology	(n=391)	3.6	8.9	81.4	6.0
Law	(n=593)	24.9	17.9	52.7	4.6
Social Work	(n=497)	16.3	17.2	60.3	6.2
Education	(n=3277)	6.2	17.4	72.0	4.4
Medicine	(n=2312)	22.4	12.8	59.1	5.7
Business	(n=2080)	7.5	18.4	69.3	4.7
Engineering	(n=4165)	9.0	16.5	65.1	9.4
Agriculture	(n=1348)	.7	8.5	84.1	6.6

\* The number of faculty in the various fields included in this table does not equal 60,028 because: 1) some faculty members (7,664) did not specify their "principal teaching field"; 2) some fields included in the survey have not been listed; and 3) some respondents did not answer the question on their religious background.

<sup>b</sup> The total number of cases for the social sciences or the humanities is more than the total of those listed for the separate disciplines because they include individuals who were listed as "social scientists" or under categories like "other foreign languages including linguistics," etc.

<sup>c</sup> Molecular biology, virology, microbiology.

group of disciplines, the social sciences have been less discriminatory, more committed to universalistic principles than the humanities. The latter, as the oldest and least "practical" fields, have tended to be identified with high status, and hence were more restrictive in their admission policies.

The underrepresentation of Jews in the humanities and history may reflect the continuation of a distinction frequently made in Wilhelminian and even Weimar Germany. Some who supported the appointment of Jews to professorships in the sciences and social sciences argued that they could not be professors of German literature or history. These subjects were at the heart of the *Volkswesen*, the national essence, while the Jews (obviously) were *wesenfremd*, alien to the national essence. Suspicions about the *Volkswesen* suitability of Jews in English and history have not completely vanished in the U.S. In his presidential address to the American Historical Association, in 1962, Carl Bridenbaugh lamented that "many of the younger practitioners of our craft . . . are products of lower middle-class or foreign origins and . . . find themselves in a real sense outsiders to our past and feel themselves shut out. This is certainly not their fault, but it is true." By "products of . . . foreign origins," we would hazard the guess, Professor Bridenbaugh was not thinking primarily of Albanians.<sup>15</sup>

Fittingly, in view of the historic limitations on Jews in agriculture in Christian Europe, they are largely absent from the faculties of agriculture schools, and are heavily underrepresented in fields linked to the soil or agriculture, e.g., geography, earth sciences, botany, and zoology. The absence of Jews in religion and theology undoubtedly reflects the fact that there are only two Jewish supported universities, and that all university-affiliated schools of theology are Christian.

### *Caliber*

Over fifty years ago, Thorstein Veblen addressed himself to the issue of the "intellectual pre-eminence of the Jews," describing their contribution in highly laudatory terms:

It is a fact which must strike any dispassionate observer that the Jewish people have contributed much more than an even share to the intellectual life of modern Europe. So also is it plain that the civilization of Christendom continues today to draw heavily on the Jews for men devoted to science and scholarly pursuits. It is not only that men of Jewish extraction continue to supply more than a

<sup>15</sup> Carl Bridenbaugh, "The Great Mutation," *The American Historical Review*, January 1963, pp. 322-323.



proportionate quota to the rank and file engaged in scientific and scholarly work, but a disproportionate number of the men to whom modern science and scholarship look for guidance and leadership are of the same derivation. . . . They count particularly among the vanguard, the pioneers, the uneasy guild of pathfinders and iconoclasts, in science, scholarship, and institutional change and growth.<sup>16</sup>

Other writers have even pointed to evidence that Jews played a major role in science and scholarship long before the modern era. Thus, drawing on George Sarton's classic studies in the history of science, Weyl and Possony reported that, for the first 1400 years of Christendom, Sarton listed 1,897 scholars of whom 10.6 per cent were Jewish, at least three times their proportion in the population of Europe.<sup>17</sup> For more recent times, a variety of analysts of intellectual creativity have emphasized the very heavy representation of Jews of varying nationalities among Nobel Prize winners. Lewis Feuer noted that out of 40 Germans who received such prizes up to 1940, 12 (30 per cent) were Jewish.<sup>18</sup> Ernest van den Haag pointed to the fact that 18 of the 67 American scientists who received Nobel Prizes up to 1965—that is, 27 per cent—were Jewish.<sup>19</sup> On a world scale Jews accounted for 16 per cent of the 225 Prize winners in the sciences between 1901 and 1962.<sup>20</sup>

The two antisemitic totalitarian powers of the 1930's, Germany and Italy, had both been heavily dependent on their small minorities of Jews for scholarly leaders:

Put the matter numerically and in the roughest way, in pre-Nazi Germany Jews formed about three quarters of one per cent of the population. Of distinguished German mathematicians, physicists and medical researchers, they provided something like 30 times their due proportion, for at least 25 per cent of these were Jewish. In Italy, where the Jewish population was only one per thousand, Jewish intellectual supremacy was even higher in certain departments. Well over 50 per cent of the distinguished mathematicians were Jews.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Thorstein Veblen, "The Intellectual Pre-Eminence of Jews in Modern Europe," in his *Essays in Our Changing Order* (New York: The Viking Press, 1934), pp. 221, 223–224. The essay was first published in 1919.

<sup>17</sup> Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony, *The Geography of Intellect* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1963), pp. 123–128.

<sup>18</sup> Lewis Feuer, *The Scientific Intellectual* (New York: Basic Books, 1963), pp. 301–302.

<sup>19</sup> Van den Haag, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–23.

<sup>20</sup> Weyl and Possony, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

<sup>21</sup> Charles Singer, "Science and Judaism," in Louis Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews*, Vol. II (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 1414–1415. See also, Ernst Heppner, *Juden als Erfinder und Entdecker* (Berlin: Henriette Beckerstiftung Welt Verlag, 1913); and Abraham Myerson and Isaac Goldberg, *The German Jew* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1913).

If this latter figure seems astonishing given the small size of the Jewish population, it should be noted that in the 1920's, when a minute fraction of the Italian population attended university, about 25 per cent of the Jewish men did.<sup>22</sup>

Jews constituted 9 per cent of all Soviet scholars (university faculty and research specialists) in January 1937. In 1947, before Stalin's antisemitic campaign began, 16 per cent of those who received Stalin awards in the sciences were Jewish, as were 14 per cent in art and literature.<sup>23</sup> Jews have continued to make a high contribution to the ranks of Soviet scientific researchers, although they are rarely allowed to hold formal administrative or leadership roles in the scholarly world, and are increasingly subject to discrimination in admission to higher education and to the nonscientific professions. However, Soviet spokesmen can still legitimately point to the very considerable participation of Jews in higher education and intellectual endeavors in their country. In so doing, they testify to the intensity of the drive among Jews to be part of the intellectual world, a drive which in pre-World War II days also led to comparable statistics in various Central and Eastern European countries which explicitly sought to restrict opportunities for Jews. It is, of course, also true, as Robert Merton has noted, that antisemitic propagandists are wont to compile lists of Jews who have made notable contributions to science, literature, and the arts on the assumption that Gentiles will see something sinister about these Jewish accomplishments.<sup>24</sup>

The record of Jews in Western democratic countries is also one of exceptionally high intellectual achievement. A recent (1965) survey found that 3.5 per cent of the British faculty are Jewish, although Jews form slightly less than 1 per cent of the population.<sup>25</sup> Jews constitute 7 per cent of the members of the Royal Society, Britain's highly honorific scientific organization, in 1971.<sup>26</sup> Lord Goodman, chairman of the Arts

<sup>22</sup> Salo Baron, "European Jewry Before and After Hitler," *AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK*, Vol. 63 (1962), p. 10; Carlo Tagliacozzo, "Presenza degli ebrei nelle scienze moderna," *Rassegna mensile di Israel* (Milan), especially pp. 212-216.

<sup>23</sup> Solomon S. Schwartz, *The Jews in the Soviet Union* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1951), pp. 300-301, 362.

<sup>24</sup> Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (New York: The Free Press, 1968), pp. 487-488.

<sup>25</sup> A. H. Halsey and Martin Trow, *A Study of the British University Teachers* (mimeographed manuscript, August 1967, to be published by Harvard University Press), Chapter VII, p. 24.

<sup>26</sup> We are indebted to Professor Julius Gould for this statistic. For an earlier

Council, commented in 1962 that the "Jewish community . . . [has] contributed very largely to the artists who have made the name of Britain resplendent. I won't instance them, but in the theatre at this moment the younger school of dramatists is perhaps 75 per cent Jewish."<sup>27</sup> In France as well, Jews have played a major role in intellectual and scholarly life, beginning particularly with the so-called "third generation" after emancipation, that is, since 1870. As Rabi put it, when their parents have been successful in the business world, "the sons are intellectuals. For them, scientific research has an irresistible attraction."<sup>28</sup> Jews have also formed a major section of the world of *belles lettres* in France.

There is probably no country in which Jews have been able to do as well intellectually as in the United States, given the extraordinary spread of higher education in this country in the post-World War II years. Studies of undergraduate enrollment indicate that about 80 per cent of college-age Jews are enrolled in higher education, as compared to 40 per cent for the population as a whole.<sup>29</sup> And the Jewish students are heavily located in the more selective (higher academic standards) schools.<sup>30</sup> A 1969 American Council on Education survey of college freshmen found that, as a group, those of Jewish parentage had higher secondary-school averages than their Gentile counterparts; this in spite of the fact that a much larger proportion of Jews than non-Jews go on to college.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, Jews seemingly perform better as students, once admitted to college; for example, they have been represented in the membership of Phi Beta Kappa at about twice their proportion of the undergraduate population.<sup>32</sup>

The generalizations and findings concerning the propensity of Jews to achieve intellectually are reinforced by our data. By every criterion of academic accomplishment, Jewish faculty as a group have far sur-

---

reference indicating that Jews formed 5 per cent of the Royal Society in 1948, see Hannah Neustatter, "Demographic and Other Statistical Aspects of Anglo-Jewry," in Maurice Freedman, ed., *A Minority in Britain* (London: Ballantine, Mitchell and Co., 1955), p. 132.

<sup>27</sup> Barnet Litvinoff, *A Peculiar People* (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1969), p. 168.

<sup>28</sup> Rabi, *Anatomie du Judaïsme Français* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1966), pp. 67-72, 105-107.

<sup>29</sup> "The American Jew Today," *Newsweek*, March 1, 1971, p. 63.

<sup>30</sup> David E. Drew, *A Profile of the Jewish Freshman* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970), pp. 11-12.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>32</sup> Nathaniel Weyl, *The Creative Elite in America* (Washington, D.C.: The Public Affairs Press, 1966), p. 94.

TABLE 5. RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL CLASSIFIED AS UNIVERSITY,  
4-YEAR COLLEGE OR 2-YEAR COLLEGE  
(Per Cent)

	University	4-Year Institution	2-Year Institution	Total
Jewish Faculty (n = 5907)	70.2	23.7	6.1	100
Catholic Faculty (n = 9096)	37.2	46.0	16.8	100
Protestant Faculty (n = 37,804)	45.1	38.8	16.2	100
All Faculty (n = 60,028)	46.4	38.2	15.4	100

passed their Gentile colleagues (Table 5). (There is, of course, a considerable range of variation among Jews and non-Jews). Thus, Jews are much more likely than Christian faculty to be located in universities rather than in four- or two-year colleges. They are heavily represented on the faculties of Ivy League schools, other elite private universities, the "Big Ten," and the various campuses of the University of California; they are considerably underrepresented in the other, generally less prestigious, state universities. When the schools in the sample are rank ordered according to an index of academic quality (Scholastic Aptitude

TABLE 6. RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL AS CLASSIFIED BY  
AN INDEX OF ACADEMIC QUALITY\*  
(Per Cent)

	1 (highest quality)	2	3	4	5 (lowest quality)	Total
Jewish Faculty (n = 5907)	31.6	12.6	12.1	30.2	13.5	100
Catholic Faculty (n = 9096)	8.1	6.6	11.8	31.6	41.9	100
Protestant Faculty (n = 37,804)	9.5	8.3	11.8	28.0	42.5	100
All Faculty (n = 60,028)	11.7	8.5	11.8	28.7	39.3	100

\* The index was composed by combining the Scholastic Aptitude Test score (selectivity), research dollars per student code (research), and the revenue per student code (affluence).

TABLE 7. "HOW MANY ARTICLES HAVE YOU PUBLISHED IN ACADEMIC OR PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>None</i>	<i>1-2</i>	<i>3-4</i>	<i>5-10</i>	<i>11-20</i>	<i>More than 20</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n = 5907)	25.5	17.6	9.9	14.1	12.2	20.8	100
Catholic Faculty (n = 9096)	50.6	20.6	9.7	8.0	4.8	6.2	100
Protestant Faculty (n = 37,804)	43.8	20.0	10.3	10.3	6.4	9.1	100
All Faculty (n = 60,028)	43.0	19.8	10.3	10.3	6.8	9.8	100

Test scores required for admission, research dollars per student, and revenue per student) 32 per cent of the Jews are at schools which are in the highest quality category, in contrast to 9 per cent of the Christian professors. Conversely, over 40 per cent of the latter are at the lowest quality category schools, as compared to 13.5 per cent of the Jews (Table 6).

The same pattern of accomplishment is reflected in the data on publications. The Jewish faculty have published many more books and articles than their Gentile compeers (Table 7). To some degree, these varia-

TABLE 8. "DO YOUR INTERESTS LIE PRIMARILY IN TEACHING OR IN RESEARCH?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Very Heavily in Research</i>	<i>In Both, but Leaning Toward Research</i>	<i>In Both, but Leaning Toward Teaching</i>	<i>Very Heavily in Teaching</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n = 5907)	8.1	34.7	32.8	24.4	100
Catholic Faculty (n = 9096)	2.9	16.2	32.6	48.2	100
Protestant Faculty (n = 37,804)	3.1	17.3	33.7	46.0	100
All Faculty (n = 60,028)	3.7	19.4	33.5	43.4	100

TABLE 9. "WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT RANK?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Professor</i>	<i>Associate Professor</i>	<i>Assistant Professor</i>	<i>Instructor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n = 5907)	28.3	24.8	31.5	15.4	100
Catholic Faculty (n = 9096)	17.4	23.0	33.7	25.9	100
Protestant Faculty (n = 37,804)	26.6	22.9	29.1	21.4	100
All Faculty (n = 60,028)	24.8	23.1	30.4	21.6	100

tions in research accomplishments are linked to the fact that the Jews in the sample, on the average, spend more time "on professional reading, writing or research" than do their non-Jewish colleagues. They also are much more likely than other professors to report themselves as primarily interested in research (Table 8).

Not unexpectedly, these academic achievements of the Jewish faculty are reflected in their rank and financial status. Although slightly younger on the average than non-Jews (the median age for Jews was 38, as contrasted to 40 for Gentiles), a larger percentage of Jews were full professors (Table 9). And the salaries of the Jewish professors were considerably higher than those of other faculty. Thus, 16 per cent of the Jews, but only 7 per cent of the entire sample, had annual salaries of \$20,000 or more (Table 10).

TABLE 10. "WHAT IS YOUR BASIC INSTITUTIONAL SALARY BEFORE TAX AND DEDUCTIONS FOR THE CURRENT YEAR?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Under \$10,000</i>	<i>\$10,000–13,999</i>	<i>\$14,000–19,999</i>	<i>\$20,000–24,999</i>	<i>Over \$25,000</i>
Jewish Faculty (n = 5907)	25.6	31.3	27.0	10.1	5.9
Catholic Faculty (n = 9096)	44.0	36.2	15.5	2.8	1.5
Protestant Faculty (n = 37,804)	34.9	36.6	21.6	4.8	2.1
All Faculty (n = 60,028)	35.6	36.2	20.8	5.0	2.3

These accomplishments of Jews in academe are in part only a special variant of the propensity of Jews for hard work—and resultant success—generally. In a detailed summary of the evidence concerning Jewish achievements from the 1930's through the 1950's, Nathan Glazer pointed out that the gains made by Jews surpassed those of all other immigrant groups, and indeed those of "old stock" Americans. In this period, Jews moved rapidly into the ranks of professionals and the self-employed generally, although relatively few of their parents had been in these occupations. And uniformly by the 1940's within specific occupations, "Jews earned more than non-Jews."<sup>33</sup> In seeking to account for Jewish success in business, the professions, and intellectual life, Glazer concluded that the explanation lay in the group's adherence to a particular syndrome of values and habits, which led members to emphasize hard work and learning, to be careful, and to postpone present pleasures for future security and satisfaction. These orientations, which characterized the behavior of poor, often unlearned and unskilled Jews in the East European ghettos and in the crowded slums of American cities, are precisely the ones making for achievement, for mobility into the urban middle class. Max Weber stressed the emergence of such traits in Western Europe to form the capitalist ethic out of Calvinism. But, as Glazer noted, these were omnipresent among Jews as a result of historic experiences reinforced by the conditions of ghetto life:

There is no question that Judaism . . . emphasizes the traits that businessmen and intellectuals require, and has done so since at least 1,500 years before Calvinism. . . . The strong emphasis on learning and study can be traced that far back, too. The Jewish habits of foresight, care, moderation probably arose early during the 2,000 years that Jews have lived primarily as strangers among other peoples.<sup>34</sup>

The propensity of Jews for academic achievement would also seem to be linked to their greater commitment to intellectual activities. Jews form a highly disproportionate part of the market and audience for art and literature. Wealthy Jews are relatively more generous in their support for such endeavors than equivalent Gentiles. Alvin Toffler described the extensive contribution of Jews to American cultural life:

. . . although there is no statistical data that even attempts to analyze the racial or religious background of the arts public, conversations with gallery directors,

<sup>33</sup> Nathan Glazer, "Social Characteristics of American Jews," in *AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK*, Vol. 56 (1955), pp. 28–29. See also Ernest Havemann and Patricia Slater West, *They Went to College* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1952), pp. 186–189.

<sup>34</sup> Glazer, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

orchestra managers, and other art administrators in many cities lead one to conclude that the culture public contains a higher than proportionate number of Jewish people. Jews, of course, have always been prominent as artists. . . . The extension director of a university in California, in discussing the rising level of cultural activity in Los Angeles, cites the growth of the Jewish population as the causative agent. A museum director in San Antonio says: "The vast majority of collectors here are Jewish." In Dallas the arts attract considerable support from the Jewish community.<sup>35</sup>

Sam Wells, in an article in *Fortune*, stressed the contribution of the New York Jews to "the world of art, theatre, and music . . . sometimes strident, generally exciting, and often original and profound." He wrote:

An educated guess has it that perhaps a third of the city's art galleries are Jewish owned or managed. In the theatre, Jews are prominent as owners, directors, playwrights and actors. They have been leaders in radio and television from the earliest days of these media. In music they have enriched the city with special abundance.<sup>36</sup>

Jews in academe reflect this group disposition in exhibiting a greater commitment to "intellectuality" than their non-Jewish fellow professionals. Previous studies of academe have indicated that Jewish professors are more likely to think of themselves as "intellectuals" than comparably located Gentiles.<sup>37</sup> And this difference in self-perception is

TABLE 11. "I CONSIDER MYSELF AN INTELLECTUAL"  
(Per Cent)

	Strongly Agree	Agree With Reserva- tions	Disagree With Reserva- tions	Strongly Disagree	Total
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	35.7	46.5	13.9	3.9	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	18.1	50.3	23.9	7.7	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	16.2	51.7	24.4	7.8	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	19.1	50.6	22.9	7.3	100

<sup>35</sup> Alvin Toffler, *The Culture Consumers* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964), p. 34.

<sup>36</sup> Sam Wells, "The Jewish Elan," *Fortune*, February 1960, p. 166.

<sup>37</sup> Charles H. Anderson, "Kitch and the Academic," *Sociology and Social Research*, July 1967, p. 452.



TABLE 12. "HOW OFTEN, ON AVERAGE, DO YOU ATTEND AN ATHLETIC EVENT?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Once a Week or More</i>	<i>2 or 3 Times a Month</i>	<i>About Once a Month</i>	<i>A Few Times a Year</i>	<i>Once a Year or Less</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Jewish Faculty</b> (n=5907)	1.2	5.0	10.1	31.1	52.6	100
<b>Catholic Faculty</b> (n=9096)	5.0	9.9	15.4	32.1	37.6	100
<b>Protestant Faculty</b> (n=37,804)	4.8	13.9	17.8	33.2	30.3	100
<b>All Faculty</b> (n=60,028)	4.4	12.0	16.3	32.5	34.8	100

associated with a greater involvement in serious culture, as reflected by reading habits and other cultural tastes.<sup>38</sup> The much more extensive Carnegie sample validated these earlier findings. Thus, twice as many Jews (36 per cent) as Christians (17 per cent) strongly agreed with the statement, "I consider myself an intellectual" (Table 11). This variation between the religious groups is linked to quite different tastes. More than half of the Jewish professors almost never attend an athletic event (53 per cent), in contrast to but one third (32 per cent) among Gentiles (Table 12). The Jews, on the other hand are more likely to attend concerts and plays regularly, and to go to "art" films (Table 13).

TABLE 13. FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT A CULTURAL EVENT  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Once a Week or More</i>	<i>2 or 3 Times a Month</i>	<i>About Once a Month</i>	<i>A Few Times a Year</i>	<i>Once a Year or Less</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Jewish Faculty</b> (n=5,907)	6.8	24.6	35.4	28.4	4.8	100
<b>Catholic Faculty</b> (n=9,096)	4.5	11.7	34.8	41.4	7.6	100
<b>Protestant Faculty</b> (n=37,804)	3.4	13.9	29.9	45.1	7.7	100
<b>All Faculty</b> (n=60,028)	3.9	14.7	31.2	42.6	7.5	100

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 447-449.

The greater commitment of Jewish academics to the intellectual role and activities clearly has its roots in Jewish culture.<sup>39</sup> Many have sought to explain this trait as a secularization of the emphasis on religious study which characterized life in the ghetto for over a millenium. Presumably, the status given to the religious scholar and the activities of the mind remains within secularized Jewish culture, transferred in large part to the intellectual and his work. Some evidence that the intellectual orientation of the current crop of Jewish faculty members is not due to the greater educational and intellectual achievements of their parents may be seen in the fact that they come from less educated families, which were less represented in the teaching professions and in other occupations requiring high levels of education, than the families of the Gentile professors. A larger percentage of the Jews had fathers who had not graduated from high school than did the rest of academe. And more Gentiles, particularly the predominant Protestants among them, had fathers who had attended college (41 per cent) than did the Jews (35 per cent), as indicated in Table 14. A similar pattern is reflected in family occupational background. Almost half the Jews had fathers who were in business, 45 per cent, as contrasted with 16 per cent among the others.

TABLE 14. "WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION REACHED BY YOUR FATHER?"

(Per Cent)

	<i>11 Years or Less</i>	<i>High School Graduate</i>	<i>Some College/ College Graduate</i>	<i>Graduate Training</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	48.5	16.9	17.4	17.3	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	54.1	18.3	16.2	11.4	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	41.3	17.5	23.7	17.5	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	44.2	17.3	21.7	16.8	100

<sup>39</sup> For a description of the historic commitment to education among Jews see Weyl, *The Creative Elite in America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-168, and Pierre Aubery, *Milieux juifs de la France contemporaine* (Paris: Plon, 1962), pp. 248-257, 265-275.

TABLE 15. "WHAT IS (WAS) YOUR FATHER'S PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION?"  
(Per Cent)

	College/ University Teaching	Elementary/ Secondary Teaching	Other Professional	Managerial	Owner Large Business	Owner Small Business	Farm Owner	Clerical & Sales	Skilled Worker	Semi- & Unskilled Worker	Total
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	1.0	2.2	16.4	9.9	4.3	40.8	.6	9.3	10.8	4.8	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	1.5	1.8	10.7	18.1	2.0	16.2	5.5	9.1	23.0	12.2	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	4.2	4.0	15.3	16.2	1.2	14.8	12.9	7.7	16.1	7.5	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	3.6	3.4	14.7	15.8	1.7	17.6	10.3	7.9	16.7	8.1	100

Although 8 per cent of the Protestants had fathers who had been employed in education at some level, only 3 per cent of the Jews gave similar reports (Table 15). Thus, though the Jewish professors must have absorbed their drive for intellectual accomplishment in their home environment, more of them than of their non-Jewish colleagues were the "first-generation" of their families to attend college.

### *Religious Involvement*

All surveys of religious commitment, belief, and practice in the United States indicated that Jews are much less involved in religious activities than Protestants, who in turn are less active than Catholics.<sup>40</sup> To an increasing degree, identification as Jewish has become ethnocultural

TABLE 16. "WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT RELIGION?"  
FACULTY OF JEWISH, CATHOLIC, AND PROTESTANT PARENTAGE, BY AGE  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Protestant</i>	<i>Catholic</i>	<i>Jewish</i>	<i>Other &amp; None</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Jewish</i>					
60 years and over (n=165)	1.9	0.1	68.1	29.9	100
50-59 (n=825)	1.9	0.1	67.7	30.3	100
40-49 (n=1,745)	1.5	0.6	69.7	28.2	100
30-39 (n=2,124)	0.7	0.1	69.8	29.4	100
Under 30 years (n=1,048)	0.3	0.5	67.8	31.5	100
All Ages (n=5,907)	1.1	0.3	69.4	29.2	100
<i>Catholic</i>					
60 years and over (n=306)	11.3	78.6	0.0	10.1	100
50-59 (n=1,532)	5.2	80.1	0.0	14.7	100
40-49 (n=2,355)	6.4	76.1	0.0	17.5	100
30-39 (n=3,256)	6.1	67.4	1.1	25.4	100
Under 30 years (n=1,637)	0.4	73.4	0.0	26.2	100
All Ages (n=9,096)	5.2	73.1	0.4	21.3	100
<i>Protestant</i>					
60 years and over (n=3,314)	79.8	5.4	0.2	14.6	100
50-59 (n=6,628)	81.9	2.4	0.0	15.7	100
40-49 (n=10,283)	72.5	3.2	0.1	24.2	100
30-39 (n=12,060)	70.1	2.2	0.0	27.7	100
Under 30 years (n=5,519)	57.8	6.0	1.0	35.2	100
All Ages (n=37,804)	72.0	3.3	0.2	24.5	100

<sup>40</sup> See the annual studies of church attendance for different denominations, which have consistently shown Jews in the synagogue during the preceding week ranging around 20 per cent, far less than Protestants (40) and these in turn far less than Catholic (60). The most recent comprehensive report is George Gallup, Jr. and John O. Davies, III, "Religion in America," *The Gallup Opinion Index*, Report No. 70, April, 1971.

rather than religious. Our data on faculty beliefs and practices show essentially the same pattern. Somewhat fewer Jews than Christians report their present religion as that in which they were brought up (Table 16). More of Jewish background (26 per cent) now consider their religion to be "none," than do those of Christian stock (20 per cent). Jews are very much less likely to attend religious services than Gentiles. Of course, Catholics, who have a religious obligation to go to church each week, attend much more frequently than Protestants (Table 17).

Given an assumption of growing secularization, it might be expected that younger Jews would be more irreligious than their elders. There is a clear tendency in this direction, but the proportion of younger Jewish academics who regard themselves as not having any religious identification, who do not attend services, or are hostile to religion, does not differ greatly from that of the older (Tables 16, 17 and 18). This finding is especially surprising since other data in the survey, particularly on political opinions, indicate very large differences associated with age. Increased age is consistently accompanied by greater political conserva-

TABLE 17. "HOW OFTEN, ON AVERAGE, DO YOU ATTEND A RELIGIOUS SERVICE?"  
 FACULTY OF JEWISH, CATHOLIC, AND PROTESTANT PARENTAGE, BY AGE  
 (Per Cent)

	<i>Once a Week or More</i>	<i>2 or 3 Times a Month</i>	<i>About Once a Month</i>	<i>A Few Times a Year</i>	<i>Once a Year or Less</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Jewish</b>						
60 years and over (n=165)	8.2	6.5	6.5	26.5	52.3	100
50-59 (n=825)	4.3	5.9	6.6	28.5	54.6	100
40-49 (n=1,745)	7.5	7.4	8.3	26.9	49.9	100
30-39 (n=2,124)	3.4	3.7	6.0	25.1	61.7	100
Under 30 years (n=1,048)	4.7	2.4	3.7	25.1	64.0	100
All Ages (n=5,907)	5.1	5.0	6.4	26.1	57.4	100
<b>Catholic</b>						
60 years and over (n=306)	60.0	2.4	3.6	5.5	28.5	100
50-59 (n=1,532)	71.6	2.1	1.8	3.8	20.7	100
40-49 (n=2,365)	64.9	6.0	6.9	6.5	15.6	100
30-39 (n=3,256)	55.6	10.0	2.9	7.8	23.7	100
Under 30 years (n=1,637)	61.2	4.9	1.2	8.2	24.5	100
All Ages (n=9,096)	61.6	6.6	3.5	6.9	21.4	100
<b>Protestant</b>						
60 years and over (n=3,314)	39.4	14.1	10.0	14.6	21.9	100
50-59 (n=6,628)	32.3	17.9	11.0	13.4	25.5	100
40-49 (n=10,283)	34.7	16.7	4.8	15.9	27.9	100
30-39 (n=12,060)	29.4	14.5	8.1	14.4	33.6	100
Under 30 years (n=5,519)	26.4	11.5	6.1	15.3	40.6	100
All Ages (n=37,804)	31.7	15.3	7.6	14.8	30.7	100

tism on a variety of measures. Among Protestants and Catholics, the differences in religiousness among the age strata are generally much larger than among Jews. This is not, as Tables 16, 17, and 18 make clear, because young Gentiles are more irreligious than young Jews—they are in fact less so—but because a posture of irreligion came to Gentile academics in the United States at a much later period.

### *Politics*

Jewish academics belong to two groups which have been more liberal or leftist politically than other strata or ethnic-religious collectivities. Intellectuals and Jews generally have been more disposed to back liberal, Democratic, and left-wing third party candidates than other segments of the population have been.<sup>41</sup> The propensity of Jews to be located on

TABLE 18. RESPONDENT'S ASSESSMENT OF HIS RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION  
FACULTY OF JEWISH, CATHOLIC, AND PROTESTANT PARENTAGE, BY AGE  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Deeply Religious</i>	<i>Moderately Religious</i>	<i>Largely Indifferent to Religion</i>	<i>Basically Opposed to Religion</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Jewish</b>					
60 years and over (n=165)	5.7	31.2	52.8	10.3	100
50-59 (n=825)	4.8	29.6	51.0	14.6	100
40-49 (n=1,745)	5.0	31.3	47.8	15.8	100
30-39 (n=2,124)	5.0	24.9	51.4	18.6	100
Under 30 years (n=1,048)	5.5	22.8	51.1	20.6	100
All Ages (n=5,907)	5.1	27.3	50.3	17.3	100
<b>Catholic</b>					
60 years and over (n=306)	45.2	44.6	8.3	1.8	100
50-59 (n=1,532)	30.5	51.2	9.8	8.5	100
40-49 (n=2,365)	17.6	61.9	16.0	4.5	100
30-39 (n=3,256)	18.0	54.6	20.3	7.2	100
Under 30 years (n=1,637)	21.8	47.6	21.8	8.8	100
All Ages (n=9,096)	21.2	54.5	17.5	6.8	100
<b>Protestant</b>					
60 years and over (n=3,314)	25.4	57.2	16.6	0.9	100
50-59 (n=6,628)	17.1	59.6	19.2	4.1	100
40-49 (n=10,283)	15.3	55.1	24.2	5.4	100
30-39 (n=12,060)	12.8	49.6	31.1	6.6	100
Under 30 years (n=5,519)	10.5	43.2	34.8	11.6	100
All Ages (n=37,804)	15.0	52.6	26.4	6.1	100

<sup>41</sup> For a detailed survey of the extant empirical literature on the politics of college faculty, published before the Carnegie study, see Lipset, "The Politics of

the left has been discussed in a number of writings; we will not detail them here.<sup>42</sup> Some link this orientation to aspects of Jewish religious teaching. Most, however, relate it to the historic pattern of discrimination which forced or disposed Jews to oppose conservative parties, so often aligned against the claim of Jews for equal rights. While discrimination was greater in much of Europe than in the United States at any time, American Jews did face barriers in employment, in admission to professions, and in access to leading private universities, as well as sanctions against their participation, even when well-to-do and highly educated, in the social activities of the predominantly Protestant affluent strata.

The propensity of intellectuals, including academics, to back the left has been related to a number of other factors, especially the emphasis on innovation and the rejection of tradition inherent in the very concept of the intellectual as a *creator* of knowledge, art, or literature. Some have argued that inherent in the obligation to create is the tendency to reject the status quo, to oppose the existing or the old as philistine. Intellectuals are also more likely than persons in other occupations to be partisans of the ideal, and thus to criticize reality from the standpoint of the ideal. The need to express the inner logic of their discipline or art form also presses intellectuals to oppose the established leadership that prefers continuity to change.

In his analysis of Jewish intellectual traits, Veblen linked the inherently critical orientation of the creative intellectual to the status of the secularized Jew as an "outsider" in Gentile societies. The Jew was dis-

---

Academia," in David C. Nichols, ed., *Perspectives on Campus Tensions* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970), pp. 85-118. An earlier survey of the literature pertaining to the politics of American intellectuals generally may be found in Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City: Doubleday-Anchor Books, 1963), pp. 332-371.

<sup>42</sup> These include the following works: L. H. Fuchs, *The Political Behavior of American Jews* (New York: The Free Press, 1956); Werner Cohn, "The Politics of American Jews," in M. Sklare, ed., *The Jews* (New York: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 614-626; Nathaniel Weyl, *The Jew in American Politics* (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1968); Nathan Glazer, "The Jewish Role in Student Activism," *Fortune*, January 1969, pp. 112-113, 126-129; Louis Ruchames, "Jewish Radicalism in the United States," in Peter I. Rose, ed., *The Ghetto and Beyond* (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 228-252; Charles S. Liebman, "Toward a Theory of Jewish Liberalism," in Donald R. Cutler, ed., *The Religious Situation: 1969* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), pp. 1034-1059; Glazer and Moynihan, *op. cit.*, pp. 166-171; Lipset, *Revolution and Counterrevolution* (Garden City: Doubleday-Anchor Books, 1970), pp. 376-400.

proportionately successful as an intellectual precisely because his social position made him a discontented skeptic, an orientation basic to intellectual achievement and, of course, to antiestablishment politics:

The first requisite for constructive work in modern science, and indeed for any work of inquiry that shall bring enduring results, is a skeptical frame of mind. The enterprising skeptic alone can be counted on to further the increase of knowledge in any substantial fashion. This will be found true both in the modern sciences and in the field of scholarship at large. . . . For [the intellectually gifted Jews] as for other men in the like case, the skepticism that goes to make him an effectual factor in the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men involves a loss of that peace of mind that is the birthright of the safe and sane quietist. He becomes a disturber of the intellectual peace. . . .<sup>43</sup>

As Veblen noted, all intellectuals should possess this skepticism. While it and other factors linked to intellectual activity will press them to be critical politically, rejection of the status quo is, of course, compatible with a strongly conservative or right-wing position, as well as with a liberal or radical one. With rare exceptions, however, the situation experienced by Jews has located Jewish intellectual criticism on the left. This has meant that in countries with significant Jewish populations and important collections of right-wing intellectuals, such as Weimar Germany, the intellectual battle between rightist and leftist forces has often appeared as a fight between Gentile and Jewish intellectuals.<sup>44</sup>

The extent to which the political background of Jewish academics differs from that of others may be seen in the responses to the Carnegie survey question: "What were your father's politics while you were growing up?" Forty-six per cent of the Jews, as contrasted to 19 per cent of the Catholics and but 14 per cent of the Protestant majority, reported fathers who were "left" or "liberal" in their views. Conversely, less than 20 per cent of the Jewish professors had "conservative" fathers, while 63 per cent of the Protestant academics indicated such a background (Table 19).

Family political-intellectual tradition affects the behavior of the children of academics. Among those faculty with children of college age, a majority (56 per cent) of the Jews report that their children have "been

<sup>43</sup> Veblen, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-227.

<sup>44</sup> See George L. Mosse, *Germans and Jews* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1970); Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968); Istvan Deak, *Weimar Germany's Left-Wing Intellectuals* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968); Harold L. Poor, *Kurt Tucholsky and the Ordeal of Germany, 1914-1935* (New York: Scribner's, 1968).



TABLE 19. "WHAT WERE YOUR FATHER'S POLITICS WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Left</i>	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Middle-of-the-road</i>	<i>Moderately Conservative</i>	<i>Strongly Conservative</i>	<b>Total</b>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	5.1	41.2	34.3	16.0	3.5	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	1.3	18.0	30.5	34.8	15.3	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	.9	13.0	22.7	40.4	23.1	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	1.7	17.2	25.3	36.5	19.3	100

active in civil rights, anti-Vietnam, or other demonstrations," as contrasted with little more than one-fifth (22 per cent) of the Gentile professors. The reason, of course, is that the children of liberal academics participate much, much more in demonstrations than children of conservative academics, and Jewish faculty are disproportionately liberal. That the correlation is between parental politics and participation is made clear by Table 20, which shows that 68 per cent of the *left* faculty having children of the right age—regardless of religion—said their children had been active in demonstrations, compared to just 4 per cent of the *strongly conservative* professors.

The contribution of faculty of Jewish background to liberal and left

TABLE 20. "HAVE ANY OF YOUR CHILDREN BEEN ACTIVE IN CIVIL RIGHTS, ANTI-VIETNAM, OR OTHER DEMONSTRATIONS?"  
FACULTY WITH CHILDREN OF APPROPRIATE AGE, BY IDEOLOGICAL POSITION\*  
(Per Cent)

		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Left</i>	(n=3,062)	68.0	32.0	100
<i>Liberal</i>	(n=3,356)	40.6	59.4	100
<i>Middle-of-the-Road</i>	(n=3,261)	24.1	75.9	100
<i>Moderately Conservative</i>	(n=3,562)	10.6	89.4	100
<i>Strongly Conservative</i>	(n=3,321)	3.7	96.3	100

\* Opinions on five questions were combined to construct a general liberalism-conservatism scale for national issues. Four of these were equally weighted: position on the Vietnam war, the legalization of marijuana, the causes of Negro riots, and on busing as a means for school integration. One question was double weighted, the faculty member's self-characterization of his political views. The five categories in the table above are positions defined by scores on this liberalism-conservatism scale.

TABLE 21. "HOW WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE YOURSELF POLITICALLY  
AT THE PRESENT TIME?"\*  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Left</i>	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Middle- of-the- Road</i>	<i>Moderately Conservative</i>	<i>Strongly Conservative</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	12.4	62.1	18.2	6.6	.7
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	4.4	40.3	30.0	23.2	2.1
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	3.8	36.9	28.0	28.4	3.0
All Faculty (n=60,028)	4.9	40.2	27.2	25.0	2.6

\* The categories in this table are based on the replies to one question. Those in the preceding one are, as explained in the note, a product of position on an attitude scale.

political groups has been stressed in a number of surveys preceding our own. Almost all earlier studies found that close to 90 per cent of Jewish academics regularly voted Democratic in presidential elections.<sup>45</sup> Jewish faculty also were found to contribute heavily to the backing of leftist third parties. Thus, according to a 1948 study, fully 30 per cent of the Jewish professors voted for Henry Wallace.<sup>46</sup> The same proclivity can be seen in Britain, where a faculty opinion study reported that the Jews were "the most left-wing of all."<sup>47</sup> Recent studies of American

TABLE 22. "WHOM WOULD YOU HAVE FAVORED AT THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Humphrey</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	37.7	62.3	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	46.3	53.7	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	48.8	51.2	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	46.8	53.2	100

<sup>45</sup> Lipset, "The Politics of Academia," *op. cit.*, pp. 97-100.

<sup>46</sup> Lawrence C. Howard, "The Academic and the Ballot," *School and Society*, November 22, 1958, p. 418.

<sup>47</sup> Halsey and Trow, *op. cit.*, Chapter VII, p. 25.

TABLE 23. "FOR WHOM DID YOU VOTE IN 1968?"

(Per Cent)

	Humphrey	Nixon	Wallace	Another Candidate*	Did Not Vote	Total
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	79.1	6.3	.1	4.6	9.9	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	59.6	25.3	1.3	1.7	12.1	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	46.6	41.9	1.4	1.3	8.8	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	51.8	34.7	1.3	1.9	10.4	100

\* Left-wing third party candidates, including Eldridge Cleaver and Dick Gregory

college professors conclude that Jews have been much more heavily opposed to the Vietnam war, and stronger supporters of student activism, than their Gentile colleagues.<sup>48</sup>

The Carnegie Commission's national survey yielded the same strong relationships. The Jewish faculty were much more inclined to identify their politics as "left" or "liberal" than Protestants and Catholics (Table 21).<sup>49</sup> Jews contributed disproportionately to the small group who backed left-wing third party presidential candidates in 1968; they were

TABLE 24. "FOR WHOM DID YOU VOTE IN 1964?"

(Per Cent)

	Johnson	Goldwater	Another Candidate	Did Not Vote	Total
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	87.2	2.1	.9	9.8	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	71.5	13.8	.6	14.0	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	63.7	23.6	.9	11.7	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	67.0	19.2	.9	12.9	100

<sup>48</sup> David Armor, *et al.*, "Professors' Attitudes Toward the Vietnam War," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Summer 1967, p. 170.

<sup>49</sup> The 1969 American Council on Education study of college freshmen reported a comparable pattern: 55 per cent of the Jewish freshmen described their politics as "left" or "liberal," compared to 38 per cent of those of other religions. Only 14 per cent of the Jews, but 33 per cent of the others, considered themselves conservatives. Drew, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

TABLE 25. "WHICH OF THESE POSITIONS ON VIETNAM IS CLOSEST TO YOUR OWN?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Immediate U.S. Withdrawal</i>	<i>U.S. Reduce Involvement and Encourage Coalition Government</i>	<i>U.S. Reduce Involvement but Prevent Communist Takeover</i>	<i>Military Victory</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	34.0	49.9	14.6	1.5	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	16.7	40.3	34.7	8.3	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	15.5	40.3	35.9	8.4	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	18.2	40.9	33.2	7.7	100

much more likely to have been for the nomination of Eugene McCarthy than of Hubert Humphrey at the Democratic convention, and gave Richard Nixon an exceptionally low vote in the election. In 1964 only 2 per cent of the Jewish faculty voted for Barry Goldwater, compared to 24 per cent of those of Protestant parentage (Tables 22, 23, and 24).

The Jews, as a group, took much more liberal positions on such issues as the use of force at the Chicago Democratic convention in 1968, the Vietnam war, student activism, the treatment of blacks in both the university and the larger society, and the legalization of marijuana (Tables 25, 26 and 27). The gap between Jews and Christians on these issues is very large, while among Christians, Protestants are usually

TABLE 26. "WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE EMERGENCE OF RADICAL STUDENT  
ACTIVISM IN RECENT YEARS?"  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Unreservedly Approve</i>	<i>Approve with Reservations</i>	<i>Disapprove with Reservations</i>	<i>Unreservedly Disapprove</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	6.2	52.9	32.0	8.9	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	2.5	41.0	40.0	16.4	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	2.2	37.3	43.3	17.2	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	2.9	39.8	41.3	16.1	100

TABLE 27. MARIJUANA SHOULD BE LEGALIZED  
(Per Cent)

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree with Reservations</i>	<i>Disagree with Reservations</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	25.1	33.5	21.5	19.9	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	11.8	20.7	22.7	44.8	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	9.9	19.5	22.6	48.1	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	12.0	21.3	22.3	44.4	100

slightly more conservative than Catholics. For example, 59 per cent of the Jews gave general approval to "the emergence of radical student activism in recent years," compared to 44 per cent of the Catholics and 40 per cent of the Protestants. The proportion of Jews favoring immediate United States withdrawal from Vietnam is twice that of non-Jews. Three-fifths of the Jews favored the legalization of marijuana (59 per cent), compared to 33 per cent of the Catholics and 29 per cent of the Protestants.

Although Jews were invariably more liberal and change-oriented than Gentiles in their responses to all politically relevant queries in the Carnegie questionnaire, it is striking that the gap between Jewish and non-Jewish faculty is smallest for items pertaining to changes in academic standards. Jews are only somewhat more willing than others to waive academic standards in appointing members of minority groups to the

TABLE 28. THE NORMAL ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE RELAXED IN  
APPOINTING MEMBERS OF MINORITY GROUPS TO FACULTY HERE.  
(Per cent)

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree with Reservations</i>	<i>Disagree with Reservations</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	6.4	24.7	28.8	40.2	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	4.3	17.4	27.8	50.5	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	3.7	16.6	27.8	51.9	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	4.2	17.6	27.9	50.3	100

TABLE 29. MORE MINORITY GROUP UNDERGRADUATES SHOULD BE ADMITTED HERE EVEN IF IT MEANS RELAXING NORMAL ACADEMIC STANDARDS OF ADMISSION

*(Per cent)*

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree with Reservations</i>	<i>Disagree with Reservations</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	19.2	34.0	24.4	22.4	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	12.7	27.2	28.7	31.3	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	11.2	26.5	28.7	33.6	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	12.4	27.3	28.3	32.0	100

faculty, or in admitting them to the student body (Tables 28 and 29). Jewish faculty favor only slightly more than the faculty as a whole offering a program of black studies (Table 30). The same pattern of response occurs with respect to questions dealing with "student power." Though relatively sympathetic to campus activism, the Jewish scholars are not much more disposed to give students a major voice in important decisions within the university than are their Gentile colleagues (Table 31).

This weakening of Jewish "liberalism" when academic standards are involved is reflective of a general phenomenon: successful, creative, and research-oriented faculty are more liberal or left on general political questions, but they are also heavily committed to the university and scholarship. This latter involvement reduces, though it does not eliminate, the

TABLE 30. ANY INSTITUTION WITH A SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF BLACK STUDENTS SHOULD OFFER A PROGRAM OF BLACK STUDIES IF THEY WISH IT.

*(Per cent)*

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree with Reservations</i>	<i>Disagree with Reservations</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	33.4	39.9	16.5	10.3	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	29.1	41.7	17.7	11.5	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	25.3	42.1	20.1	12.6	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	27.1	41.4	19.3	12.2	100

TABLE 31. "WHAT ROLE DO YOU BELIEVE UNDERGRADUATES SHOULD PLAY IN FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION?"  
(Per cent)

	Control	Voting Power on Committee	Formal Consultation	Informal Consultation	Little or No Role	Total
Jewish Faculty (n=5907)	.1	8.3	19.6	27.7	44.3	100
Catholic Faculty (n=9096)	.3	6.3	14.9	26.1	52.3	100
Protestant Faculty (n=37,804)	.2	4.8	14.3	24.5	56.2	100
All Faculty (n=60,028)	.2	5.7	14.9	25.0	54.2	100

impact of their general political ideology on matters internal to academe.

The faculty differ considerably in their political views not only by religion, but also by discipline and by scholarly quality. Academics in the "pure" or "basic" liberal arts fields are considerably to the left of those in the more applied professional schools. Within the liberal arts, social scientists are the most liberal, the natural scientists the most conservative, with the humanists falling in the middle. And, as noted earlier, those who are heavily involved in research activity, who are more successful, and who are at the more prestigious institutions are more liberal than other academics. An examination of the differences in political views among the different religious groups in these varying academic contexts reveals that each factor—religion, discipline, and academic prestige—continues to have an impact. That is, Jews and Christians in the social sciences or in high quality schools are more liberal than their fellow-religionists in other fields and lower-tier colleges. The difference is smaller among Jews than among Gentiles when the additional factor of discipline or school quality is introduced. Catholics and Protestants in the applied fields are *much more* conservative than their coreligionists in the liberal arts. Jews are only *somewhat more* conservative. Similarly, Jews at the better schools are slightly more liberal than those at less distinguished and research-oriented institutions. But the differences between Christian professors in schools of varying caliber is quite considerable. Seemingly, the elements of a Jewish environment which dispose its products to leftist views are much stronger than the factors within academe which affect political beliefs (Table 32). In this respect, the

behavior of Jews within academe resembles their behavior outside. For all studies of Jewish political opinion agree that the social-class factors which strongly divide non-Jews on political lines in the larger community have little effect on the view or party choices of Jews.

### *Religious and Irreligious Jews: Differences in Politics and Scholarship*

We assumed that a faculty member's commitment to religious practice or his irreligion is (1) part of a much larger mind set which also includes his political perceptions, and (2) related to the niche he has found in academe. Political and religious conservatism are strongly associated.<sup>50</sup>

TABLE 32. POLITICAL ORIENTATION OF PROTESTANT, CATHOLIC AND JEWISH FACULTY, BY SCHOOL QUALITY AND FIELD

(Percentages answering "left" or "liberal" to the question: "How would you characterize yourself politically at the present time?")

	<i>Elite Colleges and Universities</i>			
	<i>Social Sciences</i>	<i>Humanities</i>	<i>Natural Sciences</i>	<i>Business Applied*</i>
Jewish Faculty	84.9	84.8	79.7	67.8
Catholic Faculty	65.2	69.6	56.3	30.5
Protestant Faculty	76.9	69.8	52.8	35.7
	<i>Colleges and Universities of the Middle Range</i>			
	<i>Social Sciences</i>	<i>Humanities</i>	<i>Natural Sciences</i>	<i>Business Applied*</i>
Jewish Faculty	86.7	82.8	75.6	55.9
Catholic Faculty	70.8	61.7	44.0	29.9
Protestant Faculty	67.8	61.1	36.4	18.2
	<i>Lower Tier Colleges and Universities</i>			
	<i>Social Sciences</i>	<i>Humanities</i>	<i>Natural Sciences</i>	<i>Business Applied*</i>
Jewish Faculty	80.5	73.6	49.6	64.4
Catholic Faculty	58.4	55.9	34.0	22.1
Protestant Faculty	60.0	52.3	29.0	18.4

\* Engineering, Business, Agriculture.

<sup>50</sup> It is true, as Lenski has pointed out, that one cannot find in the general public a liberal-conservative dimension that encompasses both political and religious commitments, but that is, in significant measure, testimony to the fact that most people do not impose any ideological dimension on social and political events. College



And it seemed likely that professors who move in the highly secularized academic world of the major universities and who have committed themselves to the questioning and critical pursuit of scholarship would be much less likely than their less scholarly colleagues at lower-tier "teaching" colleges to find congenial the intellectual life of traditional religious pursuits.

The Carnegie data strongly support the first of these assumptions. The correlations between religiousness and political opinions are consistently among the highest encountered in the survey for the various biographic and personal characteristics of faculty, on the one hand, and their politics, on the other. The pattern for the Jewish faculty here is essentially the same as for Protestants and Catholics; those more deeply

TABLE 33. "HOW WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE YOURSELF POLITICALLY AT THE PRESENT TIME?"  
*Faculty of Jewish Parentage, by Present Religion\**  
*and*  
*(for those describing present religion as Jewish)*  
*Frequency of Attendance of Religious Services*  
*(Per cent)*

	<i>Left</i>	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Middle-of-the-Road</i>	<i>Moderately Conservative</i>	<i>Strongly Conservative</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish (n=3974)	8.1	62.4	21.3	7.5	0.7	100
Other (n=171)	14.5	55.2	22.6	4.8	3.0	100
None (n=1542)	23.8	62.3	9.7	3.6	0.7	100
<hr/>						
Few times a month or more (n=465)	4.0	56.4	25.4	12.0	2.2	100
Once a month or a few times a year (n=1670)	5.5	60.9	25.4	7.9	0.4	100
Once a year or less (n=1839)	11.7	65.9	15.8	6.0	0.5	100

\* The number giving *Protestant* or *Catholic* as present religion are too few for inclusion: 220 reported that their parents were Jewish, but they are Christian. Earlier tables dealt largely with birthright Jews, Catholics, and Protestants.

professors are a very special group whose "business" is ideas and whose social and political views are highly organized or ideological in the sense Converse uses the latter term. See Gerhard Lenski, *The Religious Factor* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday-Anchor Books, 1963), pp. 208-211; and Philip E. Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics," in David Apter, ed., *Ideology and Discontent* (New York: The Free Press, 1964), pp. 206-261.

TABLE 34. "WHICH OF THESE POSITIONS ON VIETNAM IS CLOSEST TO YOUR OWN?"  
*Faculty of Jewish Parentage, by Present Religion\**  
*and*  
*(for those describing present religion as Jewish)*  
*Frequency of Attendance of Religious Services*  
*(Per cent)*

	<i>Immediate U.S. Withdrawal</i>	<i>U.S. Reduce Involvement and Encourage Coalition Government</i>	<i>U.S. Reduce Involvement but Prevent Communist Takeover</i>	<i>Military Victory</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Jewish</b> (n=3974)	28.1	52.6	17.3	1.9	100
<b>Other</b> (n=171)	32.1	52.8	14.8	0.4	100
<b>None</b> (n=1542)	49.6	42.8	7.1	0.5	100
<b>Few times a month or more (n=465)</b>	21.7	42.3	33.3	2.7	100
<b>Once a month or a few times a year (n=1670)</b>	23.7	55.6	18.6	2.2	100
<b>Once a year or less (n=1839)</b>	34.6	52.3	11.7	1.4	100

\* Number giving *Protestant* or *Catholic* as present religion too few for inclusion.

committed to, and involved in, religious practice are politically much more conservative. For example, only 4 per cent of those who attend synagogue a few times a month or more often identify their politics as "left," compared to 24 per cent of the birthright Jews who describe their present religion as "none" (Table 33). Half of the latter would withdraw immediately from Vietnam, a position taken by only 22 per cent of those who attend religious services regularly (Table 34). Over half (52 per cent) who often go to synagogue strongly agree that disruptive students should be expelled from college; only 26 per cent of the "none" category take that position (Table 35). Just 40 per cent of the most religious, but 68 per cent of irreligious Jews, give general approval to "radical student activism" (Table 36). Table 37 shows one of the sharpest and most interesting differences in political position by religiousness. Fifty-eight per cent of the Jewish faculty who consider themselves "deeply religious" preferred Humphrey to McCarthy for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1968, while only 21 per cent of the "basically opposed to religion" favored Humphrey.

If the interrelation of religiousness and political opinion is close, as had been expected, the association of religious commitment and scholarly

TABLE 35. STUDENTS WHO DISRUPT THE FUNCTIONING OF A COLLEGE SHOULD BE EXPELLED OR SUSPENDED

*Faculty of Jewish Parentage, by Present Religion\*  
and  
(for those describing present religion as Jewish)  
Frequency of Attendance of Religious Services  
(Per cent)*

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree with Reservations</i>	<i>Disagree with Reservations</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish (n=3974)	38.1	34.6	20.2	7.1	100
Other (n=171)	28.6	32.2	30.9	8.3	100
None (n=1542)	26.4	28.6	29.7	15.4	100
Few times a month or more (n=465)	52.2	30.6	12.2	5.0	100
Once a month or a few times a year (n=1670)	40.2	36.4	18.2	5.2	100
Once a year or less (n=1839)	32.3	33.7	24.3	9.6	100

\* Number giving *Protestant* or *Catholic* as present religion too few for inclusion.

TABLE 36. "WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE EMERGENCE OF RADICAL STUDENT ACTIVISM IN RECENT YEARS?"

*Faculty of Jewish Parentage, by Present Religion\*  
and  
(for those describing present religion as Jewish)  
Frequency of Attendance of Religious Services  
(Per cent)*

	<i>Unreservedly Approve</i>	<i>Approve with Reservations</i>	<i>Disapprove with Reservations</i>	<i>Unreservedly Disapprove</i>	<i>Total</i>
Jewish (n=3974)	4.0	51.1	34.7	10.2	100
Other (n=171)	7.8	55.6	30.8	5.7	100
None (n=1542)	12.0	56.3	25.3	6.4	100
Few times a month or more (n=465)	2.2	37.4	41.0	19.3	100
Once a month or a few times a year (n=1670)	2.9	49.4	37.3	10.4	100
Once a year or less (n=1839)	5.8	56.6	30.2	7.5	100

\* Number giving *Protestant* or *Catholic* as present religion too few for inclusion.

TABLE 37. "WHOM WOULD YOU HAVE FAVORED AT THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION?"  
*Faculty of Jewish Parentage,*  
*by Present Religious Orientation*  
*(Per cent)*

	<i>Humphrey</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>
Deeply religious (n=289)	57.7	42.3
Moderately religious (n=1613)	54.2	45.8
Largely indifferent to religion (n=2983)	32.3	67.7
Basically opposed to religion (n=1022)	21.0	79.0
All (n=5907)	37.5	62.5

achievement has proved to be weaker than we had anticipated. We had looked for a powerful link going both ways, that is, as both cause and effect. It seemed likely that faculty members of a skeptical and questioning bent would be the most successful—for a restless and probing intellect is essential to any significant scholarly work—and that such academics would by this very same quality question all manner of regular religious beliefs and practices. Conversely, an intellectual approach that would leave an academic comfortable with organized religion should militate against his chances for scholarly achievement. At the same time, the major research universities are the most secular and irreligious; so that whatever his previous orientation to religion, the faculty member experiencing such an environment should be influenced by it in the direction of irreligion.

While the relationships which we discovered are uniformly in the direction posited by the above, they appear to us surprisingly weak. About 18 per cent of the Jewish faculty who attend synagogue two or three times a month or more often are among the more productive (5 or more publications in the last two years), compared to 23 per cent of the irreligious Jews (attendance of religious services a few times a year or less) (Table 38). About 8 per cent of the most productive Jewish professors (more than 10 publications) attend services regularly, as do 10 per cent of those not publishing at all. Among the Jewish faculty, 7 per cent at elite colleges and 12 per cent at the lower-tier

schools frequently go to synagogue, while 88 per cent at the former and 81 per cent at the latter attend only a few times a year, or not at all (Table 39). A higher percentage of the irreligious than of the religious Jews is teaching at the better schools, but again the difference is modest. Tables 38 and 39 show that the relationship between religiousness and academic achievement is somewhat stronger for Christian faculty. This is as expected, because support for intellectual activity has been stronger in Judaism than in the Christian denominations generally. Still, the most striking aspect of our findings is the relative weakness of the association between religious orientation and scholarship, for Christians and Jews alike. The strength of the relationship is not altered by recourse to other measures of religiousness.

### *Conclusion*

We have seen that the most irreligious Jewish academics are much more liberal-left politically and somewhat more successful academically than their fellow Jews who are very religious. It is fitting, perhaps, that we end this report on the characteristics of the Jewish professoriate in the United States with this seeming paradox: while Jews differ significantly from Gentiles, particularly with respect to their academic achievements and political orientations, the least Jewish Jews differ the most.

Thorstein Veblen pointed to this phenomenon a half century ago. He suggested that more important than the ancient intellectual heritage of the Jews, in regard to their modern capacity for scholarly achievement, was the impact of their "hyphenate" status, of having left the traditional Jewish world, but not becoming fully part of Gentile society. Thus Veblen assumed, "only when the gifted Jew escapes from the [Jewish] cultural environment . . . [does] he come into his own as a creative leader in the world's intellectual enterprise. It is by loss of allegiance, or at the best by force of a divided allegiance to the people of his origin, that he finds himself in the vanguard of modern inquiry."<sup>51</sup>

In the United States today, of course, almost all Jews, even the most Orthodox and practicing among them, have become hyphenate in Veblen's sense; and it is likely that the group's capacity for intellectual achievement has been thereby enhanced. It may be worthwhile to note that earlier outbursts of Jewish scientific creativity—that of the Marranos (the overtly converted Iberian Jews who remained secretly Jewish)

<sup>51</sup> Veblen, *op. cit.*, pp. 225–226.

TABLE 38. FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES BY NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS IN THE LAST TWO YEARS, JEWISH AND GENTILE FACULTY  
(Column Percentages in Parentheses)

<i>Jewish Faculty</i>	<i>None</i> (n=1,430)	<i>1-2</i> (n=1,577)	<i>3-4</i> (n=1,415)	<i>5-10</i> (n=1,135)	<i>More than 10</i> (n=348)	<i>Total</i>
Once a week or more (n=287)	30.6 ( 5.3)	30.0 ( 5.8)	24.7 ( 5.9)	13.1 ( 4.0)	1.5 ( 1.5)	100
Two or three times a month (n=284)	28.8 ( 4.8)	29.8 ( 5.5)	21.2 ( 4.8)	15.0 ( 4.4)	5.3 ( 4.8)	100
About once a month (n=382)	32.0 ( 6.6)	28.1 ( 6.5)	19.2 ( 5.5)	15.8 ( 5.8)	4.9 ( 5.6)	100
A few times a year (n=1,447)	34.0 (29.8)	23.5 (23.2)	20.2 (24.5)	16.0 (24.8)	6.3 (30.7)	100
Once a year or less (n=3,521)	27.6 (53.6)	27.1 (59.0)	22.1 (59.3)	17.8 (61.1)	5.3 (57.4)	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	
<i>Gentile Faculty</i>	(n=19,215)	(n=13,335)	(n=7,815)	(n=4,740)	(n=1,350)	100
Once a week or more (n=15,465)	62.9 (45.1)	22.2 (34.6)	8.3 (27.3)	4.8 (27.0)	1.7 (33.8)	100
Two or three times a month (n=6,750)	50.5 (12.0)	27.0 (13.9)	11.8 (12.9)	9.2 (17.2)	1.5 (10.0)	100
About once a month (n=3,345)	57.8 ( 7.1)	22.5 ( 6.1)	13.7 ( 7.8)	3.8 ( 3.7)	2.2 ( 7.4)	100
A few times a year (n=6,990)	49.4 (11.8)	23.9 (12.4)	16.6 (18.3)	8.3 (15.6)	1.8 (12.1)	100
Once a year or less (n=14,730)	45.7 (23.9)	28.9 (32.9)	14.0 (33.7)	8.9 (36.5)	2.5 (36.6)	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	

TABLE 39. FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES BY QUALITY OF SCHOOL AT WHICH FACULTY MEMBER TEACHES, JEWISH AND GENTILE FACULTY (Column Percentages in Parentheses)

	Lower Tier Colleges and Universities (n=371)	Colleges and Universities of the Middle Range (n=2,568)	Elite Colleges and Universities (n=3,104)	Total
<i>Jewish Faculty</i>				
Once a week or more (n=287)	24.9 ( 7.1)	41.2 ( 5.6)	33.9 ( 4.0)	100
Two or three times a month (n=284)	18.6 ( 5.1)	44.2 ( 5.8)	37.2 ( 4.2)	100
About once a month (n=382)	18.8 ( 6.7)	45.0 ( 7.6)	36.2 ( 5.2)	100
A few times a year (n=1,447)	23.8 (34.7)	36.6 (25.4)	39.6 (23.5)	100
Once a year or less (n=3,521)	14.6 (46.4)	36.7 (55.6)	48.7 (63.2)	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>(100)</b>	
<i>Gentile Faculty</i>				
Once a week or more (n=15,465)	(n=9,525) 57.9 (46.2)	(n=24,495) 32.2 (36.0)	(n=13,650) 10.0 (22.9)	100
Two or three times a month (n=6,750)	44.1 (12.0)	39.4 (15.0)	16.5 (13.0)	100
About once a month (n=3,345)	43.2 ( 5.9)	40.7 ( 7.8)	16.1 ( 6.4)	100
A few times a year (n=6,990)	36.5 ( 9.7)	42.0 (15.7)	21.4 (16.4)	100
Once a year or less (n=14,730)	44.5 (26.2)	31.1 (25.5)	24.4 (41.3)	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>(100)</b>	

during the 16th century, of the Jews of Central Europe in the century preceding Hitler, and of the Soviet Jews before World War II—all have in common a breakdown in the controls exercised by the Jewish community and, with this, a fostering of hyphenate status among assimilating Jews. The relationship between marginality and achievement has been well described by Charles Singer:

The Marranos, like their later counterparts, carried some residue of the old Jewish culture and, like them, they had not completely absorbed the culture of their environment. The double maladjustment, not so great as to constitute a spiritual conflict of the gravest kind, was yet enough to give an independence of approach, a philosophic detachment to the entrant into the newly accessible scientific field. This was certainly an advantage. An impartial outlook is a significant part of the equipment of the man of science. . . . [In the 19th century] there arose in the German-speaking countries a movement closely resembling Marranism. Among nineteenth-century Jews . . . only a small proportion were “believers” in any profound sense. . . . Naturally, they carried with them some elements of their traditional habits of thought. . . . Jewish emancipation coincided with an era of enormous scientific advance, the result of extreme fragmentation in the scientific field resulting from the natural product of increasingly complex techniques. . . . The frustrated and culture-starved German Marranos eagerly occupied this new field. They gave to it a certain spiritual significance that they drew from their half-forgotten religious heritage. . . . But when all is said there remains an essential something that is a real source of wonder. A people scattered, disunited, numerically less than one of the smallest nations of Europe, has for a century provided from an effective German-speaking population of some two millions an ever-increasing proportion of the best scientific exponents in central Europe.<sup>52</sup>

Many of the same factors have affected the propensity of Jews to contribute to the intellectual and scholarly life of nations as disparate as the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and Argentina for the past half century. Seemingly, these same factors have also put them in the forefront of political criticism, of those rejecting the status quo. Whether the latter propensity will continue to place them heavily on the left, however, would seem to be somewhat questionable. The Left now holds power in many countries, and has become a repressor of both free intellectual inquiry and Judaism. And even in the non-Communist world, left-wing extremists are increasingly anti-intellectual and emotive. Hence, the opposition to Israel apart, there is reason to anticipate a decline in the commitment of intellectual Jews to the new brands of ritualistic leftism.

<sup>52</sup> Charles Singer, “Science and Judaism,” in Louis Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews*, Vol. II (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 1412–1414.