

Summer 1962

The Application of the Culture-Conflict Hypothesis to the Criminality of Immigrants in Israel

Shlomo Shoham

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shlomo Shoham, The Application of the Culture-Conflict Hypothesis to the Criminality of Immigrants in Israel, 53 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 207 (1962)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

THE APPLICATION OF THE "CULTURE-CONFLICT" HYPOTHESIS TO THE CRIMINALITY OF IMMIGRANTS IN ISRAEL

SHLOMO SHOHAM

The author is Head of the Department of Criminology in Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel. A former member of the Faculty of Law of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Dr. Shoham studied criminal law and criminology at both the Hebrew University and the Institute of Criminology in Cambridge, England.

The United States, with its periods of mass immigrations, has been a logical focus of the study of culture-conflict and its effect upon the criminality of immigrants. In the following article, Dr. Shoham points out that Israel, with its more recent experience of mass immigrations, has also become a fruitful source for such study. Dr. Shoham first sketches some of the findings of the American research and then, against that background, presents his own findings with respect to the crime rates of immigrants who have come to Israel since 1948; the crime rates of immigrants from the various continents; the types of offences committed by immigrants from different regions; and the "second generation" problem, concerning delinquency rates of juveniles with immigrant parents. The differences between the Jews of oriental and European origin are among the special demographic features of the Jewish community in Israel which Dr. Shoham describes as unique sources for future study.—EDITOR.

It has been recognized that a basic distinction should be made between the etiology of crime as a social phenomenon inherent in a given society and the process (i.e., the "recruiting") by which a certain individual becomes a criminal or commits a criminal act. The latter is studied from the point of view of the individual, whereas the former is regarded from the point of view of the group, community, or nation and is expressed in crime rates.¹ It should be mentioned that most efforts in criminology from the "positive school" on were directed at the explanation of crime on the personal level. But with the development of modern sociology and especially the so-called "formal school of sociology," which was mostly concerned with forms of human interaction,² more attention was given to the phenomenon of crime on the social level. The concept of conflict, which is one form of interaction,³ was thus utilized by some American sociologists to explain the differential crime rates in given communities.⁴

One of the most lucid adaptations of the idea of

conflict to crime causation was carried out by Sellin in his monograph *On Culture Conflict and Crime*.⁵ Sellin pointed out that the conflict relevant for criminological research is the clash between conduct norms brought about "as by-products of a cultural growth process—the growth of civilization—as the result of the migration of conduct norms from one culture complex or area to another. However produced, they are sometimes studied as mental conflicts⁶ and sometimes as the clash of cultural codes."⁷

It should be pointed out that the concept of culture-conflict as expounded by Sellin is intrinsically different from the concept of conflict as used by the formal school of sociology. Shaw and McKay, for instance, used the concept of culture conflict to explain social "disorganization" which ensues from *group* conflict.⁸ The same meaning was apparently given to culture-conflict (on the social level) by Sutherland when he spoke about

⁵ SELLIN, ON CULTURE CONFLICT AND CRIME (Social Science Research Council 1938).

⁶ It seems that the idea of culture conflict as mental conflict has influenced Sutherland in formulating his differential association theory, which presumably explains criminal behavior on the personal level. This idea seems inherent in his statement that "a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law." SUTHERLAND, *op. cit. supra* note 1, at 20. See also *id.* at 9.

⁷ SELLIN, *op. cit. supra* note 5, at 58.

⁸ SHAW & MCKAY, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND URBAN AREAS (1942).

¹ See SUTHERLAND, THE SUTHERLAND PAPERS 11 (Cohen, Lindesmith & Schuessler ed. 1956).

² See PARK & BURGESS, INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF SOCIOLOGY (1942).

³ See Simmel, *The Sociology of Conflict*, 9 AM. J. SOCIOLOGY 490 (1903-1904).

⁴ See Sutherland, *Crime and the Conflict Process*, 13 J. JUVENILE RESEARCH 38 (1929); 2 THOMAS & ZNANIECKI, THE POLISH PEASANT IN EUROPE AND AMERICA 1753-55 (Knoph ed. 1927); Kobrin, *The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas*, 16 AM. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 653 (1951).

"differential group organization," brought about when "several criminals perfect an organization and with organization their crimes increase in frequency and seriousness; in the course of time this arouses a narrower or a broader group which organizes itself against crime, and this tends to reduce crimes. *The crime rate at a particular time is a resultant of these opposed organizations*".⁹

But here apparently something is amiss, because obviously the *whole* volume of crimes in a given community cannot be explained by "differential group organization." It explains no doubt the rate of *organized* or professional crime, but surely it does not account for the rates of crimes of passion and isolated crimes in a given community. In contrast, Sellin's exposition of culture-conflict as a conflict of *conduct norms*, not only among different groups but also within the group itself and between the individual and his group, may account for the sum total of crimes in a given community.¹⁰ In other words the higher the volume of clashes among the legal norms, folkways, and values in a given community, the higher the crime rate. It should be stressed however that this hypothesis has not yet been fully tested.

CULTURE-CONFLICT, IMMIGRATION, AND CRIME IN THE U.S.A.

The phenomenon of culture-conflict on the social level may be observed no doubt in the general growth of civilization and especially in the clashes of norms and values resulting from industrialization and urbanization of various communities. But the study of the conflict process in these instances is highly problematic from the methodological point of view, and the sheer length of time involved makes the possibility of comprehensive research highly remote. Most of the research on culture-conflict and crime has therefore dealt with the clashes among divergent cultural codes and especially the conflict between the conduct norms of immigrant groups and the norms prevailing in the receiving country.¹¹ It is only natural that much of the research in this field has been carried out in the U.S.A., which was until recently a country experiencing mass immigration.¹²

⁹ SUTHERLAND, *op. cit. supra* note 1, at 21.

¹⁰ SELLIN, *op. cit. supra* note 5, at 66 *et seq.*

¹¹ *Id.* at 70. As to the possible impact of immigration on deviant behaviour, see EISENSTADT, *THE ABSORPTION OF IMMIGRANTS* 20 *et seq.* (London 1954).

¹² The first law that restricted the flow of mass immigration to the United States was the National

The results of the research on the problem of immigration and crime carried out in the U.S.A. have been more often contradictory than consistent. This of course may be partly attributed to the heterogeneity of methodology employed by the various investigators. It is possible nonetheless to summarize some of the more conspicuous findings of this research as follows:

A. The crime rate of the immigrants taken as a group was at first believed to be lower than the crime rate of the native group.¹³ But then it was realized that foreign-born criminal groups are, on the average, older than native-born criminal groups with native parentage,¹⁴ and a study by Van Vechten¹⁵ indeed revealed that, when compared on the basis of age, the criminality of immigrants exceeded the criminality of native-born whites by a ratio of ten to nine.

B. There is a wide difference in the extent and nature of the criminality of immigrants from different countries of origin and different ethnic groups.¹⁶

C. Immigrants presumably have a higher crime rate in the U.S.A. than in their countries of origin.¹⁷ It should be stressed however that there is no conclusive evidence to this effect due to the differences between the definitions of "crime" and "offence" in the countries of origin and in the United States.

D. There is a marked consensus among the various investigators that the crime rate of native-born (or those who immigrated very young) of foreign-born parents is considerably higher than the rates of either the foreign-born or the relevant age groups of native-born of native parentage.¹⁸

Origins Law of 1924. From then onwards the restrictive legislation became tighter, and after passage of the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, immigration to the United States became quantitatively insignificant.

¹³ NAT'L COM'N ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT, *REPORT ON CRIME AND THE FOREIGN-BORN* (1931).

¹⁴ STOFFLET, *A STUDY OF NATIONAL AND CULTURAL DIFFERENCE IN CRIMINAL TENDENCY* (No. 185 Archives of Psychology 1935).

¹⁵ Van Vechten, *Criminality of the Foreign Born*, *PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTIETH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF CORRECTION OF THE AM. PRISON ASS'N* 505 (1940).

¹⁶ NAT'L COM'N ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT, *op. cit. supra* note 13, at 109; DEPT. OF COMMERCE, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, *PRISONERS IN STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES* 28 (1934); Wood, *Minority Group Criminality and Cultural Integration*, 37 *J. CRIM. L. & C.* 498 (1947).

¹⁷ THOMAS & ZNANIECKI, *op. cit. supra* note 4; YOUNG, *THE PILGRIMS OF RUSSIAN TOWN* (1932).

¹⁸ YOUNG, *op. cit. supra* note 17, at 209-10; Van Vechten, *supra* note 15; Ross, *Crime and the Native-*

However a very important exception, relevant to the culture-conflict hypothesis, should be noted. The delinquency rate of juveniles with immigrant parentage is considerably lower in immigrant communities which display a strong primary-group control of their members, have inner cohesion, and practice flexible but not weak home control over the young.¹⁹ Taft, while commenting on these findings, says:

"Some immigrants have been protected against crime by life in the ghettos of our cities and in homogeneous immigrant colonies in rural areas. There they have established fairly effective institutions and primary relations. . . . Immigrants who only gradually give over their old world patterns of behaviour are in general seldom seen in our criminal courts. [The immigrant thus] becomes assimilated more slowly possibly, but much more effectively. Not nonassimilation but overrapid Americanization spells crime."²⁰

In other words the danger of culture-conflict is most imminent when the original norms and values of the immigrant have disintegrated rapidly, and a cultural vacuum or chaos is created. The immigrant group is not yet ready, or time is insufficient, for an orderly absorption of the norms and values of the receiving group. The younger generation is therefore more susceptible to the criminogenic "street-culture." In contrast, a slow and gradual absorption of the culture of the receiving group, accompanied by a gradual replacement of the original norms and values, causes not a clash or conflict but a synthesis which enhances the observance of the acquired norms rather than their breach.

IMMIGRATION AND CRIME IN ISRAEL

The study of the relation between immigration and crime in Israel is complicated by the fact that Israel is quite unique from the demographic point of view. The flow of Jewish immigration to the country has been almost continuous (with marked fluctuations of course) from the beginning of the century to this present day. After the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, the flow of mass immi-

gration greatly increased, but even before 1948 the Jewish community in Palestine was basically immigrant. Eisenstadt thus says:

"The Yishuv (i.e., the Jewish community in Palestine) was not merely an immigrant-absorbing community. More probably, than any other modern absorbing country . . . it was also a community which immigrants had created. The time-span between the establishment of its first institutional outlines and the influx of waves of immigrants was very short, sometimes almost non-existent, and its institutional structure was in continuous formation and development while these various waves were entering."²¹

The most conspicuous fact about Jewish immigration to Israel is that at the establishment of the state, on the 14th of May 1948, there were 649,633 Jews in the country. Within nine years (i.e. until the end of 1957) 896,355²² new immigrants had arrived and had to be absorbed by the former, who were clearly a minority from the quantitative point of view. The flow of immigration after May 1948 may be divided into three periods:

1948-1951—period of mass immigration.

1952-1954—period of a relative decline in immigration.

1955-1957—renewal of immigration (especially from Europe and North Africa).

A rough idea of the great variety of ethnic groups among the immigrants, the differences in their cultural backgrounds, and the extent of conflict among the various conduct-norms liable to ensue may be surmised from Table I. This table shows the distribution of Jewish immigrants by country of birth. The right column shows the origin of "old" immigrants (arrival before May 1948); the middle column shows the origin of "new" immigrants (arrival after May 1948); and the left column shows the distribution of the latter in percentages.

It is necessary to point out a demographic fact concerning the Jewish community both in Palestine and in the State of Israel which will be highly relevant in our later analysis of data concerning the criminality of immigrants. This is the apparent dichotomy of oriental and so-called Sephardic Jews, and the Jews, mostly of European descent, known as Ashkenazi Jews. The Sephardic Jews trace their origin to the Jewish community expelled from Spain in 1492. These were probably a small

Born Sons of European Immigrants, 28 J. CRIM. L. & C. 208 (1937); W. C. SMITH, *AMERICANS IN PROCESS* 8 (1937).

¹⁹ Lind, *The Ghetto and the Slum*, 9 SOCIAL FORCES 206 (1930); W. C. SMITH, *op. cit. supra* note 18, at 214; Hayner, *Delinquency Areas in the Puget Sound Region*, 39 AM. J. SOCIOLOGY 319 (1933).

²⁰ TAFT, *CRIMINOLOGY* 159-60 (3d ed. 1956).

²¹ EISENSTADT, *op. cit. supra* note 11, at 46.

²² STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF ISRAEL 1957-58, table 2, at 7, table 5, at 59.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH-IMMIGRANTS BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH²³

Country of Birth	Percentage of Immigrants After 1948	No. of Immigrants After 1948	No. of Immigrants Before 1948
All Countries.....	100.0	896,655	452,158
<i>Asia</i>	29.6	259,648	40,776
Turkey.....	4.4	38,071	8,277
Iran.....	14.2	125,413	7,995
Iraq.....	3.3	29,528	3,536
Yemen.....	6.2	45,781	14,566
Aden.....	0.4	3,448	1,272
India.....	0.7	6,069	72
Other countries.....	1.4	11,338	5,058
<i>Africa</i>	25.2	221,500	4,033
Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco & Tangier.....	17.6	154,905	904
Liberya.....	3.7	32,849	873
Union of South Africa.....	0.1	982	259
Other Countries.....	3.8	32,764	1,907
<i>Europe</i>	44.3	388,458	377,487
U.S.S.R.....	1.4	11,994	52,350
Poland.....	15.8	136,620	170,127
Rumania.....	14.0	123,562	41,105
Bulgaria.....	4.4	38,559	7,057
Yugoslavia.....	0.9	7,842	1,944
Greece.....	0.3	2,579	8,767
Germany.....	1.0	8,908	52,951
Austria.....	0.3	2,906	7,748
Czeckoslovakia.....	2.2	19,161	16,794
Hungary.....	2.6	23,263	10,342
U.K.....	0.3	2,500	1,574
Netherlands.....	0.2	1,434	1,208
France.....	0.5	3,769	1,637
Italy.....	0.2	1,510	1,554
Other Countries.....	0.4	3,611	2,329
<i>America & Oceana</i>	0.9	7,330	7,579
U.S.....	0.3	1,987	6,635
Canada.....	0.0	363	316
Argentina.....	0.3	2,766	238
Other Countries in America.....	0.3	2,039	318
Australia & New Zealand	0.0	175	72
Not stated.....	—	19,419	22,283

²³ *Id.*, table 6, at 60.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF ADULT IMMIGRANT OFFENDERS AMONG TOTAL OFFENDER POPULATION FOR THE YEARS 1951-1957

Year.....	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957
Percentage of Immigrant Offenders	60.7	65.7	67.1	65.8	66.2	68.9	66.7

nucleus of the Jews who lived in Palestine before the beginning of immigration at the end of the 19th century and whose origin cannot be clearly ascertained.²⁴ The oriental Jews are those who immigrated to Palestine and to Israel from eastern countries and especially from the regions formerly included in the Ottoman Empire.²⁵ The economic and educational standard of the oriental Jews is as a rule lower than the standard of Jews of European origin.

The Criminality of Adult "New" Immigrants

Our definition of "new" immigrants as those Jews who entered the country after the establishment of the state in May 1948 may seem quite arbitrary, and indeed from many aspects it is. It may be justified, nevertheless, for our purposes if we bear in mind that the rate of Jewish immigration to Palestine during the Second World War and the last years of the British mandate is quite low when compared with the mass immigration during the first years of the state. There are also grounds to believe that absorption of the "old" immigrants by the receiving community was much more effective,²⁶ and their integration quicker, than that of the "new" immigrants.

Table II shows the percentage of immigrant adult offenders (15 years of age and above) among the total population of offenders convicted of "serious"²⁷ offences.

The average percentage of "new" immigrants among the total population for the years 1953-1957 was approximately 60%, whereas the average percentage of adult immigrant offenders among the total population of immigrants for the same years was 67.2%, i.e., an excess of more than 7%.

²⁴ See POLIAK, *THE JEWS OF PALESTINE AT THE WAR'S END 12 et seq.* (Palestine 1945) (in Hebrew).²⁵ See EISENSTADT, *op. cit. supra* note 11, at 90.²⁶ *Id.* at 58 *et seq.*²⁷ Minor offences, i.e., assaults, brawls, and offences against police regulations (contravention), were not included.

When we compare the ratio of these percentages with the ratio between the criminality of the native-born (including the pre-1948 immigrants) and their percentage of the total population, we observe that the criminality of adult "new" immigrants in Israel exceeds the criminality of the native-born (and the "old" immigrants) at the rate of 4 to 3 (or 10 to 7.5).²⁸ We may conclude that this rate is quite high if we bear in mind Van Vechten's findings concerning the relevant rate in the United States, which was 10 to 9.²⁹

An interesting comparison may be made among the rates of serious offences committed by immigrants from the various continents. The rates were computed from data collected in 1957, which were the best data available. These rates were, for serious offences per 1000 immigrants from Africa, 13; Asia, 10; and from Europe and America, 5.

It should be mentioned that the overwhelming majority of immigrants from Africa have come from North Africa.³⁰ They belong to the "Moghrebite" community, and they have as a rule an ethnic and cultural background quite distinct from that of the rest of the oriental Jews. The Asian Jews belong mostly to the category of "oriental" Jews, whereas the relatively few American immigrants are mostly of European origin or parentage. The clue to these differential crime rates may quite possibly be found in the culture-conflict hypothesis, because as we have already mentioned the general cultural, economic, and educational standards of the North African and Asian immigrants are relatively low. It may be that the clash between the cultural codes, norms, and values of these immigrants and those of the receiving community causes a relative increase in the crime rate of these immigrants.³¹ Note the

²⁸ The rates have been computed from "raw" data received from the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel.

²⁹ Van Vechten, *supra* note 15, at 505-16. The shortcomings of this comparison are obvious, because Van Vechten compared the criminality of *all* the foreign born with that of the native born. If we had done the same, and based our comparison on the corresponding age groups, the criminality of our foreign born would have been much higher than that of the native born, but for our present purposes the rate as computed above is adequate because our main concern is with the criminality of immigrants who entered the country after 1948.

³⁰ See Table I.

³¹ Eisenstadt has said, "The... disorganization of the immigrant group, instability of social relations, and of various types of norm-breaking, juvenile delinquency, crime etc. is strongest among those groups whose cultural and educational standards are much lower than those of the absorbing society." *Op. cit. supra* note 11, at 260-61.

TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT IMMIGRANT OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO TYPE OF OFFENCE (IN PERCENTAGES)

	Europe & America	Africa	Asia
Offences Against Public Order	18	16	16
Offences Against the Person	26	30	27
Offences Against Morality	2	2	2
Offences Against Property	25	27	26
<i>Burglary</i>	2	2	1
<i>Arson & Damage to Property</i>	6	10	9
Forgery & Embezzlement	2	1	1
Miscellaneous	19	12	18
Total	100%	100%	100%

relatively low rate of criminality of the European and American immigrants, whose general cultural and educational standards were similar or nearer to the standard of the receiving community.

Another aspect of the culture-conflict hypothesis may be studied by analyzing the types of offences committed by the various immigrant groups.³²

The first impression one receives from Table III is the relative preponderance of the more serious offences among the African immigrants, because the item "Miscellaneous" usually refers to the less serious offences, and this item is quite low among the Africans. Another is the high percentage among the Africans of offences against the person. It is permissible to add to this type the offences of arson and damage to property, inasmuch as the latter are committed as a rule out of violence and aggression and not for the sake of pecuniary gain. The resulting sum is 40% for the Africans, but only 32% for the Europeans. These figures may indicate the existence of a cultural tradition among the African immigrants of settling disputes by violence, a method of "self-help" which may have been more or less accepted conduct in their countries of origin. It should be stressed however that these comparisons provide only a suggestion for further research to determine whether the excess of violence among the North African offenders is embedded in the mores of their countries of origin, or whether some special

³² This has been done in many researches carried out in the United States in order to determine what offences are characteristic to the criminals in the various immigrant groups. See TART, *CRIMINOLOGY* 154 *et seq.* (3d ed. 1956).

attributes of their communities of origin or the receiving community hindered the process of integration, thereby causing real or illusory feelings of discrimination and increased violence. Whatever the case, our rough and to be sure quite superficial analysis of the data indicates that further research into the problem of culture-conflict-as related to immigration and crime in Israel may bear fruitful implications concerning the etiology of crime.

Juvenile Delinquents of Immigrant Parentage

It has already been mentioned that the main problem of culture-conflict with respect to crime and immigration arises with the second generation. The native-born of immigrant parentage, or those who came very young, are the most prone to suffer from the effects of their parents' immigration.

The conduct norms of their parents diverge as a rule from the prevailing norms in the receiving country. The process of integration may also injure and sometimes shatter the social and economic status of the head of the family. This and other effects of the process of integration may weaken the cohesion of the family unit and thus hamper the family control over the young. The oriental Jewish father, however poor he may be, is always the omnipotent pater-familias. But when he comes to-Israel, the different social set-up may prevent him from fully exercising his former status, he may be given a job not to his liking, and the different living conditions may shatter his previous convictions and leave him in a state of confusion in which he cannot exercise proper control over his family. The youngster may also realize that his father is not the omnipotent patriarch he was supposed to be, and sometimes when he comes home from school he may see his father signing a document with his ink stained thumb.

All these factors presumably increase the susceptibility of the children of immigrant parents to absorb the so-called "street-culture" and to become juvenile delinquents.³³

Table IV shows the rates of Jewish juvenile

³³ As to the possible impact of these factors on juvenile delinquency see SHAW & MCKAY, REPORT ON SOCIAL FACTORS IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY (Report No. 13, 2 Report on the Causes of Crime, National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement 1937); DRUCKER & HEXTER, CHILDREN ASTRAY (1923); 1 THOMAS & ZNANIECKI, *op. cit. supra* note 4, at 711; Abrahamson, *Family Tension Basic Cause of Criminal Behavior*, 40 J. CRIM. L. & C. 330 (1949); Kobrin, *The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas*, 16 AM. SOC. REV. 653 (1951).

TABLE IV
RATES OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN ISRAEL FOR THE
YEARS 1949-1959³⁴

Year	Absolute Numbers	Rate per 100,000 of the Population	Percentage in the Age Groups
1949	1000	99	0.68
1950	1147	95	0.67
1951	1300	93	0.66
1952	1500	103	0.74
1953	1541	103	0.75
1954	2072	136	0.96
1955	2471	155	1.06
1956	2623	157	1.06
1957	2933	166	1.03
1958	3407	188	1.08
1959	4089	220	1.32

delinquency.³⁵ The middle column shows the rates per 100,000 inhabitants, and the right column shows the percentage of delinquents in their age group. It is obvious that the rate of juvenile delinquency in Israel has been rising constantly.

We may ask whether this increase is linked with immigration, or more precisely, what is the relative role of immigrant delinquents?³⁶ In the last two years for which data is available, the rates of immigrant delinquents per 100,000 new immigrants were 311 in 1958 and 282 in 1957, whereas the rates for the total population were 188 and 166 respectively. The ratio for both years is .10 "new" immigrant delinquents for 6 of the total population. It should be mentioned that immigrant families as a rule have more children than the older population, but this fact cannot decrease the significance of the unusually high rate of immigrant delinquency or of the possible application of the culture-conflict hypothesis.

Some relevant conclusions may also be drawn from the reports of the regional probation officers for the years 1957-58³⁷. These reports, although

³⁴ Source: The Juvenile Probation Service, The Ministry of Social Welfare, Israel.

³⁵ The relevant age groups are 9-16 for boys and 9-13 for girls. Children below 9 are not criminally responsible, whereas boys above 16 and girls above 13 are considered adults.

³⁶ The rates for *native*-born delinquents of immigrant parentage could not be determined. The necessary data are not yet fully available, inasmuch as criminal responsibility begins at the age of 9, and "new" immigrants are those who entered the country after 1948.

³⁷ MINISTRY OF SOCIAL WELFARE, JUVENILE PROBATION SERVICE REPORT (1958).

not based on refined statistical analysis, contain valuable observations based on daily contact with the population of the region and its delinquents. For example, the regional probation officer for the Tel-Aviv area reports that there are nine main centres of delinquency in his area, seven of which are wholly or mainly inhabited by "new" immigrants. The probation officer of Haifa reports that the greatest delinquency rate in his area is in Tira, which is a large settlement near Haifa wholly inhabited by "new" immigrants. The highest rate of delinquency in the whole country was recorded in the rural region of the Jerusalem area. The population of this region is composed entirely of "new" immigrants. The rates per 100,000 inhabitants in that region were 455 in 1957 and 355 in 1958, whereas the corresponding rates for the town of Jerusalem were only 189 and 279 respectively.

Recent data as to the ethnic origin differentiation of delinquency are not available as yet. The latest findings in this context are the data examined by the Agranat Committee on Juvenile Delinquency in Israel.³⁹ This committee examined the delinquency rates for the years 1951-1953 and found a great preponderance of delinquency among the oriental Jews over the delinquency among the European Jews. This conclusion applied not only to new immigrants but also to "old" immigrants and native-born. The committee concluded:

"The process of the social and cultural integration of the oriental immigrant boy is seemingly accompanied by internal and external conflicts which result inter-alia in delinquency. The delinquency proneness of these boys is augmenting the more the receiving community refrains from guiding and helping them to find their place in the new society. In that case a boy may develop a feeling that he is being discriminated against; the delinquency proneness therefore increases with the accumulation of real or illusory discrimination and failure experiences with the result that the rate of delinquency of the oriental boy increases the longer his stay in the country. The European boy on the other hand shows a better capacity of adaptation to the environment irrespective of the fact whether the receiving community is fully prepared to assist him in the process of integration or not, the latter is therefore less prone to seek anti-

social substitutes of satisfaction and consequently the longer he stays in the country the less his susceptibility of turning delinquent."³⁹

The committee states however that due to insufficient statistical data this conclusion should be regarded as a working hypothesis only to be confirmed or refuted by further research. It states however that, "prima-facie the cultural differences (i.e., oriental-European) have a greater causal significance than the sheer fact of immigration."⁴⁰

It may be worthwhile to point out that according to the basic premises of the culture-conflict hypothesis, immigration and different ethnic origin are actually two aspects of the same thing. A clash of conduct norms with a resultant increase in crime may result from the conflict of norms and values among individuals and groups, within a given community, who have different cultural definitions due to different cultural traditions and backgrounds. But the same clash may result when members of one cultural group migrate to a community having a different culture.⁴¹ The chances are that when a vast array of groups of different cultural traditions meet—not in a mutual country of origin, but through migration to a new country—the degree of culture-conflict, with the resultant crime and delinquency rates, will be higher among the new groups than among members of the receiving community, even though the receiving community is composed of divergent ethnic and cultural groups. This point, of primary importance for our present purposes, was partly confirmed by the data presented in this paper. The relative causal significance of immigration and different ethnic origins to the etiology of culture-conflict—important as it is—is really not relevant for our present purposes. The committee has pointed out that a comparison between the relevant data of two years (i.e., 1951 and 1953) was not sufficient for conclusive results. We may add that the time span between 1948-49 (the beginning of new immigration) and 1951 or 1953 was not long enough for the process of culture-conflict to crystalize its effects on the nature and rates of delinquency among the immigrants; moreover there was not yet any native-born second generation to be studied, and we have seen that one of the major points in the culture-conflict hypothesis

³⁹ *Id.* at 19.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ See SELLIN, *op. cit. supra* note 5, at 63.

³⁸ JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN ISRAEL (Ministry of Justice 1956).

concerns the second generation. A wide and thorough research into the problem of the impact of immigration on crime and delinquency in Israel, if undertaken now, will have at its disposal the relevant data from the last decade, including the 9-15 age group of the native-born second generation.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper is to state the problem of culture-conflict and crime in relation to the criminality of immigrants in Israel. The criminality and delinquency of "new" immigrants tends to be considerably higher than the criminality and delinquency of the native-born and

"old" immigrants. Differential crime and delinquency rates are also apparent between the European and the oriental Jews, the rates of the latter tending to be higher. We may state therefore that these primary findings call for further research into the nature and extent of culture-conflict and crime in Israel in relation to the "new" immigrants. The vast array of ethnic groups among the immigrants, the diversity of their cultural traditions, and the special social structure of the receiving community afford a unique opportunity to test one of the basic issues of the etiology of crime on the social level.⁴²

⁴² A research project on the criminality of immigrants in Israel is scheduled to be completed in 1962.