



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

Jewish Identities and their Co-constructors

A Qualitative Study of the Social Constructions of Jewish Identities in Sweden

Master's Programme in Social Work and Human Rights

Degree Report: 30 higher education credits

Spring 2015

Author: Paula Cáceres

Supervisor: Charlotte Melander

Abstract

Title: Jewish Identities and their Co-constructors

Author: Paula Cáceres

Key words: Jewish identity, anti-Semitism, symbolic interactionism, diaspora, ethnicity

The purpose with the study was to understand how people, whom define themselves as Jewish, construct their Jewish identities in relation to different social contexts and external threats as anti-Semitism, in Sweden. The study is qualitative in its kind, which means that semi-structured interviews were used to collect the data. Ten, self-proclaimed, Jewish young adults between the ages of 19-36 years were interviewed about their constructions of Jewish identities and of their own Jewish identity in relation to different social groups and contexts. A thematic analysis and theoretical concepts were used to analyse the data. The theoretical concepts were; Symbolic Interactionism, Diaspora, and Ethnicity.

The findings showed that Jewish identities were constructed with the help of co-constructors such as family members, friends, the Jewish communities, and anti-Semitism. To construct one's Jewish identity is also to construct it with the help of the Swedish society as a whole, which adds to the discussion of being a hyphen-Jew/Swede. Further findings also revealed that one cannot be open with one's Jewish identity in every geographical area in Sweden due to anti-Semitism. Being in the privileged areas meant that anti-Semitism was surreptitious and therefore less visible. In the marginalised areas, however, the respondents meant that the exposure to anti-Semitism increased due to its more open expression. In the privileged areas it was easier to display symbols that indicated Jewish affinity whereas in the marginalised areas the respondents felt that they had to hide anything that could indicate that one was Jewish. Exposure to anti-Semitism meant that one approached the Jewish friends as a strategy for support to cope with anti-Semitism.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	6
Chapter 1: Introduction	7
Choice of topic	8
Purpose with the research.....	8
Research questions	8
Research questions in relation to theoretical framework	9
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework	10
Symbolic interactionism.....	10
Goffman’s dramaturgical theory	11
Diaspora	12
What is diaspora?.....	12
Diaspora: integration and assimilation	12
Diaspora and hybridity	13
Ethnicity.....	13
Symbolic ethnicity	14
Concepts.....	14
Anti-Semitism	14
Oppression	15
Power	16
Chapter 3: Literature Review	17
Presentation of the different researches.....	17
Socialising into Jewishness.....	17
Voluntary associations	18
The Synagogue, religious practices.....	18
Affinity	20
Anti-Semitism	21
“Uninvolved Jews”	22
Contemporary Jews	22
Jews by choice.....	23
Chapter 4: Methodology	24
Research Methods	24
Qualitative research	24

Adaptive approach.....	24
Why qualitative?.....	24
Sampling process	25
Snowball sampling	25
Data collection method.....	26
Semi-structured interviews.....	26
Collecting the data	26
Places of interviewing	26
The difference between phone interviewing and face-to-face interviewing	27
Before and during the interviews	28
Probing.....	28
When the recording machine was off	28
Data processing and analysis method.....	29
Coding	29
Thematic analysis	30
Selection of quotes	31
Validity and reliability.....	31
Credibility.....	31
Transferability	32
Dependability	32
Confirmability.....	32
Ethical considerations.....	32
Transparent, informative and clear	32
Respectful and confidential	33
Researcher and power.....	34
Distress and harm	34
Chapter 5: Findings and Analysis.....	36
Talking Jewish identity.....	37
What is Jewish identity?	37
Swedish Jews.....	38
How do you maintain your Jewish identity?.....	39
Religion and secularism.....	40
Uninvolved Jews?.....	42
Jewish identity in relation to others.....	43
Family	43

Jewish community.....	46
Jewish and non-Jewish friends	47
“Naah, you’re not Swedish”	49
Jewish identity and geographical areas	52
Middle-to-upper class areas.....	52
‘Förorten’ Marginalised areas.....	53
City centres	54
Jewish identity and anti-Semitism	56
Anti-Semitism	56
Internal effects.....	57
External effects	59
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	63
Discussions	64
Are Jews an ethnic group?.....	64
What is Jewish identity?	65
How is this topic relevant for social work?	66
Reference List.....	68
Internet Sources.....	71
Appendix 1.....	73
Informed Consent	73
Appendix 2.....	74
Interview Questions (English).....	74
Appendix 3.....	76
Interview Questions (Swedish)	76

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my biggest gratitude to every single person who has been involved and helped me throughout my thesis. First of all I would like to thank my respondents for their time and patience to be part of this thesis, you have been astonishing, all of you. Thank you for sharing those remarkable stories that each one of you had. Gatekeepers; thank you for your kind help to open up the doors for me in order to find participants, if it was not for you I would not have been honoured to hear those amazing stories. I would like to thank my family who supported me during my process and encouraged strengths and (especially) breaks in order to keep my motivation up. My supervisor Charlotte that has been a great supervisor *and* advisor. You kept my motivation on top every time I left your office! Thank you for sharing that amazing knowledge that you have. Lastly, but definitely not least, the almighty Father of this universe who made everything possible from the very beginning. Thank you for your great love and blessings.

Muchas gracias and tack så mycket everyone!

Chapter 1: Introduction

Jews have officially been living in Sweden and have practiced their religion since 1774. However, contacts between Jews and Swedes have been traced before 1774, such as year 700 when the first contact was established when the Vikings traded with the Khazars. Khazars were a people whom resided in a domain between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, in which many of them were recognised as Jews (Jewish Museum Stockholm 2015).

Another trace of Swedish people's connections to Jews can be found in 1557 when the King, Gustav Vasa, had a Jewish doctor (Jewish Museum Stockholm 2015). This was also the case for Queen Kristina, in 1645, the Queen needed a doctor for her health. The chosen doctor that was Benedictus de Castro, who was later recognised as Baruch Nehemias, a Jewish doctor from Hamburg (Meyerson 2012; Jewish Museum Stockholm 2015).

In 1686, the church established a law which proposed that those Jews who moved to Sweden had to convert from Judaism to Christianity (Jewish Museum Stockholm 2015). The law was revoked in 1774. In 1774, Aaron Isaac from Mecklenburg was the first Jew whom was granted residence and permitted to express his Jewish religion without having to convert to Christianity. The first Jewish community in Sweden was therefore established in 1775 (Meyerson 2012). According to Jewish law, in order for Aaron Isaac to be able to have a Jewish sermon he had to have at least ten Jewish men above the age of 13 years old (Meyerson 2012). Aaron Isaac could therefore take his family members to Sweden whom also were permitted residence in the country.

Between the years of 1905-1917, and 1933-1946 more Jews moved to Sweden due to persecution and/or rescuing teams. Russian Jews escaped the Kishinev massacre, 1905-1917. The Kishinev massacre, in Russia, had killed 49 Jews, more than 500 injured, 2,000 Jewish families were left homeless, and 700 houses looted (Jewish Virtual Library 1999). During World War I, a few thousand Jews escaped persecution in Tsarist Russia to settle in Sweden. During the years of 1933-1938, World War II, when the Nazis governed in Germany, not many Jews fled to Sweden to escape the murders of Jews. This could be because the Swedish and the Swiss authorities made a request to the German authorities to give special passports to German Jews in order for the border police to know who was Jewish or not (Forum för Levande Historia 2015). The German authorities accepted the request by stamping the German Jews' passports with a red "J", this facilitated the refusal of entry to Sweden (Åsbrink 2012). Those who were refused to entry were therefore sent back to Germany, and in many cases sent to the Nazi death camps. Between the years 1945-1946, approximately 15,345 people were rescued from the Nazi death camps to Sweden by an operation called the "White Buses" lead by Count Bernadotte, how many Jews were rescued is unknown (Red Cross 2015). Lastly, in the years of 1956-1970, approximately 3,500 Jews moved to Sweden during the political upheavals in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland.

In 1999, the state of Sweden recognised Jews as a national minority according to the European Council's Framework for the Protection of National Minorities (Riksdagen 1999/2000). Today, it is unclear how many Jews who are residing in Sweden, since the Swedish state does not keep records of religious denominations, this regulation was abolished

in 1951. However, it is estimated that there are approximately 20,000 Jews (Jewish Museum Stockholm 2015).

If we are to look at anti-Semitism in the 20th century in Sweden, BRÅ (2013) reports that there has been a total of 2,412 reports on anti-Semitic hate crimes between the years 1997-2013. For instance, in 1997, 82 reports were sent to the police whereas in 2009, 250 reports were sent. However, these reports should only serve as an estimation of how wide the crimes could be. As many other reports of crime, there are people who do not make an official report to the police when something happens to them.

Choice of topic

The reason why I chose to write about Jewish identities was because anti-Semitism became acknowledged by media around Europe after the war between Israel and Gaza, summer 2014. Some argued whether the war between Israel and Gaza sparked an already existing hatred toward Jews (Judisk Krönika 2014). Jews around Europe were targets to anti-Semitic actions and attitudes. Some examples from earlier this year, 2015, are the two attacks in Paris, France, 7th January. The first attack was towards the satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo where 11 people died, the second attack that took place the same day was in a kosher grocery shop where four Jewish men were killed because they were Jewish. Another example is the shootings in Copenhagen, Denmark, 15th February, where a 37 year old Jewish man was shot to death when guarding the synagogue.

Another reason for choosing the topic of Jewish identities and anti-Semitism was that, I found articles discussing the little attention anti-Semitism has got when it comes to the anti-discriminatory and anti-racism agenda in North America (Gold 1996). I found the topic to be of interest and wanted to contribute with new knowledge about Jewish identities and the effects of anti-Semitism in a Swedish context.

Purpose with the research

The purpose with the research is to understand how people whom define themselves as Jewish construct their Jewish identities in relation to different social contexts and external threats as anti-Semitism.

Research questions

What is Jewish identity?

How are Jewish identities constructed in Sweden?

How are Jewish identities expressed in different social contexts?

How does anti-Semitism affect the construction of Jewish identities in Sweden?

Research questions in relation to theoretical framework

Jewish identities are the main focus of my thesis and these will be analysed through a symbolic interactionistic approach. Symbolic interactionism enables an understanding of how identities are constructed in a social constructionist way. The concept diaspora and ethnicity are theoretical tools which will help me understand the ethnic and group aspect of constructing Jewish identities and how these ethnic identities are constructed when there is an external threat as anti-Semitism. The theoretical framework will be presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

Identity can be seen in different perspectives depending on one's theoretical perspective. In this thesis I have chosen a symbolic interactionist approach which is a sociological way of seeing identity. There is also a psychological way of seeing identity with Freud and Erikson as the leading heads in this section, identity is explained as essential, a steady core that remains the same within the individual throughout her/his life. We can either see identity as a steady and stable phenomenon that is essential throughout the individual's history, or as a constructive and changing process which changes depending on society and relations to other individuals.

I will explain the changing and constructive process of identity with the help of concepts.

Identity is about unity, emotions and collective relationships and affiliation (Hammarén & Johansson 2009). Identity is not constructed alone by the individual but is rather something that is constructed with our connections to different collective affiliations and identifications we share with other people. Hammarén and Johansson (2009) explain that identity could be seen as a bridge between our unique person and society, identity would be a way to connect us to our society. Social identities and roles, or cultural identities and lifestyles, tell a story about how society is structured and constructed (Castells 2004; Hammarén & Johansson 2009).

Symbolic interactionism

Within symbolic interactionism it is believed that the construction of the self, or identity, is in constant motion when individuals interact with each other (Mead 1934; Cooley 1983; Charon 1995). When individuals engage in different social contexts they will display different sides and attributes of themselves (Goffman 1998). This change happens both consciously and unconsciously in relation to other people, with their reactions and/or opinions (Mead 1934). Mead (1934) clarifies this by saying that selves and minds are social products, or phenomenon, of human experience. In addition, Cooley (1983) claims that because individuals are social all her/his attributes are part of a collective development.

According to Mead (1934), individuals are unconsciously addressing themselves as other address them. Charon (1995) explains this by saying that the self should be regarded as an object and as a social object that is part of the interaction with others. This enables individuals to observe their world outside of themselves and look back at situations and understand, admit and even see/remember what they felt at the time. Individuals are able to see what they do, who they are, what they have done and can use it for self-reflection (Mead 1934; Charon 1995). More or less, one could say that the individual, because s/he is a product of social phenomenon, has shaped her/his values, morals, and principles with the help of society and other people. The latter, nonetheless, makes the 'self-reflection' a product of others' thoughts as well.

Cooley (1983) illustrates the objectivity of one's self with the way we see ourselves through a looking glass. Cooley (1983) argues that as the way we see ourselves through a mirror we see

ourselves through other people's eyes, the 'self-idea'. We are interested to know how we represent ourselves through the way we think other people see us. When we imagine how other people think and see us we get conscious, if not self-conscious, about ourselves and our behaviours (Cooley 1983). Cooley (1983) claims that being self-conscious affects the way we see ourselves and because of this we are able to feel certain things about ourselves, such as pride or shame, the 'self-feeling'.

It is of value to note that what affects an individual's view of themselves is not only founded by others opinions or perceptions of her/him but instead the interpretations of how the individual *thinks* others perceive her/him (Charon 1995). An example would be when A thinks that B does not like A, because every time A is around B, B does not seem to like the company of A since B becomes passive and less talkative than usual. However, when B is with anyone else, B seems to have the time of her/his life. Charon (1995) argues, that not all the acts and gestures are understood correctly, individuals can also misinterpret certain actions and see them as negative. Charon (1995) means that a misinterpreted act can be taken as negative without it having to be negative, the act can mean the opposite of what the individual interpreted it to be because the individual misinterpreted the gestures. If we go back to the A and B example, maybe A misinterpreted B's distant behaviour thinking s/he lacked interest in A, it could have been that B becomes threaten by A's energetic personality that made B passive and quiet, or maybe B was attracted to A and was too shy to talk to A. However, even if we have interpreted the act or gesture correctly it does not necessarily mean that we have to accept it. What the other person thinks of us can be used as a tool to establish an unfair and inconvenient perception of our selves (Charon 1995).

The interaction people have with each other which enables individuals' understanding of one another is what Mead (1934) calls 'role taking'. 'Role taking' is when individuals put themselves in the place of others and act as others (Mead 1934). The 'role taking' makes it possible for individuals to consciously understand what happens in their environment and also how others experience the situation we interact on (Charon 1995). When taking over roles, the individual adopts thoughts and feelings which are assigned when the individual puts her-/himself in the other person's perspective (Cooley 1983). Individuals see the world from others' perspectives which facilitates their understanding of what other people's behaviour and actions mean for them. Cooley (1983) explains this by giving an example of when people encounter different situations and they show that they are relaxed, unselfish and spontaneous, but still on the inside thinking on what impression they are giving to others.

Goffman's dramaturgical theory

Goffman (1998) illustrates the interaction between people and society like a theatre play. The society and its members as the audience and the individual as the actor of his/her social life which he divides into two categories, the *front stage* and the *backstage*.

Front stage – This is where the actor, or individual, tries to give a good impression to the audience to not cause any problems by taking on the role that sustains her/him and embodies certain and acceptable norms. How the individual acts before her/his audience is regulated by, what Goffman calls, the politeness norms, the individual adapts the way she/he speaks and

behaves, and also shows respect for holy places. The front stage is where the individual withholds certain qualities of her-/himself in order to not disappoint the audience.

Backstage – Here is when the roles that are suppressed during the day comes out. The backstage would be seen as the place where the individual can relax and be her-/himself without keeping back any attributes. The backstage does not have any expectations on the individual thus makes it the most comfortable place for the individual to be in. Unlike the front stage where the individual has to keep her/his “real self” away from the audience and play a role that is accepted by others.

Depending on each situation, each environment, and group of people, the individual plays, according to Goffman (1998), a role that is suitable for each context.

Diaspora

A concept that has been reawakened and re-used since the late 1980s when the term was reaching an out of date period and almost ceased to be used until Safran in 1991 put diaspora back on track (Brubaker 2005). The interest in diaspora grew both in and ‘outside’ the academic world and the new era of diaspora started.

What is diaspora?

Greek for dispersion, *speiro* (to sow) and *dia* (over) (Cohen 1997). The concept describes ‘scattered’ people (Wahlbeck 2007).

Many scholars have argued and have had different opinions about diaspora such as it includes terms as transnationalism, hybridity/syncretism (Hall 1990; Clifford 1994; Anthias 1998; Wahlbeck & Olsson 2007). Others claiming that diaspora is “sharing” the meaning of terms as refugee, guest-worker, exile community, overseas community, ethnic community etc (Tölöyan 1991). Safran (1991), argues against the latter, by saying that a diasporic community or group, is a community that has been forcibly expelled from its prior home. Thus calling all these different dispersions of peoples a diaspora does that the meaning of diaspora loses its true meaning (Brubaker 2005). However, what scholars do have in common is that diaspora involves a dispersion of peoples, orientation to a real or imagined homeland and the preservation of a distinctive community and identity (Safran 1991; Cohen 1997; Brubaker 2005).

Diaspora: integration and assimilation

In order to stay diasporic, the group/community must somehow resist the power of assimilation in the settlement countries (Cohen 1997).

What distinguishes a diasporic community from the dominant group is the collective identity with others of similar background and an acceptance of an inevitable link with their past migration history (Cohen 1997). Furthermore, people in diaspora are known for historically staying together and identifying themselves as a distinct community who maintains loyal connections to a homeland and practices such as traditions and keeping their religion and culture alive which they have inherited (Clifford 1994). Therefore assimilation, forgetting,

distancing from the motherland or the community, contributes to not having a diasporic identity (Clifford 1994; Cohen 1997).

Integrating, on the other hand, is not the same as assimilating. Integrating would entail learning the language and culture of the host society, at the same time as the own culture and language is preserved as well and plays a major role in everyday life. This leads us to the next point, *Diaspora and hybridity*.

Diaspora and hybridity

The claim or myth of returning to a homeland is one of the six diaspora characteristics presented by Safran (1991). Safran (1991), uses the Jewish people as the representatives of the characteristics of diasporic people.

Since some diasporic groups have been out of the motherland/fatherland for centuries, many of them still have the notion of sometime returning to their historical homeland but reality is not always as prominent as one would think.

Clifford (1994) claims that a diaspora group/community are not groups or segments of people that are temporarily living in a country. A diaspora means that the people are staying long periods or permanently in one place that is not the prior home (Clifford 1994). This leads to the diaspora group having to eventually integrate into the host society which they or their descendants have made their home. Without losing their diasporic characteristics of being “a people amongst other peoples” (Dencik 2009, p. 321, my own translation). This further explains Cohen’s (1997) argument about the diaspora community’s sense of collective identity with both the members of the diasporic group and with the ethnic members of the country of settlement. Anthias (1998) explains the collective identity with both the diaspora group and the dominant group as a *hybridity* that is formed by an experience of being *from* one place and *of* another, with “particular sentiments towards the homeland, whilst being formed by those of the place of settlement” (Anthias 1998, p. 565). A hybrid identity is explained by Hall (1999), when saying that a diasporic individual has a cut-and-mix identity. It is hybrid or ‘mixed’ in the sense that it is produced by the country of settlement and by the diasporic group the individual belongs to. Hall (1999), further says that these hybrid identities are being reproduced continually.

So, where does “the returning to a homeland” fit in? As explained above, integration in societies play a major role when it comes to wanting or not wanting to return to a prior home, if there is one. When people in diaspora have lived out of their (real or imagined) homelands for a long period of time, one may assume that they would settle down and feel at home in the host country, which enables them to see the country of settlement as their new and prior home. Safran (1991) argues that leaving the diaspora, to return to the existing homeland may cause inconvenience, trauma, and so on. Because members of a diaspora might not identify with the homeland’s ideologies, policies, or social and/or cultural life, so moving there would mean to sacrifice an already settled life in the host country (Safran 1991). Therefore, when talking about diasporic communities with homes to return to, Cohen (1997) claims that it is a choice.

Ethnicity

Tajfel (1981, p. 255) describes ethnicity as:

That part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership.

Phinney (1996), explains that when a child is socialised into an ethnic group, the child learns about the group's values and ideologies, as well as the child learns to associate the ethnic group as something positive when the family presents positive and fun perceptions of the group to the child.

The term ethnicity, refers to a variety of socio-cultural phenomenon which characterises different groups of people based on basic classifications such as culture, religion, heritage, and so on (Eriksen 1991). Barth (1969) argues that an ethnic attribute is recognised when a person is ascribed a categorical classification based on his/her identity which is set by the person's background and origin.

An ethnicity has to be confirmed from the ethnic group, as well as the 'outside' group in order to legitimise one's ethnic belonging (Barth 1969; Eriksen 1991; Phinney 1996). Ethnicity is expressed and seen by others through signals or signs such as lifestyle, culture, or language (Barth 1969). Additionally, Phinney (1996), claims that ethnicity is expressed through sense of belonging, interest and knowledge about the group's history, and through engaging in activities and traditions of the group.

Barth (1969) claims that when a person designates him-/herself to a certain group, the person acts, keeps values and morals that is in accordance with the ethnic group s/he identifies with and is thus prepared to be judged as such. When interacting with people from other ethnic groups, Barth (1969) argues that the members of the different groups adapt to each other and interact on common grounds since there is a limitation of shared understandings when it comes to each other's issues. Barth (1969) further means that ethnic groups cannot exist if there are no other ethnic groups whereby the group can construct their distinction against, such as cultural differences.

Symbolic ethnicity

Gans (1979), presents *symbolic ethnicity*, which means that cultural patterns are transformed into symbols which are visible and clear, the cultural patterns have to be easily expressed and not time-consuming but also have to be felt within, the 'sense of' belonging. Symbolic ethnicity means that one customises one's ethnic culture in the way that it does not disturb other aspects of one's life (Gans 1979). What used to be a ceremony, or a ritual passage are now celebrations that can be done fast and it serves as a good occasion to gather family members whom one would normally not meet (Gans 1979). Gans (1979) argues that ethnicity, since it is seen as something positive, is used to show distinction in a homogenised society.

Concepts

Anti-Semitism

Historically, the term Semitic referred to a group of languages that were categorised as Semitic. Examples on Semitic languages; Arabic, Amharic, Hebrew, Tigrinya and etc. Semites was a term used to describe people who spoke one of these languages (Anti-Defamation League 2008, abbreviated as ADL). Today, however, the term is used to refer to acts and attitudes that somehow discriminate Jews as a group or people. Therefore, discrimination of previously mentioned people, if they are not Jews, do not fall into the category of discrimination within anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism has only been, and still is, applied when referring to acts against the Jewish people (ADL 2008). The concept *anti-Semitism* was coined in 1879 by Wilhelm Marr, a German journalist who used the term to represent the hatred against Jews and lead anti-Jewish campaigns (ADL 2008; SKMA 2013).

The Swedish Committee against Anti-Semitism (2013, abbreviated as SKMA, Svenska Kommittén mot antisemitism) argues that the term anti-Semitism implies prejudice and hostility toward Jews simply because they are Jews. In addition, ADL claims that anti-Semitism can be based on Jews' religious beliefs, their ethnicity and also the misconception of Jews being a "race". There are different ways in which anti-Semitism manifests its negative attitudes. It ranges from anything between mild preconceptions about the Jewish people, to outrageous hatred towards the group which is shown through verbal assertions, social and judicial discrimination and violence (SKMA 2013). SKMA (2013) claims that anti-Semitism is based on stereotypes and myths, and a negative attitude toward Jews as a group.

Jews have a long history of being discriminated against, which can be traced as far back as year 59 (Levinger 1936). Levinger (1936) claims that there have been different motives for hating Jews, however, many of these motives can still be traced in present days. Levinger (1936) presents the different motives of anti-Semitism:

Religious motives. Hated by Christians because of Christ's crucifixion and for cursing Christians in their prayers. The Christians feared Jews because of their similar beliefs. The Christians' purpose was to convert the Jews and make them one of them, when that failed the Christians started to persecute Jews and killed many of them (Levinger 1936). The religious motives was also the motives for the inquisitions in Spain and Portugal in 1481, Jews who did not convert to Christianity were killed at first and later on, expelled in 1492 (Jewish Virtual Library 2015).

Economic aspects. Jews were hated for being poor and for being rich. In the medieval ages the Jews were in charge of moneylending, the business grew and Jews became a middle-class group. Jews were therefore hated and feared for being competitors and myths as Jews being greedy and evil arose.

World power aspect (Myth of a world conspiracy). Jews as a world power that is planning on destroying the gentile nations and give over dominion of the world to Jews. These conspiracy theories were published in 1903 in Russia, called *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. In which it is stated that Jews own the banks, media, politics, and everything in it to

control everyone in the planet. This is also a theory that is still being used in many Middle Eastern countries to justify their hatred against Jews. The Protocols have been called the bible of anti-Semitism (Larsson 2009).

Oppression

The concept of oppression is a social act that restricts individuals, groups or institutions to achieve a good life by being degraded, deprived of privileges and held down in order to not thrive (Johnson 2000a; Barker 2003). Freire (1972) explains that when an individual is being oppressed, he or she is being de-humanised by the oppressor and therefore internalises the oppressor's perception of them and unconsciously starts to live up to the conceptions that are given to them. An individual or group can be oppressed by belonging to a social group, which would be the results from ideologies of superiority and inferiority (Charlton 1998).

Oppression can also become institutionalised in which its acts becomes overt and not as identified as the covert oppression, since it is in the individual's consciousness (Johnson 2000b). Freire (1972) claims that cover oppression hinders individuals to be completely free because of their inner oppressor.

Power

Power is not something an individual possesses as a *thing* (Tew 2006), it is rather a phenomenon that is enacted in different ways (Tew 2006; Börjesson & Rehn 2009). There are different ways of seeing power Tew (2006) explains it through *power over*, *power to* and *power together*. *Power to*, is the impact or influence an individual has on another to obtain his/her will when the other opposes to it (Weber 1968 in Tew 2006 p.35). *Power over* can be seen as an oppressive act of power and also as a protective act (Tew 2006). The oppressive act is meant to explain a group whom exercises *power over* other groups, the superior-inferior relationship whereby the superior group legitimise their use of power against the inferior group to enhance their own position (Dominelli 2002; Tew 2006). *Power over* is protecting when it is used to defend vulnerable people and enforcing them to achieve advancement in life. Lastly, *power together*, can be seen when individuals in a group seek support and reinforcement with each other, this can be used to stand up against other power acts (Tew 2006).

Chapter 3: Literature Review

The researches presented in this chapter are studies about Jewish life and Jewish identity and how these identities are expressed in different contexts, such as countries and in relation to other people. These studies enhance the understanding of how others understand Jewish identity. I have restricted the literature review to a European context, since Sweden is situated in Europe.

Presentation of the different researches

Miller, Schmool and Lerman (1996), presents the findings from a postal survey of British Jews. The survey was founded and proposed by the institute for Jewish Policy Research (JPR, an independent institute in Britain that specialises in research on contemporary Jewish communities in the United Kingdom and in Europe). The data for the survey was collected between July and October year 1995. The findings are based on 2,180 questionnaires that touched upon subjects as political orientation, anti-Semitism, Jewish life, and attitudes to Israel and the Middle East. I will only put my focus on the subjects that touch upon anti-Semitism and Jewish identity since these are of relevance for my research.

Dencik (2003) presents the results of a survey he conducted with Marosi and Rubenowitz, between the years 1999-2001. Questionnaires were sent to 5,991 members of the Jewish communities in Gothenburg, Stockholm, and Malmö. The results are based on 2,581 questionnaires that were answered and sent back. The questionnaires touched upon subjects on Jewish life and attitudes towards Jewish issues. I will also present the results from the survey that Dencik and Marosi (2000) used when comparing the Jewish communities of Stockholm and Gothenburg. These results are based on a total of 2,227 questionnaires that were sent back to the researchers from the Jewish communities from both Stockholm (1,685 questionnaires) and Gothenburg (542 questionnaires).

Instead of Jewish identity, Gitelman (2003) refers to it as Jewish consciousness. Together with two other researchers, Professor Shapiro and Dr. Chervyakov, Gitelman (2003) conducted an investigation about Russian- and Ukrainian Jews' attitudes, behaviours, and values. They conducted two surveys, one in 1992-1993 and the second one in 1997-1998 in the same cities of Russia (Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Ekaterinburg) and Ukraine (Kiev, Kharkiv, Odessa, Lviv, and Chernivtsi). In each of the two survey waves, they also conducted 1,300 interviews with Jews in Russia, and 2,000 interviews with Jews in Ukraine. The ages of the respondents had to be no less than 16 years old and there was no upper age limit.

Another research that will be presented here is Buckser's (2010) findings based on an ethnographic fieldwork he carried out between the years 1996-1998 in the Jewish community of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Socialising into Jewishness

Dencik and Marosi (2000) conducted a survey with the Jewish communities in Stockholm and Gothenburg where the respondents had to agree or disagree with different statements. One of the questions touched upon the maintenance of Jewish identity among the youth. In order for the young to preserve their Jewish identities they needed, according to the results, to have a

family with strong Jewish identities and sense of Jewishness (Dencik & Marosi 2000). What scored second was to have a family that keeps the Jewish traditions, habits, Jewish food etc, and to have a good Jewish schooling. The aspects that scored low on the scale of maintaining the youth's Jewish identities; were to visit Israel frequently, to have a family that is engaged in the activities of the community, a family that keeps the Jewish religious Laws (mitzvot), and having a family with a strong belief in God. These aspects confirms Gitelman's (2003) childhood socialisation idea. To socialise someone into Jewishness, especially during childhood, is, according to Gitelman (2003), a way to transmit one's Jewishness to the next generation.

Gitelman (2003) means that childhood socialisation plays a major role when it comes to future Jewish behaviour, such as observing Jewish traditions. What is significant when it comes to future behaviour and attitudes toward Jewishness later in life is the way the parents explain to their children what it meant to be Jewish. Those respondents who said that their parents explained what it meant to be Jewish in a more explicit and detailed way, would be the ones who most likely were to engage in Jewish activities more than those respondents who said that their parents only explained it a bit or whose parents avoided the subject. Gitelman (2003), furthermore, says that the younger the respondents were, when learning about what it meant to be Jewish, the stronger they felt Jewish in older ages.

Voluntary associations

The voluntary associations in the Jewish community in Copenhagen served many Copenhagen Jews, even the secularised Jews and those who never attended the synagogue, as a way to participate in the community (Buckser 2010). Buckser (2010), further explains that the Copenhagen Jews had at least one or two different association memberships. The different associations ranged from Zionist groups, women's club to sports clubs to youth organisations, and so on. All the associations, according to Buckser (2010) touched upon aspects of Jewish life whether it was support for the land of Israel, or whether it was on a neutral contexts such as sports. Most of the associations were tied to the Jewish community and the purpose with the associations was to engage Jews into gatherings with each other and to keep in touch with their Jewishness (Buckser 2010).

Voluntary associations, in this case, could also be seen as a way to construct Jewish identities. Since it encourages Jews to gather and to associate on common grounds, since they are Jewish. It seems like the community with its active encouragement of enrolling the Copenhagen Jews into activities, for Jews only, is a way to constructor Jewish identities as well.

The Synagogue, religious practices

In the research about the Danish Jews, Buckser (2010) explains the way the synagogue, in Denmark, with its weekly services and special events serve as the constructor of Jewish identities, whether it is in religious terms or affiliation terms. For those who see it from the religious aspect, the synagogue served as a place where they could connect with God and some members thought of the weekly services as the highlight of the week. The synagogue and its weekly services that consists of prayers, readings from the Torah, and a sermon from the rabbi, the services would, according to Buckser (2010) express the essence of Judaism.

Buckser (2010) explains that attending the weekly services in the synagogue would be an escape for the Danish Jews from the secular society they live in, in order to obtain that special relationship the religious Jews claim to have with God. During the weekly services they could do so by being in the environment of holiness, by singing the songs in Hebrew to God, and by listening to the readings from the Torah scrolls. Buckser (2010) claims that all this validates the religious dimension of what it is to be Jewish.

The synagogue, is not only an important place for those who are religious, it is also important for those who denominate themselves as ‘cultural Jews’ or ‘secular Jews’. When Buckser (2010) talks about the synagogal setting during ‘packed’ services, he describes it as a social setting. Women and men sit separate from each other, the men would sit on the ground level while women sit on the balconies. The ‘social synagogal setting’ (my definition) takes place in the same environment as the active service is taking place. When singing and reading the Torah, there is another active socialising going on at the same time. Buckser (2010) mean that the services offers an opportunity for those who are not religious a chance to meet and catch up with friends or family members, during the services. Buckser (2010) explains that the men stand together in knots, sometimes waving to each other from one bench to another, while women sit together chatting to each other and looking down at the men. Buckser (2010), explains this by saying that the services, especially during major holidays, served as some kind of family reunion, and many members confirmed this by saying that they only attended the services for social reasons (Buckser 2010). In the cases of religious and non-religious Jews, attending the synagogue served as a way to legitimise one’s Jewishness by taking part in the service and “feel one’s distinctive Jewish culture and tradition reaffirmed” (Buckser 2010, p. 721).

Gitelman (2003), sees the religious holiday celebrations as an informal means of transmitting Jewish consciousness to children or family members. The celebrations would reinforce a sense of Jewish identity since this would mean to gather Jewish family members and friends together to have a festive meal and remember why Passover is celebrated. Gitelman (2003), meant that this observance would set the celebrants apart, in a positive way, from the rest of the population. Of those respondents who observed or celebrated Jewish holidays in their childhood, scored highest on the “index of Jewishness” which means that they also had Jewish objects at home, stronger identification with Israel, and attended synagogue and cultural events more than those who did not score as high on the Jewishness index.

When talking about having Jewish objects at home, Dencik (2003) observed that Swedish Jews, in a large extent, had a *mezuzah*¹, on their door-posts. Owing a mezuzah seems to be a symbol that marks Jewish belongingness, among Swedish Jews (Dencik 2003). Nearly eight out of ten Swedish Jews, from Dencik’s survey (2003) had a mezuzah. Dencik (2003), means that hardly any ‘regular’ Swede would notice nor read what that symbol on the door-post might mean, whereas Jews would be able to recognise it and through that see it as an indication of a Jewish home. Although Jews in Sweden, in a larger extent considered

¹ Mezuzah, means “doorpost” in Hebrew. Refers to a small case that contains a scroll of two Biblical passages (Deuteronomy 6:4-9 and 11:13-20) which declares God’s unity and Jews’ devotion to Him. The mezuzah (the case with the passages) is later placed on the doorpost (Chabad Stockholm 1993-2015).

themselves to be ‘secular Jews’, they still owned a mezuzah but, according to Dencik (2003), as a way to identify one’s Jewishness.

Most of the respondents, from Dencik’s (2003) survey, found it more important to be ethnical Jewish rather than being a religious group, and to customise old traditions and make it their own. Dencik (2003) gives the example of the circumcision (Brit Milah), which is one of the highest observed practices together with attending the yearly Seder² and Pesach ceremony and celebrating Chanukah³, practices that would rather be ‘national’ in character. Circumcision of a Jewish born son and participating in the yearly Seder and celebrating Chanukah, are essentially religiously based. The Brit Milah would be the eternal covenant between God and the Jewish people. The yearly Seder, celebration of being freed by God, through Moses from the oppressions of Egypt to go to the Promised Land. Chanukah, the miracle of light. Dencik (2003) means that what is rather celebrated through these occasions is the fact of belonging to a people rather than a relationship to God. Dencik (2003) explains this by calling it “symbolic Judaism” which consists of customising religious traditions and give them new meanings.

Affinity

According to Dencik’s (2003) data, the important factors in feeling ‘Jewish’ entailed feelings of being Jewish in essence (personality, way of thinking etc), loyalty to Jewish inheritance, and feeling of belonging with other Jews. It was less important to attend to religious activities, going to the synagogue and celebrate religious customs. A little more than six out of ten respondents referred to Jews as being a people rather than a religious group.

The strong Jewish identification, among Swedish Jews, was not only shown on previously mentioned factors but also in the high interest on Jewish culture such as aesthetics (arts, music, films and etc.), attending lectures on a Jewish topic, going on trips with a Jewish theme and going to a play because of its Jewish connections.

For those Danish Jews who did not see themselves as religious meant that their connection to Judaism was not a symbol to divinity but rather a symbol that described their distinctiveness as a people and culture from the dominant culture, in this case Denmark. The Jews would describe their Jewishness as a spice in the soup that provided flavour and character to the soup which otherwise would be bland. Attending the services enabled them to reinforce their Jewish identity by engaging in Jewish customs and by interacting with other Jews.

In one way or another, in the cases of the Danish Jews and Swedish Jews many defined themselves as secular and that being Jewish or being part of the Jewish people is being part of a group that share the same history, similar backgrounds and traditions. The Danish Jews,

² The seder. It is celebrated in accordance with Easter. Pesach is a remembrance of when the Jews were freed from the oppressive powers of the Pharaoh. God sent Moses to free the people and through Moses, God split the Red sea into two so that the people could pass.

³ A remembrance of the time when the Macabees (a family) fought against the Greeks who ruled at the time, the Macabees managed to drive the Greeks away and got back what was the Jews. There was also a miracle, the miracle of light. The macabees found a jar of oil that has not been impured by the Greek, but the oil was only enough to be lit for one day, but with the miracle of God, the oil burnt for eight days. The remembrance of those miracles are still celebrated amongst Jews.

recognised themselves as a people or a group, however, a group with differences within group who have a common essence that distinguishes them from the larger Danish society (Buckser 2010).

When it comes to Jewish identity in the cases of the British Jews, which can also be seen in the cases of Swedish- and Danish Jews, do not think that synagogue affiliation is the only way of judging one's Jewish identity, but that there are other dimensions as well, such as being 'traditional' or having ethnic attachment to the group. Most Jews in the survey claimed to be 'secular' or 'just Jewish' (44 percent) while 31 percent called themselves 'traditional', 9 percent 'strictly Orthodox', and 15 percent 'progressive'. To say that one has Jewish identity, is in the case of most British Jews, being a part of a people. Miller et al. (1996) meant that the ritual observance (ex. lighting the candles on Shabbat) are closely linked to ethnic identity, as to say, that it is observed to show one's identification to the Jewish community rather than a symbol of strong connection to divinity.

The majority of the respondents from Sweden strongly identified themselves as Jews and that they felt more Jewish than Swedish. Dencik (2003) argues that the strong sense of Jewishness did not necessarily mean that the sense of Swedishness was low, in fact the level of participation in society (military service, attending to regular Swedish schools, public affairs, and general elections) is as high among Jews as it is among other Swedes. Therefore, to identify as Jews does not mean that they do not identify as Swedes (Dencik 2003). There were those whom felt equally Jewish as Swedish (38.9 percent).

In the case of Russia and Ukraine, Gitelman (2003) explains that the experience of knowing that one was Jewish was more on the negative side rather on the positive among those respondents who were between 50-55 years old. Those who were positive about being Jewish, and also were more proud of being Jewish, were the younger (16-29 years) and older respondents (60 and above). Those who experienced their Jewishness as negative were those who were born around the time of World War II. Gitelman (2003) explains that feelings of pride in being Jewish is not only shown internal within the individual but it was also shown external when those respondents were the ones who scored higher on attending Jewish cultural and educational events. On the other hand, however, Gitelman (2003) also explained that attendance at Jewish events does not necessarily mean that one is more proud, or feel more Jewish by attending, as other behaviours. Gitelman (2003), further means that the events offer more than Jewish gatherings, they also offer food or entertainment which means that those who do not express strong Jewish affinity attend those events as well.

Anti-Semitism

When it comes to anti-Semitism, in the cases of Russia and Ukraine, those respondents who said that they experienced anti-Semitism were those who scored higher on Jewish consciousness (Gitelman 2003). Gitelman (2003) explains it by saying that those who scored higher on Jewish consciousness and were more active in Jewish affairs were more likely to sense anti-Semitism more than those who did not score as high on the scale. Furthermore, those who experienced anti-Semitism may also had their Jewish consciousness raised, such as becoming more aware that they are Jewish (Gitelman 2003). Similar results can be seen in the cases of Jews residing in Britain. Those Jews, in Britain, who felt or had experienced anti-

Semitism were those who, according to Miller et al. (1996), highly identified themselves as Orthodox Jewish men rather than British. The relatively low proportion of respondents who claimed that there was an increase in anti-Semitism (31 percent), undermines the assumption that there is fear among Jews about this matter (Miller et al. 1996).

According to the findings of the JPR survey, British Jews, back then in 1996, did not feel that anti-Semitism had worsened in the last five years but rather felt that racism in general had increased (Miller et al. 1996). According to the findings of Dencik and Marosi (2000), most Jews from Sweden thought that racism in general had increased in Sweden, as can also be detected in the cases of Jews from Britain in 1996 (Miller et al. 1996). However, when it came to anti-Semitism, the respondents from Sweden perceived it differently to the Jews from Britain. In Britain, Jews did not think that anti-Semitism had increased while half of the respondents in Stockholm (Sweden) thought that anti-Semitism had increased in the last five years, 46 percent of the Jews from Gothenburg agreed with this statement (Dencik & Marosi 2000). However, 49 percent of the Jews in Gothenburg claimed that anti-Semitism has remained unaltered, while 46 percent in Stockholm agreed with the statement. Four percent in both Gothenburg and Stockholm meant that anti-Semitism had decreased since most of them never had experienced anti-Semitism. However, those who had experienced anti-Semitism were slightly less than 25 percent in Gothenburg and 20 percent in Stockholm. Those 25 percent in Gothenburg indicates that every fourth respondent had experienced anti-Semitism and five percent of those affected had experienced anti-Semitism several times, three percent in Stockholm had the same experience (Dencik & Marosi 2000). A reflection here is, whether those Swedish Jews who have experienced anti-Semitism, once or several times, were those Jews who highly identified themselves as Jewish and therefore were more sensitive to sense anti-Semitism, as in the cases of Britain, Russia, and Ukraine.

“Uninvolved Jews”

Of those Jews who did not participate in any Jewish event or did not feel affinity to the group, were called ‘uninvolved Jews’ by Miller et al. (1996). The authors explained that uninvolved Jews were far less observant to Jewish customs and beliefs, they felt more British than Jewish, and 62 percent were married to non-Jews and were also more likely to engage in non-Jewish relationships. The same patterns were seen in the cases of Jews in Sweden. Miller et al. (1996) claimed that being uninvolved did not necessarily mean that they perceived all what is considered to be Jewish, negative. Apparently, more than half of those who were classified as ‘uninvolved Jews’ had strong or moderate attachments to Israel and 81 percent claimed that it was important that Jews survived as a people (Miller et al. 1996). According to Miller et al. (1996) uninvolved, even if they were assimilated and/or weakly identified as Jews, they were not anti-Jewish. The authors explains that everyone’s strength of Jewish identity is explained by their Jewish backgrounds. Those who were uninvolved, were according to Miller et al. (1996) those Jews who had a less intense Jewish backgrounds than the involved Jews (Miller et al. 1996). Less intense, means that the family did not observe Jewish traditions. This, somehow confirms Gitelman’s (2003) ‘childhood socialisation’ perception.

Contemporary Jews

Dencik (2003) asserts that Jews, throughout history, have always been modern. In the sense that they gave new meanings to their cultural and religious interpretations and adapted them to their current era and/or settlement. One of the Western traditions that have influenced the Jews in Sweden is how they dealt with gender equality. The findings disclosed that people wanted to change the traditional rules of the synagogue life. Things that they would like to change are that women should be able to sit among men in the synagogue, be called to the Torah, be counted in Minyan⁴, and be a rabbi.

It seems like Jewish identity, and culture, is a changing process that adapts to the society the individuals live in. However, the connection and relation to the Jewish people is a remaining aspect that stays throughout these changes in the culture. The majority of the Jews in the survey were open to adopt Swedish traditions and applied them in their lives such as keeping kosher food at home but enjoying shrimps in restaurants (Dencik 2003). They adapted them into their lives without losing the basic values in Judaism (Dencik 2003).

Jew by choice

Dencik (2003), in his conclusion, argues that all members in the Jewish communities in Sweden are Jews by choice and that living in diaspora entails feelings of being an outsider as well as an insider in the country of settlement. Being Jewish in contemporary Sweden means, to most Jews, to belong to a people and not a religion. Swedish Jews are considered, according to Dencik (2003), to have a strong Jewish self-awareness and as the ones who customise the way they want to “be Jewish” and add new meanings and attributes to traditional Jewish practices. Because they are living in Sweden, being Jewish and being loyal to one’s Jewish heritage does not imply that Jews do not feel equally Swedish and does not hinder them from making Sweden as their home.

⁴ Minyan is ten Jewish men older than 13 years old, needed in order to conduct a Jewish sermon (Meyerson 2012).

Chapter 4: Methodology

I will in this chapter present the methods used to conduct the research. I will present the choice of methods and why I chose the specific interview and analysis methods for my research. I will also explain why I think that the methods chosen are suitable for just my research and why another research method was not chosen. I will present the way I conducted my interviews, the processes that were taken before, during and after conducting the interviews. I will also present the way I chose the quotations for my analysis. A discussion about validity and reliability will be presented as well. Finally, ethical considerations and the researcher's position of power will be brought to you by the end of this chapter.

Research methods

Qualitative research

Qualitative research is known to describe the life-worlds with the help of the people who participate in the research (Flick, Von Kardorff & Steinke 2004). Flick (2014) argues that qualitative research is of relevance when researching social relations. Qualitative research contributes to better understand processes, patterns, realities, and structural features when highlighting the different ways people experience their worlds and how social relations are built (Flick et al. 2004). The latter would be seen as a qualitative research with an epistemological approach according to Bryman (2008). Having an epistemological approach is when the researcher intends to study how people interpret and experience the world they are living in (Bryman 2008). The aim with qualitative studies are to develop new ideas and theories (Flick 2014).

Adaptive approach

When conducting the study I chose to use an adaptive approach rather than a strict deductive or inductive approach. In short, a deductive approach involves proving and testing hypotheses and theories on collected data (DePoy & Gitlin 2011). An inductive approach involves fitting collected data into existing theories and it sometimes reveals theory out of the data, also known as theory-generating (Layder 1998; DePoy & Gitlin 2011). An adaptive approach is a mix between the two mentioned approaches. Layder (1998) claims that an adaptive approach uses both inductive and deductive processes to develop and elaborate theory, concepts and/or ideas. With an adaptive theory the researcher is free to use both pre-existing theories when collecting data and also to stay open to new theories and concepts that might emerge from the data (Layder 1998).

Why qualitative?

I find that the qualitative approach is the most suitable research method for my study since my research questions touches upon subjects as the construction of Jewish identities, and the impact of external threats on the construction of Jewish identities. To get a deeper comprehension and perception of how the participants experience their lives as Jewish, the qualitative research is therefore more relevant for this study. I find that conducting a qualitative research makes it possible to comprehend how people understand and interpret

their environments with their own words. When listening to how people explain their living situations I get a small insight in how they construct their positions. I get to see their world through their stories even if it is for a little while, as in for the time I conduct my research. However, I can say that qualitative research helps to understand their constructions of their positions better.

Using an adaptive approach I get the opportunity to use already known and used theories on the subject, to understand what is going on in the data at the same time as I have the flexibility to stay open to new concepts and ideas. I feel that I am not as limited as I could be by following a strict deductive approach. Staying completely inductive seems to be difficult, if not impossible, since throughout the social work education a student learns and applies theories into exercises. An adaptive approach, however, gives me the opportunity to have a foot in both the approaches and it opens up new ways to analyse and look at the data.

Sampling process

I have chosen to base my study on young adults between the ages of 20-30 years old whom identify themselves as Jewish in Sweden. I believe that between the ages of 20-30 is the time in life when people are getting their independence and principles set. A person has, at the ages between 20-30 years, already been socialised into Jewish life and are not dependent on being socialised to it by their parents. I believe that an individual between the ages of 20-30 has the choice of freely developing her/his own identity, and Jewish identity as s/he wishes. It was of relevance for my research that the participants had to be Jewish since Jewish identity and anti-Semitism are my topics. The ones with the best knowledge within these two fields are those whom identify themselves as Jewish.

Conducting the research in Sweden came naturally to me since I am living in Sweden. This enabled me to verbally express myself with my respondents in 'our own manners', which facilitated the way both my respondents and I could express ourselves during the interviews. Conducting the research in Sweden also made it easier to get in contact with my respondents through acquaintances.

When planning my research idea and focus points of my research I have to admit that I thought finding participants would be easier than I expected. At first, I found it difficult to find young adults who wanted to participate in the study. Since it was difficult I decided to contact some acquaintances whom identify themselves as Jewish in order to help me get in touch with young adults they thought would like to participate. Due to those contacts I was able to find respondents who were willing and keen to participate.

Snowball sampling

In an early stage of my research I decided on using the snowball sampling, meaning that the researcher with the help of a group of people, who are relevant to the research, facilitates the findings of prospective participants for one's topic (Bryman 2008). I found my interviewees with the help of three acquaintances (the gatekeepers) whom gave me four phone numbers and three email addresses to prospective respondents. When initiating contact with the respondents I asked whether they knew anyone within their same age range who would like to

be interviewed. The latter lead to three more interviewees. Using the help of gatekeepers facilitated finding respondents and also the first contact made with the respondents since I was 'sent' by someone they knew. With the snowball sampling I found people who were willing to participate and also within the same age group.

Data collection method

Semi-structured interviews

I chose to collect my data with semi-structured interviews. Meaning, that an interview guide is made with a list of questions or specific topics that should be discussed during the interviews (Bryman 2008). Semi-structured interviews gives the researcher the opportunity to ask the questions on the guide in a different order and with different wordings, further questions that are not included in the interview guide are encouraged and may be asked as well (Bryman 2008).

In order to keep the collected data within the purpose of the research I made sure I included the research questions in the interview guide. I did not ask the research questions straight away, I formulated them differently and with different questions to cover both research questions and the purpose of the research. I chose to do it that way since I wanted to stay within the frames of the research. Since semi-structured interviews do not follow a strict sequence, it enabled me to ask further questions about matters that the respondents brought up that were not included in the interview guide. It also enabled me to get a clearer view of what the respondents meant with certain terms.

I chose to collect my data with interviews since I believe that with interviews I get the opportunity to get fuller and richer stories told by the respondents. It also gave me the opportunity to immediately ask the respondents what they meant with certain things and they would explain it accordingly to how they experienced different phenomenon.

Collecting the data

The interviews were conducted by me. I conducted ten interviews in total with five females and five males. The females were between 20-25 years old and the males were between 19-36 years old, however the respondents' varying ages did not make any difference to how they answered the questions. Since I used a snowball sampling strategy, the equal amount of females and men was not consciously made it happened by chance.

The lengths of the interviews varied depending on the interviewees' schedules, depending on how many questions and following up questions that were generated by the respondents' answers. The lengths also varied depending on how talkative the interviewees were. The lengths of the interviews lasted between 45 minutes-1.5 hours. Four interviews lasted less than an hour and six interviews were over an hour and up to an hour and a half.

Places of interviewing

The interviews were conducted in places where external noises and sounds would not disturb and with the possibility to speak without being overheard by people nearby. Six interviews

were conducted in group rooms belonging to Gothenburg University, one was done in a group room of the university's library, one on skype, one by telephone and one home visit. I was the one who offered to interview my participants in the facilities of the university. I also suggested to go through with the telephone interview due to my own personal reasons. The home visit and the skype interview were suggested by the interviewees.

The interviews conducted in the facilities of the university were not very noisy, mainly because the interviews were made in the evening when university was not as busy. With 'not very noisy' I mean that the external noise, outside the group room did not disturb the interviews. External noise would be people nearby the room we were situated in, who were talking and laughing with each other. I booked different group rooms through the university's website. To my surprise I found that the noisiest place to interview was, ironically enough, in the university library. Ironical, due to the fact that libraries are generally known to be quiet environments, I guess my preconception was disproved. Although, the noises did not affect the interviews directly, it affected the transcription process after the interviews, sometimes the external noise could make it difficult to hear what was said in the interviews. The home visit, the telephone, and the skype interviews did not have any noisy surroundings at all.

By doing the interviews in different settings I could not observe any differences in the way my respondents answered the questions. I suppose that the case would have been different if the interviews were made in a public environment, such as a café. Being in the facilities of the University, one-on-one interviews, I assume, facilitated the way my respondents could disclose feelings about certain topics which they might not have been able to do if we were in a café surrounded by people.

The difference between phone interviewing and face-to-face interviewing

I found the telephone and skype interviews to be shorter than the face-to-face interviews. Not only were the interviews shorter but they were conducted in a way that the 'conversation alike interview' did not take place. Meaning, that I as a researcher asked a question and let the interviewee answer and then continued on the next question on the schedule. By doing the interviews on skype and on the telephone made it difficult for me as an interviewer to give space to silent moments since this gave me the impression of the different systems shutting off.

As a face-to-face interviewer I did not find it difficult to let it be silent while interviewing since this gave the interviewees the opportunity to reflect upon thoughts and answers. I found that the interviewees and I made some kind of an unaware agreement of when it was appropriate to continue to a new question. Such agreement was discovered, by myself, when the respondents spoke and paused. I noticed that when the interviewees paused or reflected upon a question or a thought they tended to look away from me. When they were done reflecting and answering a question they would look back at me and say "mmm" and then waited for the next question. I grasped such a gesture already on the first interview which was of great help for the other interviews I conducted since I saw the same occurring gestures when interviewing the other participants. I guess that similar techniques would have been developed if I had conducted more telephone interviews.

Before and during the interviews

I started off every interview by asking the respondents to tell me about themselves. In some cases I had to ask the interviewees to elaborate on certain things if they did not know what to say. I could not notice whether the interviewees were nervous because they seemed somehow excited to be part of my research. After 10 minutes or so I could sense that the interviewees were getting more comfortable and they were both cooperative and talkative in all the cases. However, in the cases of the phone and Skype interview this was sensed halfway through the interview. I guess that the lack of facial expressions and gestures made it difficult to become comfortable in an earlier stage of the interview.

Probing

Bryman (2012) claims that probing opens up for a richer data, which comes with follow-up questions. The aim with probing questions is to find out more about the subject that (1) is of relevance for one's study and (2) to better understand what the respondent has referred to (Bryman 2012). Probing entails questions such as "could you explain what you mean with, could you elaborate a little more on that?" (Bryman 2012, p. 478).

When it comes to probing, I asked in some occasions if the respondents could clarify what they meant with certain things and I would ask them if I understood something they said correctly by summarising what they said. If I did not interpret something correctly they, themselves, took the opportunity to explain what they meant in a different and fuller way. This, I later found very helpful when re-listening to the interviews.

By the end of each interview sessions I would round them up by first making sure that the respondents were done answering the last question and second by saying that I did not have any more questions to ask. However, I asked the respondents if they had anything they wanted to add to what has been said and also asking them if they had any questions. When the respondents confirmed that they were satisfied with everything and that they did not have anything else to add nor anything to ask I stopped the recording.

When the recording machine was off

After the interviews were done and the recording machine was turned off I asked the interviewees how they were feeling and asked them about their thoughts about the interview. Many expressed that they were excited about their participations and that they appreciated that someone was writing about Jewish identities and anti-Semitism. No 'new' information that was relevant for the research was disclosed. I let everyone know that they could contact me at any time if anything, such as feelings or thoughts, arises after the interview. In the cases where I did not do the home visit nor did the phone- and skype interviews I felt a responsibility to follow the interviewees out of the campus or library building. I did so, not only because of responsibility but also because of curtesy and as a small gesture of showing my appreciation and gratitude for their participation. I walked them either halfway or all the way to the bus- and tram stop to make sure that they would find their way back and also out of curtesy because they took their time to be interviewed by me.

Data processing and analysis method

All the interviews lead to 11 hours and 30 minutes of audio recordings which was transcribed. Interviews that lasted more than an hour could at times take me at least six to seven hours to transcribe. I recorded the interviews with an audio recording program that was installed on my tablet. I listened to the interviews on my tablet at the same time as I transcribed them on my laptop. Since I did not have any transcription programs I listened to each interview at least two times which enhances the validity of the transcriptions. One time to write down most of the interview and the second time to fill in the missing gaps till I got them right. Sometimes I had to repeatedly listen to certain phrases in order to get the exact words from the interview to make sure I got every single word correctly in order to prevent misinterpretations on what was said. Bryman (2008) states that not writing down the respondents' answers as exactly as possible might result in the researcher distorting and introducing error in the research. Everything said on the interview was transcribed, even repeated words. Since the interviews were conducted in Swedish, the transcriptions were in Swedish.

The text that was translated to English were the quotes that were going to be presented in the analysis. One difficulty I encountered was when I had to translate the quotes into English. The translation from its original language made it difficult to keep the respondents' stories close to the way they explained it. An example is:

Swedish: Medans en judisk krets liksom, ah klassiskt typ, då kommer dom fatta exakt vad jag menar och kanske man kan bli mer förstådd antar jag.

English: Whereas, in a Jewish company, it's a classic, they gonna get exactly what I mean and I guess one is more understood.

During the translation process I found that certain nuances in the text got lost. Expressions that are explained in a language sounds different when translating it to another language. This could sometimes change the intensity of certain contexts which could undermine, or exaggerate a statement. In my cases I tried to choose wordings that would give the same meaning and/or intensity as the original text.

Coding

Coding means, in grounded theory, that the collected data is being broken down into smaller parts which are given 'names' that explains what the data are about, in this case the names would be the codes (Bryman 2008). Charmaz (2008) explains that codes are indications of what the content of the data represents. The coded components of the data are gathered and put into categories that gives an overview of what the codes stand for (Bryman 2008).

When coding the data I was inspired by the grounded theory and adaptive approach. I conducted a line-by-line coding which means that every line in the transcriptions had a code attached (Bryman 2008). In both the adaptive approach and grounded theory approach line-by-line coding enables the researcher to work close with the data and to stay open-minded to possible theoretical understandings (Layder 1998; Charmaz 2008). The purpose with line-by-line coding is that theories, concepts and ideas should emerge from the data rather than forcing the data into predetermined theories and categories (Charmaz 2008). However, in the

adaptive approach a researcher has already a theoretical framework which flexible. It is used when one is coding, however, if other significant information emerges from the data that is not included in the theoretical framework one has the possibility to add and adapt the theoretical framework in relation to the data (Layder 1998).

After the interviews were transcribed and printed on paper I coded and highlighted all of them. Since I did formulate the interview guide with the help of my theoretical frameworks, I found it quite easy to fit parts of the collected data into the theories I had. Nevertheless, since I have an adaptive approach to my research, I did not restrict myself entirely to my theoretical framework, because I wanted to keep an open mind to new subjects and ideas that could emerge from the data.

When coding I applied concepts from the theoretical frameworks and used wordings that explains what has been said by the respondents. Codes that were used from the theoretical framework was 'ethnicity', 'backstage', 'front stage', 'Mead', and so on. New subjects emerged from data when coding it. I found new subjects which I did not think about in the beginning of the research such as 'symbols' and 'districts'. These subjects or themes were later applied and elaborated in the interviews with the remaining respondents.

Thematic analysis

Themes are classifications of similar events that have been described by the respondents and themes appear when comparing these events or situations with other events and concepts that has emerged during the coding of the data (Ryan & Bernard 2003).

"A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of *patterned* response or meaning within the data set" (Braun & Clark 2006, p. 82).

When looking for themes in the data I looked for topics that appeared regularly in the respondents' stories with the help of the codes. Codes that explained similar situations or phenomenon were put together to make a theme. I made sure that all aspects of the same subject were covered such as different opinions about the theme or situation, if there were any. In that way the data and analysis would become more nuanced rather than if only the similarities were presented. I could therefore notice that most of the respondents used metaphors and analogies when they explained how they felt in different situations. An example is when they spoke about anti-Semitism and explained it as waves of water or as wind that comes and goes.

The thematic analysis was chosen since I believe that it makes it easier to understand the content of the data and I get a more structured analysis. What made it easier to put them into categories was when I was looking for possible quotes. I used pens in different colours to highlight parts of the text which I considered using. Highlighting made it easier to put the different texts into categories. The codes I attached to the text was of help as well, especially when I wanted to understand what I just highlighted.

A difficulty I encountered with the analysis process was the starting of the analysis. I found it difficult to analyse the chosen quotes. I decided to write a separate document with the

findings where I added quotes and summarised the themes I was going to use for my analysis. On another document I analysed the themes with the help of the theoretical framework. When most of my analysis was finished, I added those findings and quotes that analysed them. I had to refine the analysis and findings in order to connect them. Such as adding comments after the quotes. I could detect quotes, or parts of quotes, that were not analysed when I worked on the analysis and findings separately. I therefore analysed those untouched quotes and incorporated them into the analysis text.

Selection of quotes

The quotes that I present in the *Findings and analysis* chapter are those I found best described a general opinion about certain themes. Those who did not share the general opinion are also presented, in order to show nuanced perceptions of the same theme.

Validity and reliability

Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) explains validity as the measurement of trustworthiness of the study. Bryman (2008) claims that qualitative studies are difficult to replicate due to its unstructured methods and due to the different researchers' approaches. Bryman (2008), further states that depending on the researcher the study could take different starting points and get different results. My respondents were recommended to me by someone they knew. I guess that knowing that I had a connection to someone they knew made it easier for them to trust me and facilitated the first contact with them. Bryman (2008) also argues that the researcher's personal characteristics (age, gender, background, and personality) also influences on how the results will turn out. Since, I am within the same age range as the respondents, I found that it was easier to express myself. I have to admit that I could speak more informal than I would if the respondents were older. When it comes to the researcher's religious or ethnic background, I guess that the findings would not have been much different whether one is Jewish or not. I got the question of my background *after* the interviews were conducted which shows that my background did not affect the interviews nor findings, it seemed as the interest in the topic was of value rather than the researcher's religious background.

Guba (1981) presents four terms that should be applied to qualitative researches instead of *validity* and *reliability* which are *credibility*, *transferability*, *dependability* and *confirmability*.

Credibility

Credibility is when researcher studies what s/he intends to study and nothing else. One way to measure one's credibility is to conduct the study with members of a group whom one intend to study and whom are relevant to one's research questions (Guba 1981). Bryman (2008) claims that the researcher's observation should match the theoretical framework one has and should match the theoretical ideas that emerge from the data and theory.

I conducted my research in accordance with what I informed my participants what I am going to study. I have not conducted a covert research which means that what I have informed my participants that I would study, is exactly what I am doing and nothing else. Since I am conducting my research about Jewish identities and anti-Semitism I went to those whom

identified themselves as Jewish in order to prove my research questions. I did not go, nor intended to conduct the study about Jewish identity with people who do not identify themselves as Jewish. I went to those who are experts in their own Jewish identities and used them as sources.

Transferability

Transferability is used instead of external validity/generalisability, which entails the applicability of one's work to another context. Time and space has a great meaning on how the results will turn out. If the research was conducted in a manner where time nor situation affected the findings then it would be possible to apply the research to any social context regardless of chronological time (Guba 1981; Bryman 2008). In addition, this would permit the findings to be generalised (Bryman 2008). However, since time and space does affect the ways the findings turn out, it might be difficult to generalise my study to the entire Swedish context.

Flick (2014), claims that numerical generalisation cannot be applied to qualitative research due to its small amount of participants. A qualitative research is difficult to generalise to a larger numerical context. However, even if I cannot generalise my results with the rest of the Jewish young adults in Sweden, it can confirm what other researchers have done before and in that way it can be generalised. I believe the findings can generalise and confirm something that has already been studied rather than generalise and confirm what have not been researched.

Dependability

Dependability is used instead of reliability which touches upon consistency. It is the way the study could be repeated if using the same processes and similar respondents as described in the methodology chapter in order to get the same results (Guba 1981). I cannot guarantee that my research will give the exact same results for future studies. Nonetheless I can say that similar results could be gained if someone follows the procedure described for this research.

Confirmability

Confirmability is used instead of objectivity, which touches upon the researcher's neutrality to the subject. This means that the research has been conducted objectively thus the findings and analysis were not influenced by the researcher's personal feelings in order for the research to be conducted in good faith (Guba 1981; Bryman 2008). To ensure the confirmability of my research, I have as far as possible used my theoretical framework and the literature review in order to analyse my findings. Doing it that way I ensure that I do not apply my own values onto my research and dye it with my own thoughts and feelings.

Ethical considerations

As I understand ethics is that the researcher does, or at least considers to do, as much as possible to protect the integrity of the participants by being *transparent, informative and clear*, and also *respectful and confidential*.

Transparent, informative and clear

Transparent, informative and clear is when the researcher informs her/his prospective informants about the true purpose with the research and informs what the researcher is going to look at while observing or interviewing (Bryman 2008). Bryman (2008) states that the researcher has to make sure that the people being studied are fully aware of it and also acknowledge that their participation is voluntary and not binding. Furthermore, the participants must be informed that they will be anonymised for the research and highlighted about their rights to refuse answering questions and withdrawing their participation at any time during the research period (Bryman 2008).

When I first contacted my respondents via email and telephone I made sure I sent everyone my letter of consent informing them about the purpose with my research and how I intended to collect my data. I familiarised the participants with the topics that would be discussed during the interviews and that the interviews would last between 1 hour to 1,5 hours. I informed them that their participation would be anonymised and on a voluntary basis and that no unauthorised person would take part of the recorded interviews. I also informed them that all collected data and information would be destroyed when the work on the research was completed. Furthermore, the participants were informed that they could withdraw their participation at any time during the time of work on the research. The information was given when I first took contact with them. When meeting the participants for the interviews I once again informed them that they had the right to abstain from answering any question they found uncomfortable or just simply, did not want to answer. I also made sure that the respondents were still fine with me recording the interview by asking them this.

I did not ask my respondents to sign any letter of consent due to what this could entail. Bryman (2008) states that a possible problem with the requirement to sign is that it could induce concerns about participating rather than alleviate, which could further lead to a refusal of participation. To avoid the latter to happen I did not require any signed consents since I did not want to cause distress to my participants nor to let them think that they were signing a binding contract, even though I informed them that their participation was voluntary. In addition, since I did not keep any of their real names but rather their pseudonyms, signing the letter of consent would reveal their identities if someone, somehow, would get a hold of the papers.

Respectful and confidential

It is important to be respectful and confidential when conducting qualitative interviews since the researcher enters private spheres which would not have been entered if it was not for the research. Barron (1999) argues that the researcher declares loyalty with the group s/he intends to study. Although Barron (1999) does not clarify what she means with loyalty I will assume that she is talking about confidentiality. Since the researcher somehow show loyalty to the people being studied, the researcher invites the participants to open up and emotionally expose themselves to the researcher without being judged. Barron (1999) states that the researcher contributes in highlighting a lived order that in another context would not be noticed. Opening up for the researcher in a way they might not have done before puts the respondents in a vulnerable position. Vulnerable in the sense that they would share something

of theirs which otherwise would not have been heard if it was not for the researcher's interest in the topic and this might also be a rare opportunity for the participants to make their voices heard to someone in a 'high position' (Barron 1999). Since interviews can awake certain feelings within the participants, the researcher must be aware that the participants might change their minds about participating in the research after being interviewed since they might have exposed things they might regret saying. The latter should be taken with respect by the researcher, after all, the respondents agreed on participating on a voluntary basis. Therefore, before, during and after the data is collected the researcher has to take care of the participants and make sure that their identities are fully anonymised and only for the use of the researcher (Bryman 2008).

When I printed the transcribed interviews I made sure I did not include anyone's name nor names of the places in the transcriptions nor in any notebook in order to maximise my participants' security. This in the case that the printed transcriptions would fall into wrong hands. Wrong hands would entail anyone and everyone that is not me.

Researcher and power

When it comes to the researcher's power, I can certainly say that I as a researcher possess more power than I thought. First of all when interviewing. As an interviewer I would be the one who decides on the focus of the interview and also on the topics that would be discussed so that it can be relevant for my subject. Another aspect of power position possessed by the researcher is when interviewing. I informed my interviewees that they could refuse to answer questions that they felt uncomfortable with or did not want to answer. However, I cannot deny the fact that maybe the interviewees, out of respect and/or curtesy, answered all the questions even if they felt uncomfortable. This does not have to be the case but it is a reflection that I had, however, what puts me to ease is the fact that no one contacted me afterwards expressing regrets or anxiety about their participation.

As a researcher I encourage my respondents to open up about certain matters and in exchange I would make their stories and experiences heard by writing about it. This leads to the second aspect of power which has lightly been mentioned in *Respectful and confidential*. I have been reflecting on this second aspect on various occasions. Listening to my respondents' stories and experiences I cannot deny that I felt a responsibility, and sometimes pressure, to make their stories heard, even if I am not a journalist or someone in a governing position. Even if I think that I as a student cannot do much to change the order in the society we are living in, the respondent might think I do. This puts me in a position of power which I might not possess. An ethical dilemma here is that the respondents, as helpful and cooperative as they were, maybe only opened up for me and exposed all those feelings because they thought that I would somehow change the living order in society.

The third aspect of power is what Bryman (2008) argues when doing an interview, the respondent is the one voicing and speaking about certain matters but when the analysing begins the informant's voice is filtered through the researcher. When analysing, the researcher is the one who decides what parts of the interviews should be highlighted and the researcher interprets what has been said during the interviews with the researcher's own predilections (Bryman 2008).

Distress and harm

Lastly, when it comes to minimising the risks of causing harm and distress to my participants, I believe that it is almost impossible to completely avoid harm and distress to occur. By interviewing about certain situations or issues, awakens reflections and awareness, not only in the researcher but as well in the respondent. By being constantly reminded of one's situation or problems could cause distress and harm. As much as a researcher keeps the respondents' real identities covered from everyone else, it is unavoidable to hide this from the respondents themselves. As a researcher, what I do is that I put myself in their lived position for a period of time. But I have my safety net which is that I can put their lived order aside when I am not working with the research. With the help of fellow human beings I intend to answer my research questions which are part of their daily lives. However, at the end of the day when I go back to "my real life" and put their situations aside, they will still stay in their positions and deal with the issues that I am researching about.

Chapter 5: Findings and Analysis

In this chapter the informants' constructions of Jewish identities will be analysed. I have divided the findings and analysis into five main themes called; *Talking Jewish identity*, *Jewish identity in relation to others*, *Jewish identity and geographical areas*, and *Jewish identity and anti-Semitism*. All the themes and subthemes make up for a better understanding of how Jewish identities are constructed in Sweden with the help of others and with the effects of anti-Semitism.

Talking Jewish identity presents and analyses the respondents' constructions of Jewish identities in relation to how my respondents explain Jewish identity in general matters and then in a personal matter. These aspects were divided into five subthemes called *What is Jewish identity?*, *Swedish Jews*, *How do you maintain your Jewish identity?*, *Religion and secularism*, and *Uninvolved Jews?*

Jewish identity in relation to others presents and analyses how the respondents construct their Jewish identities in relation to different groups that have a closer relationship to them such as families, friends, and the Jewish community. These aspects were divided into four subthemes called; *Family*, *Jewish Community*, *Jewish and non-Jewish friends*, and "Naah, you're not Swedish".

Jewish identity and geographical areas presents and analyses the way my respondents act or display their Jewish identities with symbols in different districts and cities in Sweden. *Jewish identity and districts* generated three subthemes called; *Privileged areas*, *'Förorten'* *Marginalised areas*, and *City centres*

Jewish identity and anti-Semitism presents and analyses the way anti-Semitism affects the respondents' constructions of Jewish identities, both internally and externally. The subthemes for *Jewish identity and anti-Semitism* are called; *Anti-Semitism*, *Internal effects*, and *External effects*. The subtheme *Anti-Semitism* is meant to be an introduction to how the respondents perceived anti-Semitism.

Talking Jewish identity

Talking Jewish identity, is presented through how my respondents explain what Jewish identity means in a general matter. In addition, it also presents the way the respondents explain how they maintain their Jewish identities.

What is Jewish identity?

When asking the respondents what Jewish identity was, they explained it in a general sense. They defined Jewish identity through affiliation, and the *feeling of being Jewish*.

Most of my respondents claimed that a person's Jewish identity cannot be defined merely on the grounds of how religious or traditional a person is. All of my respondents meant that people construct their Jewish identities in accordance with what *they* define as Jewish identity. Sarah said that it does not matter whether a person had been to the synagogue or not because what mattered was "the feeling one has. /.../ As long as you feel Jewish and, like, feel proud of it then that's enough for me". Lara explained that it was up to each person to decide when saying:

Lara: You have your own identity, your own perception, I don't think anyone can tell another person that s/he is less Jewish just because you don't celebrate everything that says in the Torah, it was written for some x number of years ago. So I think it's one's own perception, what one has done with it [Jewish identity]. Everyone constructs their own Jewish identity.

When Lara says that "everyone constructs their own Jewish identity" it seems like it explains why the concept *Jewish identity* has been so discussed without any clear definition of what it means. The fact that "everyone constructs their own" identity shows that people are the ones responsible of how they define their Jewish identities. Whether they chose to entail religious elements or not, or whether they choose to keep certain traditions or not, in the end it is up to themselves how *they* 'do' their Jewish identities. The same patterns are seen in Dencik (2003) where he talks about the way Jews in Sweden choose to customise their Jewishness by applying new meanings and definitions to them. In both cases, both Dencik's (2003) respondents and my respondents, mostly felt that their Jewishness was based on affinity and belongingness to the Jewish people rather than Judaism the religion.

When asking my respondents if a person was more Jewish the more religious a person was, almost everyone said that a person is not more Jewish the more religious the person was. They meant that religion does not define how Jewish a person is, what is of value is how the person her-/himself defines her/his Jewishness out of her/his own feelings.

Sam: No, you are *religious* and your compatriot is secular. /.../ [The feeling of] is in fact more powerful and it can be shown stronger than any other person that goes to the synagogue and prays three-four times a day, so yeah, it's the 'feeling of'.

Sam, and most of my respondents, explains Jewish identity almost like it would be an ethnic identity. An identity within the individual that is felt through affinity and pride to a group of people (Barth 1969; Gans 1979).

One respondent differed from the rest by saying:

Chris: Difficult to say but, yes I think so. I mean if you keep the Jewish religious Law then I believe that one is more Jewish in a way. But on the other hand, one is automatically Jewish if one's mom is Jewish. But I personally think that the more a person lives a Jewish life the more [Jewish one is] or keeps the Jewishness, if there would be any scale. So yeah, that's my opinion.

Here, two important things were named by Chris when explaining Jewish identity. The first aspect is that religion and keeping Jewish traditions is of value when a person is to be defined as having a strong Jewish identity. The second aspect is the heritage aspect, by being born to a Jewish mother, which is of value. Chris' example confirms Gitelman's (2003) and Miller's (et al. 1996) discussions about a Jewish identity being strong when the Jewish individual observes Jewish traditions. However, what is of value here as well is when Chris says that "one is automatically Jewish if one's mom is Jewish". Jewish identity seems, according to Chris and other respondents, to be constructed as an inherited identity. It seems like an unpractised Jewish identity could endure when the individual feels Jewish. It seems like the expectations of keeping Jewish traditions is less important than the *feeling of* being Jewish. I believe that the *feeling of* could be understood as a way to keep the group together, to not lose Jews into assimilation, that the *feeling of* is enough to be entitled a Jewish identity.

Swedish Jews

Being a *Swedish Jew* was brought to light by the respondents when asking them what they saw themselves mainly as. A *Swedish Jew* was, according to some respondents, being a Jewish person living in Sweden, others claimed that it meant being equally Swedish as Jewish, and finally, others meant that it was being Swedish *first* and *then* Jewish. Those who said that a *Swedish Jew* was a Jewish person living in Sweden, they still identified themselves as Swedish whether they found themselves *in* Sweden or abroad.

Chris: I see myself as a Swede, as a Jew, and as Polish. The three of them. Partly because my parents are from Poland and we spoke Polish at home when I was younger and we visited my grandparents in Poland. I see myself as a Swede, very much, because I grew up in Sweden as well as I have taken part in the Swedish traditions, we have celebrated midsummer, Christmas, and all that. If I look at it biologically, I guess I would be an Ashkenazi, European Jew. It's a tricky question.

Rachel: Both. I'm Jewish and I'm Swedish. For me there's no either/or, I'm both.

Jacob: I'm a Swedish Jew. /.../ everyone I meet knows that I'm Jewish because it's such a big part of my life. Apart from being Jewish, I'm also a strongly dedicated supporter of the local soccer team.

These three quotes are only some examples of what my respondents saw themselves as. More than half my respondents were connected to at least three countries in which some felt associated to. Many of my respondents meant that they were a "mix" of different cultures, however what was of value for most of them was that they were *Swedish Jews*.

Being Jewish in Sweden, could be seen as a person with dual, or hybrid, identities and/or cultures (Hall 1999). Not dual in the sense that they have multiple personalities within themselves but rather having an identity that takes different shapes in relation to other people or other societies. In the cases of my respondents, several saw themselves as both Swedish *and* Jewish. They have been *Swedified* by living and taking part in Swedish society and its norms, and *Jewified* by their home- or Jewish environments⁵. One could say that the way the respondents refer to themselves as Swedish Jews is a way to see their options of being hyphenated-Jews/Swedes which links them to both the Swedish society and the Jewish people. By cutting and mixing parts from the Swedish culture, or other cultures, they have the opportunity to add Swedish elements to their Jewish identities (or add Jewish elements to their Swedish identities), without completely losing what they find important and of value by being Jewish and/or Swedish (Hall 1999). In this case, the hyphen's main purpose would be to link elements from both cultures and customise these in order to make something 'new' (Hall 1999). By customising the cultures and giving new meanings to old Jewish traditions they can stay both Jewish *and* Swedish and make both their Jewishness and their Swedishness relevant to themselves, the people, and the society they are living in. When linking them together they make what they call a *Swedish Jew*. A *Swedish Jew*, to be part of the Swedish society without losing membership and/or loyalty to the Jewish people. By saying that they are *Swedish Jews* shows that they feel part of Swedish society, it could also mean that several have accepted and adopted general opinions and norms and made them their own (Mead 1934).

If we are to discuss the disadvantage of being a hyphenated-Jew or hyphenated-Swede is that not only will the respondents be a mix of cultures or identities, they will also be seen as hyphenated-Jews/Swedes by others. In the sense as others whom claim that they are not Swedish because of their Jewishness. This will be further discussed in "*Naah, you're not Swedish*".

How do you maintain your Jewish identity?

When it comes to my respondent's way of maintaining their Jewish identities, some said that for them, their Jewish identity was nothing more than good relationships, or affinity, to a group of fun people. Others meant that it is a lifestyle that they want to keep up in their everyday life such as keeping kosher and following certain values or morals to be a good human being in order to remind themselves of who they are. Another meant that it was about helping out in the Jewish community with making projects to attract younger Jews. Esther and

⁵ The synagogue, family, Jewish preschool, Jewish friends, and so on.

Joe said that there was nothing special they had to do to maintain their Jewish identities because they meant that “it was always there”.

In accordance with Gans (1979), it seemed that for most of my respondents their Jewish identities lay in affinity rather than practicing traditions. Tajfel (1981) explains that an individual’s membership of an ethnic group derives from the values and emotional significance attached to that membership. This could explain the respondents’ way of maintaining their Jewish identities by being emotionally attached to it when they meant that *feeling of* being Jewish was more important. By feeling Jewish, they keep their membership in the Jewish people.

What is of value to the respondents is *how* they express their Jewish identities in terms of feelings, pride and thoughts. Nevertheless, there were those respondents who claimed that in order to maintain their Jewish identity they kept certain customs and practices as a reminder of where they come from. Those customs and practices were for instance; observing Shabbat⁶, keeping kosher even outside of the home, and celebrating and visiting the synagogue during big holidays such as Pesach, and Rosh Hashanah⁷. By doing so, my respondents get the opportunity to stay loyal to their Jewish heritage, as well as they can stay loyal to the country of residence, which in this case is Sweden.

Religion and secularism

Both Miller (2003) and Dencik (2003) talk about the effects of globalisation, not only in the sense of time-and-space compression but also how this has increased secularism⁸ in the Western world. Since Jews have lived in diaspora for centuries, Jewish culture or life, has been influenced by non-Jewish elements (Webber 2003). And, because Jews have been living in diaspora, and still live in diaspora, they have adapted their Jewishness depending on the country they are residing in.

My respondents said that they did not keep all the traditions since some thought that some traditions did not make any sense, others were unsure whether there was a God who would see how they kept Jewish traditions, and *if* there was a God, why would he care? Since many of my respondents claimed that religiousness did not have anything to do with how Jewish a person is, by saying so and by not strictly keeping (religious) Jewish traditions, is a way to see how my respondents have been influenced by the trends of secularity.

The increase in secularism, as it seems, got Rachel to reflect whether she would be seen as “weird” in other people’s eyes. She said, in the interview, that it was better to be around people who also were religious because she could be proud of it and because it would be respected to be religious.

Rachel: If you are a religious Christian then you are questioned “do you believe in Santa too?” you know. People might not want to say that they are religious with people they are uncomfortable with because people think that you’re stupid if you’re religious. /.../ I mean, if you have a religion as a

⁶ A commandment from God to keep the seventh day of the week as a resting day. Exodus 31:15-17.

⁷ Jewish new year’s eve.

⁸ *Secular*, not having any connection to religion (CDO 2015)

young person in Sweden, you're somehow seen as weird, you're not part of the majority, and you're a minority in that.

Rachel claimed that most of her Jewish friends were secular and that she was probably the only one that was somehow religious. Dan confirmed Rachel's statement about being seen as weird if one is religious when he says:

Dan: I think they're weird, those who are exaggeratedly religious. Those who wear peyes⁹. There's no logical explanation behind religion. Of course, you can be religious but only if you do it in the right way. I know someone that is a very religious Jew and he is working and that's fine because he's working and stuff. You give meaning to life, but if you only live for religion, it's just so weird.

According to Dan, "the right way" of being religious is when a person contributes to society by working and to "give meaning to life" by working. To work and to contribute seems to be the "right way" to integrate and be accepted into Swedish society, according to Dan. During the interview, Dan said that he was against all kind of religion since there was no logical meaning behind them. For Dan, being Jewish for him is about the togetherness.

Joe explains that secular Jews have always been very good in integrating into societies, that Jews do not really "stand out so much", as he explained it. When I asked him whether religious people do not integrate into society he said:

Joe: If you are extremely religious then it's not possible to integrate to society. The very religious, both in Islam and Judaism, are not allowed to sit next to a woman on an airplane. They can't and it doesn't work [with the Western societies], so it's hard for them to really integrate. A person has to adapt to the country they live in, to a certain point. Sweden is a country with freedom of religion which allows very much. So you have to compromise, you get so much back if you just let go a little bit. So yeah, I think one must compromise and adapt, and do one's best to integrate to society.

Joe, gives another example of how a person should act and behave when living in Sweden, which is to compromise strict customs or religions in order to fit in.

Mead (1934) says, when individuals take over other individuals' attitudes when they unconsciously put themselves in the place of the others and act as others act. Living as a Jew in diaspora, as a people amongst other people, one is living in a country where the vast majority does not share the same cultures, traditions, history, and religion as oneself. It seems that in order to "adapt", as Joe said, to Swedish society a person has, at times, to embrace parts of the national culture of the country of residence to not be excluded from society but rather be part of the society. As it seems from Dan's and Joe's different expressions of religion it seems like they have accepted the Swedish norm of secularity. From what they said, it seems that (any) religion has to be compromised in order for an individual to fit in and be accepted into society.

⁹ uncut side locks

In accordance with Hammarén and Johansson (2009), an individual's identity is like a bridge between the individual and society. Individuals' identities can tell us about the order of the society they are living in (Castell 2004; Hammarén & Johansson 2009). By looking at Rachel's, Joe's and Dan's example, it is possible to detect how the Swedish society is built when saying that one is "weird" if one is religious, that working and integrating to fit in is the "right way" to be religious. It seems like, working and being 'secular', is a general norm in Swedish society by looking on these three respondents' expressions about religion.

It is difficult not to observe that living in a society that is becoming more and more secular has shaped how some of the respondents position themselves when it comes to religion or old Jewish traditions. An example is when Lara, for instance said that a person cannot be judged for being less Jewish for not celebrating everything stated in the Torah because "the Torah was written for some x number of years ago". Dan, Lara, and Joe's examples can be connected to Dencik's (2003) discussion of how the rapid change in technologies and globalisation changes not only the development of highly developed countries, which in turn also affects the individuals' social lifetime residing in those countries. Dencik (2003) further argues that social lifetime is not consistent that life as we know it is difficult to sustain since everything is in constant change, such as traditions, values, customs, family patterns, sex roles, life-styles, and so on. Dencik's (2003) discussion can be applied to Joe's statement about compromising one's religious views into the society one lives in. Compromising one's religious views to the changing factors of society would therefore lead individuals into adapting to the changes of the society by choosing to not carrying on certain traditions, or religion, that are not socially relevant for the time they are living in (Dencik 2003). The latter is expressed as, what Gans (1979) calls, a *symbolic ethnicity*. Gans (1979) explains that adapting to new cultures enables people to look for easier ways to express their ethnic identities, ways that do not conflict with other ways of life. Gans (1979) further explains that the easy way of expressing one's ethnic identity would be to refrain from rituals and traditions that are time-consuming. Symbolic ethnicity encourages ethnicity to be an identity, and that concern lies in having the ethnicity as an identity rather than keeping traditions (Gans 1979).

From my point of view, it seems like separating Judaism as a religion from the belongingness aspect forces some respondents to choose to be either religious or ethnic Jews. If someone chooses to be religious then they will be seen as "weird", not only by non-Jews but also among Jews. Dan, for instance claimed that he was not religious, and that religious people were "weird". It seems like, in order to not be seen as "weird" some distance themselves from everything that has to do with religion to not be associated with the term. This could also be a reason as to why some do not want to keep Jewish religious practices. As mentioned above, time changes and societies are becoming more secular, I guess that 'being' religious is not something that people think is particularly trendy, and they rather choose to distance themselves from what is defined as religious.

Uninvolved Jews?

Uninvolved Jews are those who are not proud of being Jewish (Gitelman 2003), not observing Jewish customs (Gitelman 2003), do not take part in religious or communal life (Miller et al. 1996), not accepting of the religious aspect of Judaism (Miller et al. 1996), and assimilated

and weakly identified as Jews (Miller et al. 1996). Uninvolved Jews are said to have a less intense Jewish background (Miller et al. 1996), and therefore considered to have weak Jewish identities (Gitelman 2010).

During the interviews a few of my respondents claimed that they were not religious nor applied Jewish practices in their lives. They did not celebrate the Jewish holidays, or kept the dietary rules of not eating certain things, they even said that they were Swedish before Jewish. Those respondents said that they did not have a very strong Jewish identity. The question is, in relation to whom do they have a weak Jewish identity?

Is it fair or right to say that those who do not observe the Jewish practices or are in any way not involved in Jewish activities that they have a weak identity? According to the way some of the authors described 'uninvolved Jews' or thin cultured Jews, I could see that some of my respondents fell into those descriptions as well.

However, what was observed during the interviews, those respondents who claimed that they had a weak Jewish identity and said that they did not observe any practices, they seemed to be very involved in their 'uninvolvement'. Through words, through explaining to me their Jewish sides, through entering the interview sphere and presenting themselves as Jews, is a way of expressing and showing their Jewish identity. Miller (2003) talks about social- and mental ethnicity which, according to me 'measures', the strengths of belonging expressed through social behaviour and attitudes (social), and as personal feelings (mental). My respondents would fall into the category of mental ethnicity because of their personal feelings of being Jewish and for expressing affinity to the group. During the interview I would say that their social ethnicity was shown as well, when they verbalised their Jewish sides to me. Even if they do not verbalise their Jewish identity openly in settings where they do not feel the urge to say that they are Jewish to every new person they met, they are mental or emotional in the sense that they are involved in their minds as well as their feelings.

Jewish identity in relation to others

This part will present the way the respondents show or display their Jewish identities in accordance to others, such as family, Jewish community, and non-Jews.

Family

How did my respondents 'become' Jewish in the first place? All my respondents said that they had a Jewish identity because they were born to a Jewish parent or parents. They construct their Jewish identities as an inherited identity, an identity that was given to them from birth. They said that a person who converted to Judaism also had a Jewish identity.

When growing up, Dan said that he did not have a strict Jewish upbringing, he explained it by saying that his Jewish upbringing was more about visiting other family members and going to the synagogue when there were bigger events. At home, he explained, that the family kept kosher but that he did not really understand the idea behind kosher. He further discussed that one of his parents did not keep kosher when the parent ate at restaurants. Dan meant that kosher did not make any sense to him and when I asked Dan if he still kept kosher today, he

said that he did not and that he eats everything today. Chris had a similar upbringing, the difference was that Chris' family did not keep kosher at all. Chris explained that the family ate everything, including pork and shellfish.

Leah said that her upbringing was more on the traditional side, which she explained as celebrating all the Jewish holidays but not going so much to the synagogue. Leah further explained that the family did not keep kosher but that she still, today, tries to keep all the holidays as long as the circumstances let her.

Joe said that the family celebrated all the Jewish holidays when he was younger and he explained further in the interview that he, even today, is keeping the rule of not eating pork nor shellfish. He claimed that he was indoctrinated as a child to not eat pork nor shellfish, that it was important for his parents that he kept that part of his Jewish upbringing. So, even if he does not believe that he is going "to be struck by lightning", as he expressed it, he still felt that it was wrong to eat such things in present days. Joe explained that he has tried to eat both pork and shellfish but that it felt wrong.

Sam, on the other hand, does not talk very much about the dietary rules more than he said that he does not eat pork. For Sam's upbringing, as it seemed from the interview, it was important for his parents to let him know about his family's history and the struggles of life as a Jewish person. Sam explained that his mother was the one who kept the traditions. Sam said that his mother was traditional in the sense that they kept Shabbat every Friday, celebrated Pesach, and Chanukah. Sam said that it was mainly his mother and the mother's side of the family that somehow always reminded him of where they came from. Sam keeps in touch with his mother that is living abroad, saying that she would call him from time to time to remind him of his heritage and history.

Sarah, Rachel and Lara all grew up in families who kept kosher and kept Jewish traditions such as keeping Shabbat and celebrating holidays. All three of them said that they today are keeping kosher and trying to keep the Jewish traditions.

In all these cases it is clear that the family members, whether it is the parents, grandparents or other relatives, play a major role in the construction of a Jewish identity or consciousness. They are the ones who socialised the respondents into Jewish life and awareness. Awareness in the sense that they all knew that they were Jewish, it means that the parents let them know that they were Jewish. Gitelman (2003), calls this the childhood socialisation. One could say that the respondents' families were the first to introduce Jewish life to the respondents, which would make the families the main co-constructors of Jewish identity. The co-constructors are the people who, in one way or another, serve as tools when an individual is shaping his/her identity. It is with the co-constructors, or significant others (Mead 1934), in which the respondents shape what seems to be right in order to resemble their parents (Mead 1934; Cooley 1983, Charon 1995). A good example of the internalisation and/or resemblance to the parents is Joe's "indoctrination" to not eat pork nor shellfish.

As understood from the interviews, I could detect a pattern in relation to the way the respondents chose to maintain their Jewish identity and the way their families kept a Jewish life. How the respondents chose to live their Jewish life in present days, as older and in some

cases not living in the family home, is a reflection of how the parents were when the respondents grew up. The parents or other significant relatives served as role models in which the respondents constructed their Jewishness from. Those respondents who had families who observed Jewish traditions and cultures were the respondents who later in life kept kosher and observed certain practices, as Shabbat. The same patterns can be seen in Gitelman's (2003) research about being Jewish in Russia and Ukraine. Those of Gitelman's (2003) respondents who had, according to Gitelman, a strong Jewish identity were those whose parents explained in detail what it meant to be Jewish when the respondents were children. Chris, for instance, explained that when he was younger, his parents took him to fun Jewish events, such as Chanukah or Rosh Hashanah where he could meet other Jewish children to play with.

Phinney (1996) explains that a child that is socialised into an ethnic group learns about the positive and fun sides of the group's values and ideologies which are associated by the child as something positive. Many of my respondents' parents took them to Jewish events as children, or put them into the Jewish schools so that the children could meet and play with other Jewish children. Taking the children to fun events such as Chanukah, enabled the children to associate Jewish events, cultures as something positive and therefore associate him-/herself as part of the group.

To socialise the children into Jewish life and culture is important if parents want their children to keep the Jewish traditions alive later in life. In the case of my respondents, not everyone had the opportunity to grow up in families whom observed Jewish traditions.

When I asked the respondents if they would transfer their Jewish identities to future children, all of them said yes. When I asked them *how* they would do it, they explained it very similar to the way they were raised. Those who were raised in families where they, either did not know that they were Jewish, or did not keep any Jewish traditions due to certain circumstances, they meant that they wanted their children to get something that they themselves did not get when they grew up.

Since many of my respondents, whether they were Jewish since birth or whether they got engaged in Jewish life later in life, claimed that they had a Jewish identity. Some saw it as their responsibility to pass it on to their future children in order to not lose their Jewish identities. The importance to pass on, what has been passed on for generations is, according to Dencik (2009), what defines the Jewish culture and religion. Dencik (2009) explains that the memory has an important role in Jewish life, since this serves as a reminder of where the Jewish people came from and the struggles the Jews have had to go through in order to be where they are. To keep experiences alive by passing them on to future generations is a way to keep those traditions alive.

When talking about future children, I could detect a difference between the females and the males. The females, all said that they would not mind marrying a non-Jewish partner, as long as they could pass on their Jewish identities to their children. Three males, however, said that in order to pass on their Jewish identities they had to find a Jewish partner, in order to legitimise the child's Jewish identity. They said that if the mother was not Jewish, the child would not be seen as Jewish. These respondents hoped to find a Jewish wife, but if they did

not, they would not see it as an issue, “love comes first” as Jacob and Chris said. However, finding a Jewish wife, or a wife that would consider converting to Judaism, or a non-Jewish wife that allowed these respondents to pass on their Jewish identities to their children would make the process of passing on their Jewish identities much easier.

In above paragraph, one could talk about Judaism, the religion, being a co-structor of Jewish identity. The Jewish Law sets the rule of a child being Jewish when being born to a Jewish mother. Those children who are born to Jewish fathers and a non-Jewish mother are not seen as Jewish. In the construction of Jewish identities in this case, the inherited identity would facilitate the construction. My respondents, talk about their, and their future children’s, Jewish identities as essential and as inherited identities.

In the cases of my respondents, the family members are the ones that start to construct a Jewish consciousness in their children. The children, or in this case my respondents, had the opportunity to choose later in life whether they wanted to keep their Jewish identities or not. They all chose to keep it in one way or another. Whether they kept it as a lifestyle, or if they wanted to keep the strong connections with their friends, they still claimed that they had a Jewish identity.

Jewish community

Some of my respondents explained that from time to time the synagogue would arrange dinners for the young adults so that they could gather and get together. Most of my respondents meant that the purpose of the dinners was to bring everyone together and to have fun together, that attending the dinners did not have anything to do with religion. Even if the dinners would be arranged in accordance with some Jewish religious holidays, many respondents meant that it was more important to meet their friends rather than being religious. Leah said, that engaging in such dinners helped her to “get some Jewish identity”.

As understood from the interviews, the Jewish community seems to be another co-structor of Jewish identities. The Jewish community arranged dinners and gatherings in the synagogue for the young adults to meet, the community would also arrange sport events or games for all ages so that Jews can meet on neutral contexts. This is also seen in the case of Denmark (Buckser 2010).

To be in Jewish settings or institutions is a way to legitimate one’s belongingness to the group. Sam and Esther spoke about how they felt when they approached the Jewish community. Both expressed that they felt great affinity to the community.

Esther: It’s a cool belongingness feeling, like, this is why I’ve felt weird in all the other contexts, because here I’m not, and here’s where I’m supposed to be.

Sam: It’s a special feeling. I have never seen so many Stars of David before, even if some [Jews] are more traditional than others, some are secular and don’t care, they have it only as an identity, it doesn’t matter because there is something, it’s probably our history that connects us.

From a diasporic point of view, by feeling at home when approaching the community, Esther and Sam express the feelings of being part of a group that has its own history. When Sam says “it’s probably our history that connects us” a diasporic standpoint would be that, because Jews have been diasporic, and recognised as such by studies, what gets them together is the shared history as a diasporic group regardless if the respondents had similar backgrounds or not, what connected them was the fact that they were Jewish.

Entering the community would be a way to enhance a person’s belongingness. Since humans unconsciously address themselves as others address them (Mead 1934), in this case, both Esther and Sam could address themselves in accordance with their own definition of themselves as Jewish and get it confirmed when approaching the Jewish community. By getting this confirmed, both of them could make their Jewish identity official to others by being accepted or seen as Jewish by the members of the group.

Jewish and non-Jewish friends

Most of my respondents, not everyone, have Jewish friends. They said that they felt more comfortable and felt that they could speak about Jewish issues with their Jewish friends. When talking about non-Jewish friends, or non-Jews in general the respondents expressed mixed feelings. Some said that being with non-Jewish friends was no different to being with their Jewish friends. Others added that, there was no difference *but* that they had to adapt the conversations so that they could be able to speak on the same terms as the non-Jewish person so as not to not cause conflicts. A topic that would be avoided would be the Israel-Palestine discussion.

What was also observed was that most respondents tended to distinguish their friends by saying “my friends” when referring to their Jewish friends, and as the “Swedes” or “non-Jews” when referring to friends that did not have Jewish backgrounds.

Joe: When I’m with my Jewish friends, I can be more open. It’s not like I behave different but you discuss Jewish issues, because it affects their lives as much as mine. It’s not like I go to a Swede and say “check what happened in Copenhagen¹⁰”

When Joe, and other respondents, call their Jewish friends as their friends and the Swedish friends as the Swedes they create an ‘us’ that is in relation to ‘them’. When the respondents are exposed to external threats they distance themselves from those who do not have a Jewish background by making an ‘us’, the ones with shared experiences, and ‘them’ the ones who cannot understand nor relate to our issues.

Barth (1969), explains that people from different ethnic groups have different issues in which only the members of the group can relate to. Thus, when people from different ethnic groups meet and interact they adapt to each other and connect on common grounds. When my respondents claimed that they could not talk to non-Jewish friends about their Jewish issues, they adapted their conversations in order to have a friendship based on common interests and issues. Topics that were avoided with non-Jewish friends were anti-Semitism, and the

¹⁰ January 2015, a Jewish man was shot to death.

conflicts in Israel, or Israel in general. Anti-Semitism, because my respondents claimed that the non-Jewish friends could not relate to that kind of hatred and therefore chose to talk about it with their Jewish friends. The Jewish friends were the ones who could understand and relate to anti-Semitism and therefore could show support to each other. The respondents could recognise themselves in their Jewish friends' eyes and therefore act in accordance with what they think is correct in a Jewish setting. Preferences of "hanging out" with Jewish friends can also be seen in the researches about British Jews (Miller 2003) and Swedish Jews (Dencik 2003). Miller (2003) explains the preference of Jewish friends, and sense of belonging to the Jewish community, as a way of expressing one's Jewish identity through *social ethnicity*, which means, "the strength of belonging expressed via social behavior and attitudes" (Miller 2003, p. 53).

When asking Chris where his Jewish identity appeared the most, he said:

Chris: My Jewish identity is more visible when I'm in Jewish company. That's when you know that you can talk about Judaism, about Israel, and everyone will understand *exactly* what you mean. Jews are very ironic, they have a lot of humour and when you joke about things that happen in Israel with non-Jews they won't really understand that you're joking because they haven't experienced the same thing as I have. Whereas in a Jewish company, it's a classic, they gonna get exactly what I mean and I guess that one is more understood. One can stick to a certain jargon which I otherwise wouldn't have been able to, simply because we have similar experiences, similar knowledge.

Most of my respondents meant that their Jewish identity stood out the most in the company of other Jews or when they somehow were situated in a Jewish setting. Barth (1969), explains that an individual who calls him/herself a member of a group, the individual is aware of the values and morals that are kept in that group and s/he acts in accordance with those values in order to legitimise her/his membership in the group. Mead (1934) illustrates this as a group being a team, the individual is part of the team in which s/he shares the attitudes of. The team plays the role of being a team in order to convince others that they are who they appear to be (Goffman 1998). The team is seen as an organisation of attitudes that is formed by its members (Mead 1934). Because my respondents claimed that they had Jewish identities and therefore belonged to the Jewish peoplehood, they knew which topics and issues could be discussed and not when they were with people who did not share the same group affiliation as themselves. They adapt their conversations and speak about topics that are relevant to the group they are in (Goffman 1998). When they are with their Jewish friends they can take on the role as Jewish and act in accordance with what is expected of that role (Goffman 1998), as Chris explained when one sticks to a certain jargon.

Rachel and Sam had different opinions when it came to non-Jews, or non-Jewish friends. Both of them meant that they could be or act in a certain way, which they cannot do, or are not comfortable doing when they are with other Jews. It seems like the role play or taking on different roles to fit in is not only made in non-Jewish settings. This is also done in the Jewish settings. Goffman (1998) talks about terms he call the *front stage* and *backstage*. Where *front*

stage meant that the individual plays a specific character or role depending on the audience the individual has, *backstage* was the place where the individual could let go of those played characters and be her-/himself.

In the cases of Rachel and Sam, it can be seen that the Jewish settings *and* the non-Jewish settings served as their *front stage*. In the Jewish settings they adapt or play a role that is in accordance with the individuals there. For instance, Rachel meant that, because she was religious, being with her secular Jewish friends was not a forum to be her religious self in. She claimed that it was easier to be with non-Jewish friends who were religious as well. Even though the friends had other religions, she meant that she was more comfortable. For Rachel, being with non-Jews was not a bigger issue, she meant that she could display her Jewish side more and talk about spirituality and food customs with those who were religious. Then, we have the case of Sam who said that he would feel more comfortable with non-Jews, as long as they did not know where he came from. He meant that he could keep to a certain way of speaking.

Sam: How should I explain this, it's weird, it sounds really strange but I have more in common with... I can navigate better and speak more and explain myself better with a guy from *förorten*¹¹ than with a guy from whatever, you know what I mean? It's so weird! But of course, it's because I have been there, I have navigated there, I feel at home there, I know how they speak, I know the slang, I can communicate better, get along better *as long* as he doesn't know where I came from.

Sam could recognise himself in both the Jewish settings and non-Jewish settings. Jewish settings because of shared history and affinity. Non-Jewish settings, because he felt that he fitted in. Here, is not only the common and shared values and history that mattered, but also territory relations mattered. Sam and the person of the example, instead of sharing a belief or history they shared similar understandings of coming from similar areas, language such as slang, and internal jokes etc. It seems like Sam has to compromise with his identity wherever he finds himself in. To enact as Jewish in the Jewish settings and taking on the politeness-role, as Goffman (1998) calls it. However, when finding himself in the marginalised areas, the politeness-role was not as crucial as it was as presenting himself as non-Jewish in order to prevent harm.

Sam and Rachel, even if they felt like they could be themselves in certain contexts they still had to adapt certain conversations to the people they were with. Non-Jews or Jews. With the Jews they could be Jews, did not have to explain any Jewish issues to them. With the non-Jews, Sam for instance could stick to a jargon that is held in the marginalised areas, which he felt comfortable with. Rachel could be her religious self without being questioned of why she is religious. However both of them had to adapt to their environments and take on roles as either religious or being from *förorten*. Rachel meant that topics that were avoided with her non-Jewish friends were Israel and the conflicts, for Sam it was his Jewish identity.

¹¹ Swedish word that is frequently used to describe the marginalised areas. *Banlieue*, in French.

“Naah, you’re not Swedish”

In 1999, the Swedish Parliament recognised that there was a special need to protect minority groups and their languages so they decided to ratify the European Council framework convention for the protections of these groups. Amongst the groups that were recognised were the Jews, Roma people, Sami, Swedish Finns and Tornedalers. The decision of ratifying both the framework convention and the European Charter entailed a recognition of supporting and keeping national minorities and their languages alive (Riksdagen 1999/2000).

To be recognised as a national minority by the Swedish state meant that Jews were recognised as a distinct people that needed protection. Rachel liked the fact that she was part of a national minority and thought it was a way for her to be distinguished from the Swedish society, Dan on the other side, did not share the same opinion as Rachel

There were a couple of respondents who said that they did not feel Swedish, or that being Jewish was primordial. This was clearly expressed by Sarah when saying:

Sarah: I see myself as a Jewish person in Sweden. My dad is Scandinavian and so is my mom but to me it doesn’t matter whether they are Scandinavians or not, they could have been from Germany, or whatever, but I live a Jewish life and that’s the life I want to live. The Swedish traditions don’t really concern me at all, it’s nice that people celebrate them but it doesn’t concern me, the Swedish [traditions]. I only feel Swedish when I’m outside of Sweden. Can you say that? Cause, when I was living abroad I was so proud of being Swedish, everything that had to do with IKEA, Pippi Longstocking it was like, it was *me!* And then I got back (to Sweden) and I’m never really Swedish in most of my friends’ eyes. When they look at me they see that I have darker hair, slightly darker features and they go “naah, you’re not Swedish” even though I am. But I still don’t feel like a Swedish person, Jewishness is what comes first.

When being abroad Sarah said that “everything Swedish” was her, and that she was proud of being Swedish when she found herself out of the Swedish context. It seems like being in Sweden, according to a couple of the respondents, meant that they were seen as different, they were different to the vast majority because they did not share the same traditions or customs as the Swedish society. In some cases it was because of their features or hair-/skin colour that distinguished them from what seems to be ‘typical Swedish’. However, it is not only that they do not share the same customs or traditions as the vast Swedish majority, more than half the respondents have been told that they were not Swedish because of their looks, or because of their Jewish identities, as Sarah explained. Cooley (1983), with his looking glass theory, explains that the way individuals see themselves through a mirror they see themselves through other people’s eyes. In this case, when Sarah says that she is Swedish but that her friends say “naah, you’re not Swedish” because of her darker features, then she quickly said “but I still don’t feel like a Swedish person, Jewishness is what comes first”. According to the theory of ethnicity, a person’s ethnic identity has to be confirmed from both the members of the group as well as those who are not members of the group (Barth 1969; Eriksen 1991; Phinney 1996) in order for it to be enacted. To not be recognised as Swedish by others is a way to be defined

as different. When saying that “Jewishness comes first” could be explained by the way my respondent’s Jewish identity is legitimised when she is identified as Jewish in the Jewish setting, as well by others when they claim that she looks different to the vast majority. Because she is identified as Jewish in both groups and not as Swedish (by those who claim that they are Swedish), she takes on the role or identity as Jewish and therefore primarily sees herself as Jewish because of the lack of recognition as Swedish.

However, being placed into a new context made Sarah aware of her Swedish side when being Swedish was not shared with others in the new context. Living in Sweden, since children, and taking part of different Swedish institutions such as its educational system, working place, can be seen as a bridge that enabled the respondents to take part of the native culture and food customs. In order to adapt and be part of society they take parts of the dominant culture and adapt it to their own lives. Thus, when they are abroad they see themselves as the Swedish person they cannot be in Sweden, due to lack of recognition as such, and they show pride in being Swedish since, in my opinion, this entails emotional feelings towards home.

Another example is Dan who thought it was uncomfortable being seen as different in a Swedish context, because he was afraid that people would associate his Jewish identity as being religious. He thought that being religious and being something other than Swedish meant that “one is so different”. However, the way my respondents perceive themselves is constructed by the way, they think, other people see them and then they act to either confirm (as Sarah) or disprove (as Dan) what has been stated as a fair or unfair perception of them (Charon 1995). Sarah, chose to confirm her difference by identifying herself as Jewish *first* and *then* Swedish. Dan chose to disprove his identification to religion by not being religious and by not keeping kosher. Dan chose to not talk about his Jewish identity if there was no reason for doing so.

Being in non-Jewish settings was not always seen as a negative setting, in which the respondents felt uncomfortable in. To engage in non-Jewish settings could be understood as settings where an individual can enact or legitimise her/his Jewish identity with non-Jews. This is what some of my respondents get to do when they engage in contexts with non-Jews or non-Jewish friends. For Rachel, it seemed like being with non-Jews was a way for her to legitimise her Jewish identity when she had to explain why she did not eat certain things when she ate in restaurants. In order to legitimise and making her identity seen and confirmed by others she displays it by wearing certain symbols, by talking about her Jewish identity, and by keeping kosher. For her, these things were used as a way to distinguish herself from the vast majority. To show distinction.

Hyman (1999 cited in Liebman 2003, p. 349) claims that religion is the only way to show distinctiveness within white populations in the West. The members do not have to be distinguished in a discriminating way but as a way to be recognised as a member of another group and ‘different’ to the dominant culture. What shows distinction from the vast majority, in the cases of my respondents, is the use of symbols, mainly jewellery and kippot¹².

¹² Plural form of Kippah which is a skullcap, mainly used by Jewish men

To be a hyphenated-Jew/Swede meant that, one links the Jewish and Swedish cultures to feel part of both cultures and peoples. However, in this section, being a hyphenated-Jew/Swede meant that several were not recognised as full Swedes because of their Jewish identities. Many of my respondents said that being in a context where they tried to blend in, by not talking about the Jewish identity, was not easy. They meant that they would feel different anyway. While some of them did not express anything about it, others meant that being in Sweden and not being part of the majority meant that they were not fully Swedish. However, they found it also important that the Jewish community and its activities stayed “Jewish”, or religious, in order to be distinguished from the majority, and avoid assimilation.

Jewish identity and geographical areas

Asking my respondents whether they could be open with their Jewish identities in any city and district in Sweden, several of them said that it depended on which city and district it was. My respondents claimed that they could not be ‘openly Jewish’ in districts they knew could cause them harm. Especially if they found themselves alone in a specific place. To avoid drawing attention to themselves, and avoid violence, physically or verbally, they choose to take a step back and not show their identity openly. Even if some of my respondents otherwise would not be open with their Jewish identities, they wanted to have the option to be it.

Depending on which scene or setting my respondents find themselves in, they acted in accordance with what is in front of them. If they are in a setting where they cannot be Jewish they will not express their Jewish identities in order to not draw attention or to not be harmed. By hiding their symbols they choose to take on a role that was safe for them.

Middle-to-upper class areas

The middle-to-upper class areas are those areas in which people with higher income are considered to live in, according to my respondents. I will call the middle-to-upper class areas for the “privileged areas”. Walking around in the privileged areas with a Star of David pendant and a kippah was fine according to Jacob and Sarah. Esther said that she went to school with some people who came from the wealthier parts of Gothenburg, when they learnt that Esther was Jewish they said “don’t think that you’re so damn special” and distanced themselves from her. Chris said that in the privileged areas, there are more people who sympathised with Hitler’s ideologies living there whereas Sarah explained the privileged areas as the places where people were “stuck” with the old medieval myths and stereotypes about Jews. However, to display one’s Jewishness in the privileged areas was easier than in town and in the marginalised areas since in the privileged areas people would not really “dare” to verbally express anti-Semitic attitudes, according to these respondents.

Several respondents claimed that the residents of the privileged areas were mainly ethnic Swedes. They further said that the residents in these areas seldom expressed these ideologies of theirs openly if they were to see someone wearing a Star of David pendant. Anti-Semitism in these areas appears to be surreptitious in its kind and therefore less visible according to the respondents. This could be understood as the residents taking on, what Goffman (1998) calls,

the politeness role. The politeness role is to act and behave in respectable ways (Goffman 1998). Since my respondents are aware of its quietness and the people's political correctness, several took the opportunity to display their symbols which they would not be able to do in other places. My respondents know that they could encounter problems, nevertheless the problems seemed less likely to happen owing to the residents' political correctness. Political correctness seems to be an underlying 'rule' in these areas. So, whatever has been suppressed during the day or even week, such as the Jewish identity, can now be released and displayed in terms of symbols.

Chris for instance, explained that he would hide his symbols if he was in a district in which he was aware of these ideologies. To avoid violence, he said that he would hide his Star of David. Nevertheless, since he did say that he has lighter skin and hair, he said that he could blend in and appear as "Swedish".

Could it be, that those Jewish respondents who claimed that they would not be exposed to anti-Semitism in the privileged areas was because they were seen as Swedish? Because of their similar traits to Swedes? If a person with darker traits, would walk in those areas, would s/he draw more attention to her/him because they are darker and different, and therefore is more likely to be exposed to anti-Semitism or other discrimination? It is interesting to see whether it has to do with looks or not. If my respondents are to wear a necklace, and they are considered to look Swedish in other people's eyes, then I would guess that they would not be noticed as much than if they were darker. They would blend in and therefore be seen as one of the people living in the privileged areas. In this case one could probably discuss class differences or ethnic differences whether it is given that those living in the privileged areas are merely 'white' and richer Swedes, however this would lead to a new discussion of other topics than the one I have focused on, on this thesis.

'Förorten' Marginalised areas

The marginalised areas are considered to be very multicultural, in general opinion, because people from different countries live there. The areas are marginalised because they have been recognised, by the state, as poorer areas, and have higher rates of unemployment and low incomers than in other areas (Göteborgs Stad 2015).

Those respondents who have been to or lived in any marginalised area in Sweden meant that in those areas they were not comfortable with wearing Jewish symbols, nor saying that they were Jewish. More than half my respondents said that those with most anti-Semitic and anti-Israel attitudes would be found among youngsters with Muslim backgrounds that live in the marginalised areas. Some respondents explained that in the Middle East people are taught in schools to hate Jews, they learn that Jews are an elite who are controlling the world with media, banks, politics, and so on. The respondents further said that youngsters with Muslim backgrounds might have adopted these ideologies from family members or other people whom have learnt to hate Jews by their former home countries. However, according to several respondents, these youngsters were the ones that freely expressed their anti-Semitism. Another respondent explained that several left-wing activists living in those marginalised areas, regardless of their ethnical or religious background, also supports the idea that Jews are some kind of powerful people.

In contrast to the privileged areas, in the marginalised areas people's anti-Semitism would be based on anti-Israel attitudes and conspiracy theories, according to my respondents. Jacob explained that several young Muslims directed their anger toward Jews about Israel's policy. Some respondents said that this would sometimes lead to Israel being called a Nazi state, or an apartheid state, and many would wish that all Jews were killed by Hitler. Since the anti-Israel attitudes were directed to Jews, several respondents did not want to tell people from the marginalised areas that they were Jewish. They would keep it to themselves because they did not want to be held responsible for the conflicts in Israel.

In this case, it gives the impression that anti-Semitic attitudes are not only generated by ideologies forced or taught by others, but also by their marginalised positions (in society or as individuals). They might be marginalised from society in such ways as being unemployed which leads to economic restraints, or being socially segregated from the society because of discrimination, and so on. Charlton (1998) explains that belonging to a social group awakens ideas of superiority and inferiority. It could possibly be that being in a marginalised position could awake thoughts of other social groups being superior and evil. If, in this case, those residents living in the marginalised areas with anti-Semitic attitudes perceive themselves as inferior to Jews, they might use anti-Israel attitudes to support their hatred against Jews because of their own alleged inferior position.

In the marginalised areas, the Jewish identity appears to be suppressed and oppressed. It is suppressed because it is hidden, it is oppressed because it is being violated when the youngsters or other people express anti-Semitic attitudes with violence. According to Johnson (2000a) and Barker (2003) an identity is also oppressed when it is seen as negative and therefore not appreciated. In this case it seems like my respondents would be seen as the State of Israel instead of the human beings that they are. By being seen as the State of Israel, the youngsters' hate towards Israel would be justified by hating or physically/verbally attacking Jews. When the individual is forced to take on another identity s/he is oppressed in the sense that s/he cannot show sides of her/himself that will not be recognised or accepted by others. So, when the respondents withhold their Jewish identities they prevent causing disorder in the audience by adopting those acceptable norms that rule in the marginalised areas and act as non-Jews and at the same time suppress the oppressed Jewish identity (Goffman 1998).

City centres

The respondents said that they adapted and compromised with their Jewish identities depending on which city they were in. In Gothenburg and Stockholm, for instance, Sam said that since Gothenburg was big, a person in general was more anonymous so it would not be a bigger problem showing that one was Jewish. Jacob said that it had to do with *where* in the city one was situated in. Jacob said that there were certain places in the city where he could wear a kippah without meeting people with anti-Semitic attitudes. Being open with one's Jewishness in Stockholm and Gothenburg city centres, and the central stations depended on whether the respondents were with friends or not. If they were alone, several said that they chose to hide anything that would identify them as Jews to prevent problems. If they were with friends, some respondents would consider using their symbols. Many meant that they were more conscious of themselves when walking around with a Jewish symbol in town. If it

was a necklace they said that it was fine because they could easily hide the pendant under the shirt. Some respondents looked for other options, such as wearing symbols that not everyone could identify as Jewish.

In the city centres, I understood it as places where people from many different districts would meet. In the central stations, and in shopping malls that are situated where many people with different social- and economic backgrounds move, there would be a mix of different thoughts and attitudes. These different thoughts and attitudes are later 'picked up' by the respondents which they then adapt to in order to not cause problems or not drawing attention to themselves (Mead 1934). However, being with friends seemed to make it easier to use symbols than when they were alone, this could be connected to Tew's (2006) concept of *power together* which explains the support and reinforcement individuals in a group have when they are together. The friends would in this case serve as moral support for the respondents, so if anything was to happen they could rely on their friends and maybe the anti-Semitic attitudes would, therefore, not be as personal or as alarming as they could be if the respondents were alone. Therefore, when the respondents were alone they would embody roles that are in agreement with the ruling norm in town (Goffman 1998), like they do in the marginalised areas.

When talking about Malmö, Jacob, Lara and Sam said that one can absolutely not be open with one's Jewishness in Malmö's city centre. Mainly because Malmö is much smaller than Gothenburg and Stockholm, and also because they said that everyone "hangs out in town". In Malmö, they explained, one would see the people who are not fond of Jews more than in Gothenburg and Stockholm. They also said that there are more people from the Middle East in Malmö with anti-Semitic attitudes. Sam said that when there are anti-Israel protests in Malmö, at least 500 people demonstrated in town saying "death to Zionists, death to your country, death to you". Being open with one's Jewishness was not an option in Malmö according to these three respondents. Malmö seems to be very similar to the way the respondents explained that they could not be open with their Jewish identities in the marginalised areas. They would tone down and act in accordance with the ruling norm and become invisible.

Chris and Esther, on the other hand, explained that they could "blend in" in town since, according to them, no one would be able to identify them as Jewish because they were lighter in terms of skin and hair. According to these respondents, someone who has lighter skin and lighter hair could disappear more and probably be identified as Swedish rather than Jewish. These two respondents could blend in and become 'Swedish' if they so wished, and therefore avoid anti-Semitism. Joe explained that those Jews who wear symbols that indicates that they are Jewish would be more exposed to anti-Semitism, as well as those Jews who are a bit darker. Those who considered themselves as looking different to the 'typical Swede' thought that they would be singled out easier since they would be asked where they come from. Dan said that people would not identify him as Jewish, because he does not wear any symbols that indicates that he is. However, he explained that he would get the question about his heritage, and when it happened he would say that he was from Central Europe.

As well in the privileged areas it is interesting to see whether exposure to anti-Semitism has to do with looks or not. If my respondents look Swedish in other people's eyes, no one would assume that they would be something else than Swedish, unless they used symbols that identified them as Jewish. They could blend in easier. Of course, this is just a thought. Out of my respondents' stories most of them had experienced anti-Semitism, whether they were considered looking Swedish or not. But my question is whether first impression has to do with if they are exposed to anti-Semitism to the same extent as the 'darker' Jews. Maybe if I put it like this, does a lighter Jew want to use her/his symbols more because otherwise s/he would not be identified as Jewish? And, if they do not feel the urge of using symbols in order to feel Jewish, would they then be exposed to anti-Semitism to the same extent as darker Jews would, since there would be no indication of their Jewishness on an external level. Just a thought.

Jewish identity and anti-Semitism

Anti-Semitism

Jews have a history of persecution and oppression against them. Many people therefore think that all those persecutions and hatred stayed in history. Anti-Semitism is not only a historical phenomenon that stayed with history, nor is it a new phenomenon. I asked my respondents when anti-Semitism was current for them, several said that it has always been a current topic.

Anti-Semitism can be shown, according to my respondents, in numerous ways such as:

- Stereotypes and myths – Conspiracy theories, that Jews own the world and that all the Jews are rich. “You're greedy, you're cheap, where's your Jew gold?”
- In anti-Zionism or anti-Israel attitudes – When anti-Israel attitudes are directed toward Jews.
- Surreptitious – Use of symbols, jokes and in anti-Israel attitudes.
- Forthright – Verbal and/or physical attacks toward Jews.
- Scapegoat – To have someone to blame for all the bad things in society.
- Hitler associations – Hearing jokes as “I'm gonna gas you”, painted swastikas on walls, “swastikas = Star of David”, or when people do the “hail Hitler” salute.
- Denial – When politicians and people deny that anti-Semitism exists any longer.

Something that I observed, according to my respondents' experiences, was that it seemed like the Jewish males were more exposed to physical violence than the Jewish females. Three respondents had experienced violence, or have been close to being attacked because of their Jewish identities. The females, on the other hand, would encounter more “angry glances”.

Overall, they all claimed that anti-Semitism is anti-Semitism, that no one above is better or worse than the other. Several of my respondents said that anti-Semitism is becoming socially acceptable in society, that nowadays, it seemed like a Jew had to die in order for the politicians to act, “if they do act” as Sarah said. Is the Swedish society doing enough to protect its Jewish citizens? Most my respondents said, no. Firstly, because the politicians did not recognise that anti-Semitism was a problem, and when they did recognise it as a problem they did not take clear nor specific action in order to combat it. Secondly, my respondents

claimed that *if* the Swedish society had done enough to protect the Jews, they would not have had security guarding the synagogue in the first place, and that the term anti-Semitism would not have existed.

Anti-Semitism, as I understand it, serve on the one hand as an oppressive act, on the other hand it also served as a catalyst of reinforcement. All the respondents meant that it brought their Jewish identity to consciousness, and in most cases reinforced their identities as Jewish, similar findings can also be seen in Gitelman's (2003) research about Jews in Russia and Ukraine. Most of my respondents said that anti-Semitism, even if it made them scared, sad and worried they said that it generated feelings of belongingness to the Jewish people and that they would seek comfort and support in their Jewish friends. Seeking support with their Jewish friends generated feelings of pride which, several said, strengthened the group. When asking those who would wear Jewish symbols, why they chose to wear them, Rachel, Chris, and Jacob claimed that it was to send a political statement and to show people in society that Jews exist. They also claimed that Sweden is a democratic country and that they had the right to walk around with Jewish symbols if they wanted to.

If we are to look at anti-Semitism as an act of power, in some cases it can serve as a force that reinforces Jewish identity that otherwise would not get as much attention which could raise awareness or be used to fight anti-Semitism. Or, in other cases it would make people suppress the Jewish part of themselves.

Internal effects

More than promoting oppression and Jewish awareness, anti-Semitism also generated fear and sensitivity toward the threats, and not to mention, exposure and vulnerability. The internal factors entailed fear and considering moving to another country if it got worse in Sweden. Almost all my respondents said that they would either move to the United States or to Israel where Jewish life is not an issue and can be freely expressed.

When interviewing Dan he explained that he did not have a strong Jewish identity, to start with. When we spoke about anti-Semitism he explained that this was not something he was concerned about because he meant that anti-Semitism did not affect him. The more we spoke about anti-Semitism I could observe that it did affect him, if not directly towards him, then indirectly.

Paula: Would you say that your Jewish identity is affected when there is anti-Semitism?

Dan: It becomes stronger somehow.

Paula: In what way?

Dan: You want to stand up for your identity even if it's a small part you want to... why can't I have this small part? Why can't I have this part? I mean, do you understand that I, somehow, feel that it is so innocent? I want this little Jewish part, what am I doing wrong? And everything is just so illogical, you just get "what? What is this?" As if I'm doing something wrong.

Dan, as seen in the example, wanted to keep his Jewish identity even if it was “a small part” of him. He became aware of his Jewish identity when anti-Semitism was acknowledged. This could be explained through the way national identities are represented as underlying within people (Gellner 1983 in Hall 1996 p.614). Gellner (1983 in Hall 1996 p.614) illustrates the national identity as a slumbering identity that is always ready to be awakened from its long and mysterious slumber to resume its existence.

Even if being Jewish, or having a Jewish identity is not considered to be connected to a race or a nation but rather a people, one can still apply the national identity to the cases of my respondents. Whether my respondents were actively aware of their Jewish identities or whether they did not pay any attention to it, their Jewish identities were brought to consciousness or waken up when external threats questioned or endangered that part of their selves. As the example of Dan who wanted to keep his Jewish identity and also Chris who said that he had to look behind his shoulders like a criminal when going to the synagogue because of fear. Chris’ example can be explained through the way an individual internalises his/her oppressor’s perception of them, in this case anti-Semitism, which means that, they become both a target of the oppressors acts, but also a target of the oppressor’s thoughts which has been internalised or learnt by the individual (Freire 1972). They have been internalised or learnt unconsciously or indirect by those who express the oppression (anti-Semitism) in general matters or through jokes, or consciously/direct by own- or other’s experiences.

Not only does anti-Semitism violate the respondents’ rights to freely express their religion or affinity to the Jewish group, it also deprives them of their sense of feeling free as humans. Because of its existence and constant reminder of the respondents’ vulnerability as individuals or as a group. Anti-Semitism has institutionalised an inner oppressor in several of the respondents’ minds. The inner oppressor serves as a reminder of who they are and what they cannot do or speak about when being with those who practice the oppression. This, furthermore, generates fear and in some cases shame or anger since this does not allow several respondents to be open with their Jewish identities whenever they want to.

Since anti-Semitism made all my respondents aware of, both, their Jewish identity and the threats they could encounter, most of them felt that their identities as Jews became stronger and, in most cases, felt proud of being Jewish. Some even expressed it by saying that they got “patriotic”, Sam explained it as “the more you question that part of me, the stronger I get”. When discussing the theory of diaspora (in *Theoretical Framework*) and how groups stay diasporic Cohen (1997) claims that a diasporic group had to resist assimilation in order to stay diasporic. In addition, if the group assimilates they are no longer considered to be a diasporic group according to Clifford (1994) and Cohen (1997). In the cases of my respondents, one could say that anti-Semitism serves as a way to keep the group together. Considering that the respondents seek each other out when the group experiences external threats one could say that it is a way to stay together. Discrimination or threats against the group is something that only the members of the group can relate to which, furthermore, gathers the members of the

group which enables them to talk about issues that only they understand. Jacob illustrated it as follows:

Jacob: We are like a village, we have walls and we fight about who sells the best bread and some think one way and others another way but if an army from the outside would come then we would close our gate, put soldiers by the gate and everyone has to keep together in order to survive. So yes, our affiliation gets stronger when there are external threats and that's probably the only positive thing about it, that our group is strengthen.

The village metaphor explains how anti-Semitism, can be used as a way to stay diasporic and thus remember the connection that the respondents have to each other, creating an 'us', and also staying distinct to the outer world. Many respondents claimed that they did not want to let anti-Semitism win over them, and therefore chose to fortify their affinity.

It seems as anti-Semitism, serves in this case as a way to unite the Jewish community, especially my respondents. It serves, not only as a tool of oppression but also as a tool that unites and fortifies a diasporic group who might not have stayed diasporic if it was not for these threats.

External effects

The external effects are the way anti-Semitism affects the respondents on an external level and how they act in relation to the oppression. The reinforcement of identity and submission to anti-Semitism can both be observed in my respondents' stories.

According to Hall (1996), national cultures constructs identities that are placed somewhere between the past and future. When discussing external threats towards an ethnic minority, or a national identity, Hall (1996) discusses the regressive aspect of national cultural story, he argues that the national cultures, at times, turns the clock back, not only to remember what used to be but rather to restore past identities. The regressive aspect entails to mobilise the people to struggle against those who are threatening their identity, and to purify their ranks by excluding those who are not part of the culture (Hall 1996).

Jews are not a people based on a geographical place nor a race in itself, but rather a people whom define themselves as a people owing to their shared history as such. In accordance with Hall's (1996) discussion about the regressive aspect of the national culture I captured in the respondents' stories that some of them tended to 'go back' to their Jewish identities when they or someone in the Jewish community experienced anti-Semitism. The respondents' Jewish identities unified them and made them a 'we', all the internal conflicts were therefore laid aside, like Jacob's metaphor about the Jewish community being a village. Some of my respondents mobilised, not to "purify" themselves as a people but rather mobilise to fight against an external threat that is, more or less, questioning their identity as Jews and, at times, questions their existence as a people. The fact that the respondents claimed that the group got stronger can also be seen as *power together*, together we are stronger. *Power together* is obtained when a group of people, such as an ethnic minority group, get together and share mutual understanding and emotional support when being oppressed or threatened by external actors (Tew 2006). Power together can also serve as a collective action of resistance against

the oppressive acts that are directed to the group. The resistance is driven by shared collective values, which are shared by everyone whom identifies themselves as members of the group.

Since their identity as a group reinforced some of my respondents claimed that they started to wear symbols that identified them as Jewish such as a Star of David, kippah, and so on. The meaning of wearing symbols to show one's identification with the Jewish people can also be seen as a way of how identities are constructed in relation to others and how my respondents felt the urge to show their Jewish identities when their Jewish identities were questioned. Mead (1934) talks about the dialects we pick up about ourselves when we interplay with other people and how we perceive them, Charon (1995), explains that individuals do not have to accept a perception that they do not find a fair way to describe the way they are, that individuals can choose to rebel against it. Many of my respondents claimed that anti-Semitism was an attitude that unfairly described the Jewish people. By using their symbols and by not letting anti-Semitism win over them, in terms of accepting it and give up, they chose to rebel against it and made them take on a description of themselves that is correct in relation to themselves, which they want to show to other people. By not letting anti-Semitism oppress them and force them to become what they do not want to become, which is a neutralised Jew, they reinforced this side of themselves instead.

Rachel said that she would wear her "Magen David¹³" every day, she said that she got a Menorah¹⁴ pendant from someone, but she said that no one knew what the Menorah was and therefore chose to wear her Star of David to mark that she was Jewish. When it comes to the kippah, the male respondents said that it is normally religious Jews that walk around with kippot outside of the synagogue, which is also the reason why these respondents did not wear one. Jacob on the other hand, said that he was not religious but that wearing a kippah was his way to show people that Jews exist. Jacob explained that he used to wear a necklace with a Star of David pendant but that he took it off when the war between Israel and Gaza (summer 2014) raised people's anti-Semitic acts. After what happened in Copenhagen he said that he was not going to hide any longer and he started to wear a kippah. Jacob was well aware of the consequences he could meet if he walked around with a kippah in town but he said that it did not stop him.

Jacob explained that he tried to get other Jewish youngsters to get engage and encouraged them to also wear their symbols to show that enough is enough. He meant that if Hitler was alive today, or if ISIS¹⁵ were to kill Jews in Sweden, that there was no point in hiding at home or behind the walls of the synagogue because he would be killed anyway. He further said that he would rather die standing up for his identity and fighting against anti-Semitism than hiding. Since many of my respondents said that they wanted to fight against anti-Semitism and resist its oppressive attitudes, one can connect it to the way the respondents rebel against an erroneous perception of them (Charon 1995). By resisting anti-Semitism and acting against it by using symbols and by encouraging other young Jews to be more active shows that the group is stronger when they get together. By mobilising and being more active, together they

¹³ Hebrew for Star of David

¹⁴ A candelabrum with seven arms, that symbolises the seven days of the week and the burning bush seen by Moses on Mount Sinai.

¹⁵ Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, a radical Islamic terrorist group

can fight against an oppressive act that is trying to diminish their Jewish identities (Baker Miller 1991).

As much as anti-Semitism reinforced many of my respondents' Jewish identities by becoming more aware of it and by reinforcing the group with the wish of fighting against it, anti-Semitism is also limiting and has put barriers around the respondents as individuals. Anti-Semitism, as I understand it out of what has been said during the interviews, is not only hatred towards the Jewish people, it is also a tool of power to oppress and to produce fear. Anti-Semitism seems to be a tool of power since it puts barriers around the respondents. Barriers that set up rules of what they can say or not say, what they can do or not do, if they overstep the boundaries then they have to assume the consequences of being hurt or risk that a family member gets hurt (Barth 1969). Anti-Semitism is oppressive in its kind since many respondents felt afraid of showing their Jewish identities, several claimed that this also restrained them to fully be themselves.

Sam was the one of those respondents who stood out when it came to not being able to be open Jewish at school, work, streets, and so on. Sam told me during the interview, that he had been exposed both directly and indirectly, ever since he was a child, to anti-Semitic attitudes. He explained that when he went to school, he would be beaten up because of his Jewish identity on a frequent basis. He said that he, for a long time, could not tell people that he was Jewish. When he started working he was even encouraged by colleagues to not tell the youngsters he worked with that he was Jewish. Sam, said that because he knew another language, he could take on his parents' nationalities and use them to present himself as when he met new people. Sam had been exposed to anti-Semitic attitudes for a long time which has made him look for other options. When asking Sam how he felt when he felt forced to take on another identity in order to protect himself he said:

Sam: I've died on the inside. I've felt really crap. I've been disappointed in myself. I've felt like a coward, spineless, I've felt that I also was afraid. I've felt incomplete as a person, I haven't been proud of myself, I've been disappointed with myself, actually. There are many [people] that say that you have to be proud of who you are and that you have to stand up for yourself, sure, do that when you find yourself in that situation and see what will happen. It hasn't been fun seeing myself in the mirror. Imagine, you have your own identity, we all have our own identities and all of a sudden you are forced to let go of that identity and embrace another, how would you feel? No, it's awful. And then everyone says that you have to be ashamed of who you are. Newspapers say that, people say that, the kids between them said that, colleagues said that.

Sam's example can be connected to Freire's (1972) inner oppressor internalisation. Freire (1972) explains that when an individual is being oppressed, he or she is being de-humanised by the oppressor and therefore internalises the oppressor's perception of them and unconsciously starts to live up to the conceptions that are given to them. In the cases of my respondents, no one really expressed that they started to live up to any stereotypes, they rather acted in accordance with those perceptions. When individuals act in accordance with power or

oppression they submit to it or they might also feel forced to do things they otherwise would not and when they do, they earn the ‘reward’ of preventing harm, such as in the case of Sam (Börjesson & Rehn 2009). Since the Jewish identity meant that Sam would face threats he chose to take on another identity to prevent such harms. Other respondents chose to hide their visible symbols in order to protect themselves. Furthermore when it comes to the way Sam felt when taking on another identity than the Jewish identity, Charon (1995) explains that humans as social beings, are also objects to their own selves which enables them to reflect at former behaviours and thus feel certain emotions about themselves such as happiness, shame or pride. However, when going back to, what Goffman (1998) calls, the *backstage* where the individual can let go of those acted roles and not have to perform for any audience, Sam for instance could recall the role he had to take on, on the *front stage*. When Sam recalled the acted role he expressed and felt shame and disappointment for playing a role that was not in unison with his true self.

Another respondent who stood out was Leah. Leah told me that when she went to high school she started to hear all kinds of anti-Semitic comments. She said that classmates and schoolmates would call each other “Jew” and that the word Jew was intended to be an insult to the other person. She said that because everyone in her class knew that she was Jewish, she felt like she had to represent all the Jews:

Leah: In my high school, I represented 16 million Jews. Everything I did was for every other Jew in the world. So I’d better keep myself calm, always sit at the front of the class, and quiet. I had to behave and not start any fights so that they [classmates] could get a positive image of how all the other Jews are around the world. It’s so weird thinking like that but that’s how it is.

Instead of taking on another identity, Leah felt the responsibility to represent other Jews around the world when people found out that she was Jewish. Leah was proud of being Jewish, however, anti-Semitism made her pride turn to carefulness when situated in settings in which she could be exposed to harm or distress. Leah said that she would not tell people that she was Jewish unless they asked her, then she would either try to avoid the question or carefully admit that she was Jewish. When admitting that she was Jewish she acted and behaved in ways she thought would be seen as proper and representable in order to show others that Jews are humans and good people. Leah wanted to disprove people’s stereotypes of Jews by being to opposite of those stereotypes (Charon 1995). This could be seen as a resistance on its own on Leah’s behalf to change people’s views of Jews. By doing this alone, she had a great responsibility of trying to keep that role up in order to make it authentic for others. If she failed, she felt that it would confirm others’ stereotypes or myths about Jews.

Although Leah felt that she could be open with her Jewish identity in some contexts, she restricted herself by acting in “good manners”. This can be connected to Freire’s (1972) argument about a free individual that is not completely free in her/his mind since the individual has internalised a given misconception, this can also be called a covert oppression (Johnson 2000b). Freire (1972) claims that as much as the oppressed want freedom they cannot achieve this because of their inner oppressor. This means that an individual who starts

to live up to (or act in accordance with) a given conception, leads to the individual being afraid of anything he or she is not entitled to. In this case, it would be freedom of expressing their Jewish identities however they want to. Their inner anti-Semitism is their inner oppressor that is reminding them of their vulnerability as single individuals and as Jews.

Most my respondents have in one way or another experienced anti-Semitism, whether it was straight directed to them or if it was directed to the Jewish people in general. On the individual level, it seemed like standing alone against an oppressive power such as anti-Semitism was more difficult than doing it in the group. Many respondents, as much as they enjoyed the fact that together they were stronger, felt that fighting anti-Semitism alone was difficult.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This research explored ten, self-proclaimed, Jewish young adults' constructions of Jewish identities in relation to different groups and contexts. Furthermore, how external threats, as anti-Semitism, affected the construction of these identities. The research questions touched upon matters such as; what is Jewish identity, how are Jewish identities constructed in Sweden, how are Jewish identities expressed in different social contexts, and how is the construction of Jewish identities affected by anti-Semitism. The answers to these questions would make up an understanding of how the constructions of Jewish identities are created in a Swedish context.

My respondents saw their Jewish identities as essential and inherited, something that is stable, "always there", because they were born Jewish. The respondents seemed to be acceptable of any definition of Jewish identities when it comes to how other Jews defined it, as long as it entailed feelings of pride and feeling Jewish within.

When it comes to what defines a Jewish identity, what was important according to my respondents was the *feeling of being Jewish*, which also was the main indication of having a Jewish identity. How Jewish identities were maintained was up to each individual to decide, according to the respondents. Whether they wanted to observe Jewish traditions or not, whether they went to the synagogue or not, or whether they wore symbols or not, was not that important for the respondents' understanding of being Jewish. The most important aspect was to feel Jewish. All the respondents were socialised in one way or another to Jewish life. Most of them were socialised into Jewish life through their parents, others by engaging in activities in the Jewish community. The Jewish friends served as people whom my respondents could identify with and could turn to when they needed support. The non-Jewish friends were the people which the respondents could either display or hide their Jewish identities from. The non-Jewish friends also served as the ones whom defined whether the respondents were Swedish or not. To be Jewish in Sweden, therefore meant to be different, in most cases. It meant that one was not completely perceived as Swedish by other Swedes. It meant that one was a hyphen-Swede, Swedish-Jew. Most my respondents meant that they were Swedish because they were born in the country, and it meant that one was Jewish because one was raised as Jewish.

Anti-Semitism was explained as hatred toward Jews on the mere ground that they are Jewish. Anti-Semitism could take on different approaches such as anti-Israel attitudes, Nazi ideologies, surreptitious and forthright, and so on. Several of the respondents said that it depended in *which* geographical areas they were for them to be able to display their Jewish identities. In the marginalised areas, my respondents could not be open with their Jewish identities, such as wearing symbols that indicated their Jewish identities. In the marginalised areas, anti-Semitism was more visible and expressed through anti-Israel attitudes. In the privileged areas, many said that they could wear symbols as an indication of their Jewish identities. The difference between the privileged areas and the marginalised areas was that in the privileged areas anti-Semitism was not as visible and as largely expressed as the

marginalised areas. However, anti-Semitism in the privileged areas were surreptitious, but when expressed it took inspiration from the Nazi ideologies.

Several felt that anti-Semitism reinforced the feelings of being Jewish and therefore reinforced the group's affinity to each other. However, anti-Semitism also made that most of my respondents had to tone down their Jewish identities when they were not comfortable showing it. It meant that they had to adapt to the situation or setting they found themselves in. Anti-Semitism is therefore seen as a co-constructor of Jewish identity since it generated feelings of being Jewish and produced feelings such as being strong or vulnerable. Anti-Semitism was explained as an oppressive act, by me, but it also served as a catalyst of resistance. If it meant to die for one's Jewish identity, when resisting the forces of anti-Semitism, some said that they would assume those consequences.

When analysing the findings, some new reflections appeared such as if a person's hair or skin colour mattered when it came to being more or less subjected to anti-Semitism or not. Also, another very interesting topic that crossed my mind several times was how it is to be a Jewish person living in the marginalised areas where my respondents claimed that anti-Semitism was a bigger, or visible, issue.

Discussions

Are Jews an ethnic group?

Throughout this research I have used theories that touches upon ethnic identities and ethnic groups. But the question is, are Jews really an ethnic group? When talking to my respondents about ethnicity and peoplehood, all my respondents said that they were part of the Jewish people but being seen as an ethnic group entailed certain characteristics put on them which would make the term 'ethnicity' a difficult term to advocate for. In addition, they claimed that saying that Jews are an ethnic group neglects the fact that they are so diverse, in terms of having different cultures and coming from different countries. According to my respondents, there are Jews from all over the world whom all share the identification of being Jewish but might not necessarily share the way they practice their traditions or their food customs.

Reflecting on the term *ethnicity* made me think about what it meant for me. For me ethnicity means a group of people who all identify as a people due to shared culture, mutual understandings on 'inner group' issues, such as external threats. This is how I have presented ethnicity in this thesis. However, it seems like the term ethnicity is becoming more and more related to the word race and power in our society. To be Jewish does not mean that one is part of a race, except for the human race. Jews are not a race. They are a people or an ethnic group but not a race. Because Jews are as diverse as they are, they have different ethnic groups within the ethnic group, if we are to call them ethnic. There are Jews in every continent in the world, which is also the reason why they are seen as a diasporic group. Because whether they live in different continents and whether some are darker than others, they all share the identity of being diasporic Jews, of being a people amongst other people, of being a minority in every country they live in, except for Israel. Jews come in all colours and shapes. Since they do come in all colours and shapes, is it fair to call them an ethnic group? Some have suggested

religious-cultural-minority, but not everyone in the group considers themselves to be religious. Jews are recognised as an ethnic minority in Sweden, since 1999. Does that make them ethnic?

Since I do not see the term *ethnicity* as a synonym for race nor power, I would see Jews as a diasporic people with ethnic traits. Diasporic because they are ‘scattered’ around the globe, ethnic, because in relation to diasporic of being scattered around the globe, when they meet they feel affinity and at home. They feel that there is a connection between them, regardless, of the country they were born and raised in. What binds them together is their shared history and their shared values as a people, as Sam (my respondent) explained, and *that* is what makes them a people. They are a people with a shared history, values, and similar cultures, which are very similarly described to the ethnic groups.

What is Jewish identity?

Jewish identity, according to what I have seen through my respondents’ answers, is apparently not constructed by the individual alone, it is rather constructed as such with the help of co-constructors such as family members, Jewish law, Jewish institutions, Swedish society, and non-Jews. It is difficult to discuss the constructions of Jewish identities without talking about anti-Semitism. The discussion of how anti-Semitism plays a role in the construction of Jewish identities has been discussed in the sense of reinforcing the respondents’ awareness of their Jewish identities.

Jewish identity gives the impression of not being a static phenomenon that remains the same throughout time. It is rather a phenomenon that is in constant change depending on the era and geographic location we are situated in. Of what I have heard from my respondents, and observed when they spoke about their Jewish identities, it seemed like Jewish identity remained rooted within the individual whether s/he paid any attention to it or not, or whether they expressed that it was important or not.

As I understand it, Jewish identity serves as a frame that keeps everything that defines a (Jewish) person, such as social roles, gender, background, experiences, music- or clothing preferences, and so on, within the borders of the frame.

As much as authors claim that being Jewish or having a Jewish identity is a choice (Boyarin & Boyarin 1993; Dencik 2003; Liebman 2003; Miller 2003), it is difficult to completely agree that it is a choice, unless a person converts so to say. From my point of view, when a person learns that s/he is Jewish, then the choice of being Jewish is taken away from them. Why? Because as soon as a person knows that s/he is Jewish, it is difficult to emotionally distance themselves from external threats. This was clearly seen when those respondents who claimed that their Jewish identities were not a big part of their lives. Anti-Semitism affected them as much as it affected those respondents who claimed that they had a strong Jewish identity, because anti-Semitism raised their awareness of being Jewish. Many of my respondents had the choice of staying or keeping Jewish traditions, those who chose to not keep time-consuming traditions or who chose to not observe anything Jewish were as much affected by anti-Semitism as those who claimed that their Jewish identity was everything to them. Many of the respondents felt loyal to their Jewish identity, even when some claimed that it was not a

big part of their lives, however, the way they spoke about it during the interviews showed that it was important for them. It seemed like, even if they chose, they did not choose. Jewish issues affected them all, whether they claimed that they were more or less Jewish.

Of what I have understood from my respondents, when everything seemed to take rapid changes in society or in the personal life, due to globalisation, life crises, time, and so on, the Jewish identity is a phenomenon that sticks with the individual throughout these crises, as a pillar in which the individual could rely on.

Jewish identity, out of my respondents' perceptions, is a lifestyle, a state of mind, or a state of emotion that can either be expressed through practices and traditions. The Jewish identity could also serve as a loyal friend that will always be part of oneself and encourages (stability) belongingness and affinity to a group of people that shares a history.

How is this topic relevant for social work?

Social work is a practice-based profession and an academic discipline that promotes social change and development, social cohesion, and the empowerment and liberation of people. Principles of social justice, human rights, collective responsibility and respect for diversities are central to social work.

(IFSW, 2014)

This topic is relevant because anti-Semitism, as read, is not seen as a real issue in the Western world. Some claim that it had to do with people not seeing Jews as people of colour, and since they are recognised as white it is difficult to see why they would be subjected to oppression as other people (Alexander 1992; Gold 1996). If that was true, then my respondents would not have to "hide" their Jewish identities. Anti-Semitism is a problem that needs more attention than it has gotten. As Soifer (1991), Alexander (1992), and Gold (1996) puts it, it is important to infuse anti-Semitism into the anti-racism or anti-discriminatory agenda, in social work.

Of my own experiences, I cannot recall learning about anti-Semitism or the exposure of Jews when I studied social work. Social work that is supposed to be an advocate for those in need, and those who are discriminated against, social work and its education that promotes multiculturalism and rejects anti-racism. What happened with incorporating anti-Semitism, and other discriminations against religious backgrounds?

According to what has been infused now in recent years, in Sweden, anti-Semitism has been incorporated into some courses, however, these are taken from a historical perspective. Seeing it from a historical perspective could enable thoughts of "oh, how awful, good thing that it stayed in history". I insist, that anti-Semitism in all its grace needs more attention than it has gotten. The fact that my respondents claimed that politicians and people think that anti-Semitism is an outdated phenomenon, something that happened in WWII, shows that the educational level on anti-Semitism is low. Anti-Semitism, as seen throughout history, has always been up-to-date and it has always been a "fashionable" phenomenon. If Jews, alone, are going to be the ones standing against this phenomenon, where is our society heading

towards? Not only will the society neglect the fact that anti-Semitism exists, but they also violate Jews' rights to freely express their religion or identity without being hurt.

Anti-Semitism, and racism in general, should never be encouraged nor undermined since it is an oppressive act of power. The fact that this kind of phenomenon is passing by, in present days, without anyone taking clear or straight sanctions against it is worrisome.

If social workers do not stand up for the Jews, who will?

Paula Cáceres.

Reference List

- Alexander, E. (1992). Multiculturalism's Jewish Problem. *Academic Questions*, 5(4), pp. 63-68.
- Anthias, F. (1998). Evaluating 'Diaspora': Beyond Ethnicity? *Sociology*, 32(3), pp. 557-580.
- Baker Miller, J. (1991). Women and Power. In Jordan, J., Kaplan, A., Baker Miller, J, Stiver, I. & Surrey, J. (eds.) *Women's Growth in Connection*. New York: Guilford.
- Barker, R.L. (2003). *The Social Work Dictionary*. 5th ed., Washington DC: NASW Press.
- Barron, K. (1999). Ethics in Qualitative Social Research on Marginalized Groups. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 1(1), pp. 38-49.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Oslo: Universitets Forlaget.
- Boyarin, D. & Boyarin, J. (1993). Diaspora, Generation and the Ground of Jewish Identity. *Critical Inquiry*, 19(4), pp. 693-725.
- Braun, V. & Clark, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 77-101.
- Brubaker, R. (2005). The 'Diaspora' Diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), pp. 1-19.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. 3rd ed., Oxford: University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed., Oxford: University Press.
- Buckser, A. (2010). Jewish Identity and the Meaning of Community in Contemporary Denmark. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(4), pp. 712-734.
- Börjesson, M. & Rehn, A. (2009). *Makt*. Malmö: Liber.
- Castells, M. (2004). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Vol. 2, The Power of Identity*. 2nd ed., Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Charlton, J.I. (1998). *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Charmaz, K. & Henwood, K. (2008). Grounded Theory. In Willig, C. & Stainton-Rogers, W. (2008). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 240-259.
- Charon, J. M. (1995). *Symbolic Interactionism: an Introduction, an Interpretation, an Integration*. 5th ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Clifford, J. (1994). Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology*, 9(3), pp. 302-338.
- Cohen, R. (1997). *Global Diasporas: an Introduction*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Cooley, C. H. (1983). *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Dencik, L. (2009). Diasporans Dialektik: Om Konsten Att Vara Judisk i Den Svenska Moderniteten. *Socialvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 3(4), pp. 320-349.
- Dencik, L. (2003). Jewishness in Postmodernity: The Case of Sweden. *Research and Positions Papers of the Rappaport Center for Assimilation Research and Strengthening Jewish Vitality*. Vol. 10.
<http://www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=14249>
 [Accessed 2015-04-20]
- Dencik, L. & Marosi, K. (2000). *Judiskt liv I Sverige. Levnadsvanor och Attityder bland Medlemmarna i de Judiska Församlingarna i Göteborg och Stockholm*. Stockholm: Judiska Centralrådet.
- DePoy, E. & Gitlin, L.N. (2011). *Introduction to Research: Understanding and Applying Multiple Strategies*. 4th ed., Elsevier: Mosby.
- Dominelli, L. (2002). *Anti-oppressive Social Work Theory and Practice*. Basingtoke: Palgrave.
- Donin, C.H. (1985). *To be a Jew – A guide to Jewish Observance in Contemporary Life*. Stockholm: Hillel Förlaget.
- Eriksen, T.H. (1991). Nationalism versus Ethnicity. *Journal of Peace Research*, 28(3), pp. 263-278.
- Flick, U. (2014). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. 5th ed., SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Flick, U., Von Kardorff, E. & Steinke, I. (2004). *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogik för Förtryckta*. Falköping: Gummessons Tryckeri AB.
- Gans, H.J. (1979). Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic and Cultures in America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 2(1), pp. 1-20.
- Gitelman, Z. (2003). Becoming Jewish in Russia and Ukraine. In Gitelman, Z., Kosmin, B.A., Kovács, A. (2003). *New Jewish Identities: Contemporary Europe and Beyond*. Budapest: Central European University Press, pp. 105-137.
- Goffman, E (1998). *Jaget och Maskerna: En Studie i Vardagslivets Dramatik*. Stockholm: Nordstedts Akademiska Förlag.
- Gold, N. (1996). Putting Anti-Semitism on the Anti-Racism Agenda in North American Schools of Social Work. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 32(1), pp.77-89.
- Guba, E.G. (1981). Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology*, 29(2), pp. 75-91.

- Hall, S. (1996). The Question of Cultural Identity. In Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D., Thompson, K. (eds.). *An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Wiley: Blackwell, pp. 596-623.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In Rutherford, J. (eds.). *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hammarén, N. & Johansson, T. (2009). *Identitet*. Malmö: Liber.
- Hartman, H. & Hartman, M. (2011). Jewish Identity and the Secular Achievements of American Jewish Men and Women. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50(1), pp. 133-153.
- Johnson, A.G. (2000a). *Privilege, Power and Difference*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, A.G. (2000b). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology: a User's Guide to Sociological Language*. 2nd ed., Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kvale & Brinkmann (2009). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Layder, D. (1998). Towards Adaptive theory. In Layder, D. (eds.). *Sociological Practice – Linking Theory and Social Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., pp. 132-173.
- Levinger, L.J. (1936). *Anti-Semitism Yesterday and Tomorrow*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Liebman, C.S. (2003). Jewish Identity in Transition: Transformation or Attenuation? In Gitelman, Zvi Y., Kosmin, Barry A., Kovács, András (eds.). *New Jewish Identities: Contemporary Europe and Beyond*. Budapest: Central European University Press, pp. 342-350.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University Press.
- Meyerson, P-M. (2012). *Judiskt Liv I Europa 1786-1933: Integrationsprocess med Förhinder*. Stockholm: Dialogos Förlag.
- Miller, S. (2003). Changing Patterns of Jewish Identity among British Jews. In Gitelman, Zvi Y., Kosmin, Barry A., Kovács, András (eds.). *New Jewish Identities: Contemporary Europe and Beyond*. Budapest: Central European University Press, pp. 45-60.
- Miller, S., Schmool, M. & Lerman, A. (1996). *Social and Political Attitudes of British Jews: Some Key Findings of the JPR Survey*. London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.
- Phinney, J. (1996). Understanding Ethnic Diversity: The Role of Ethnic Identity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(2), pp. 143-152.
- Ryan, G.W. & Bernard, H.R. (2003). Techniques to Identify Themes. *Field Methods*, 15(1), pp. 85-109. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Safran, W. (1991). Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1), pp. 83-99.

Soifer, S. (1991). Infusing Content about Jews and About Anti-Semitism into the Curricula. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 27(2), pp. 156-167.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Identity: Studies in Social Psychology*. Cambridge: University Press.

Tew, J. (2006). Understanding Power and Powerlessness: Towards a Framework for Emancipatory Practice in Social Work. *Journal of Social Work*, 6(1), pp. 33-51.

Tölöyan, K. (1991). The Nation-State and Its Others: In Lieu of a Preface. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1), pp. 3-7.

Wahlbeck, Ö & Olsson, E. (2007). Diaspora – ett berest begrepp. In Lundqvist, C., Rabo, A., Sawyer, L., Wahlbeck, Ö. & Åkesson, L. (eds.) *Transnationella rum: Diaspora Migration och Gränsöverskridande Relationer*. Umeå: Boréa, pp. 43-68.

Webber, J. (2003). Notes Towards the Definition of “Jewish Culture” in Contemporary Europe. In Gitelman, Zvi Y., Kosmin, Barry A., Kovács, András (eds.), *New Jewish Identities: Contemporary Europe and Beyond*. Budapest: Central European University Press, pp. 318-340.

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society, Vol.1*. New York: Bedminster Press.

Åsbrink, E. (2012). *Och i Wienerwald Står Träden Kvar*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur

Internet Sources

Anti-Defamation League (ADL), (2006). *Confronting Anti-Semitism – Myths and Facts*. [Pdf] <http://www.adl.org/assets/pdf/education-outreach/CAS-Myths-and-Facts.pdf> [Accessed: 2015-02-23]

Cambridge Dictionaries Online (CDO), (2015). *Secular*. [Website] <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/secular> [Accessed: 2015-05-03]

Chabad (2005). *What Makes a Jew Jewish?* [Website] http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/45132/jewish/What-Makes-a-Jew-Jewish.htm [Accessed: 2015-04-08]

Chabad Stockholm (1993-2015). *Vad är en Mezuzah?* [Website] http://www.chabadstockholm.com/templates/articlecco_cdo/aid/172307/jewish/Mezuzah.htm [Accessed 2015-04-23]

Forum för Levande Historia (2015). *Ett “J” i Alla Tyska Judars Pass*. [Website] <http://www.levandehistoria.se/fakta-om-forintelsen/judeforfoljelserna-under-1930-talet/ett-j-i-alla-tyska-judars-pass> [Accessed: 2015-05-10]

- Göteborgs Stad (2015). *Inkomster – Medelinkomst*. [Website] <http://www4.goteborg.se/prod/G-info/statistik.nsf/> [Accessed: 2015-05-31]
- International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW), (2014). *Global Definition of Social Work*. [Website] <http://ifsw.org/policies/definition-of-social-work/> [Accessed: 2015-05-11]
- Jewish Virtual Library (2015). *Kishinev Massacre*. [Website] <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/History/Kishinev.html> [Accessed: 2015-05-10]
- Judiska Museet Stockholm (2015). *Judarnas Historia i Sverige*. [Slideshow] <http://www.judiska-museet.se/index.php/kronologi-judarnas-historia/> [Accessed: 2015-05-10]
- Judisk Krönika (2014). <http://www.webbkampanj.com/judiskkrönika/1403/> [Accessed: 2015-05-15]
- Red Cross (2015). *Specifikation över antalet räddade*. [Pdf] <http://www.redcross.se/om-oss/historik/vita-bussarna/?page=2#tabs> [Accessed: 2015-05-10]
- Riksdagen (1999/2000). *Erkännande av Nationella Minoriteter i Sverige (KU6)*. [Website] <http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Utskottens-dokument/Betankanden/Arenden/19992000/KU61/> [Accessed: 2015-03-03]
- Svenska Kommittén Mot Antisemitism (SKMA), (2013). *Antisemitism*. [Website] <http://skma.se/antisemitism/> [Accessed: 2015-02-25]
- Svenska Kommittén mot Antisemitism (SKMA), (2009). *Om Antisemitism. Orsaker, Utveckling, Motiv*. [Pdf] http://www.skma.se/filer/Om_antisemitism.pdf [Accessed 2015-05-10]

Appendix 1

Informed Consent

My name is Paula and I am contacting you since I am conducting a research project. The research project is part of my education in the International Master's program in Social Work at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

The research I am conducting is about Jewish identity and its effects of anti-Semitism. The purpose of the research is to understand how Jewish identities are constructed in Sweden and how anti-Semitism affects the construction. I plan to investigate this by interviewing people between the ages of 20-30 years who somehow identifies themselves as Jewish in Sweden.

I am intending to do one interview per person, of approximately 1-1.5 hours' length, where the subject of Jewish identity and anti-Semitism will be discussed. The interviews will be conducted in the university, alternative, that you yourself propose a place for the interview.

With your permission, I would like to record the interview. Recording facilitates the documentation of what is said during the interview and helps me in the continued work on the project. When analysing, I will anonymise all data that can be traced to you as an individual, such as names of people and places so that no one interviewed will be recognised. After the completion of the project, all the data such as recordings and notes will be destroyed. The data I collect will only be used in this project.

For my work to comply with the ethical requirements of good research, I will keep to the following principles

- Respondents have the right to decide whether to participate in the project, even after the interview is completed
- The data collected will be treated confidentially and will be stored in such a way that no unauthorised person can see nor reach them

Participation is entirely voluntary and you have the right to refrain from answering questions, and withdraw your participation during the time of work of this thesis without giving specific reasons and without any impact on your treatment/contact with me.

If you would like to participate please contact me no later than 22th March. You may also convey the information about the study to anyone who you think would be willing to participate in the study.

If you have any further questions you are more than welcome to contact me or my supervisor

Student's name

Paula Cáceres

Supervisor's name

Charlotte Melander

Appendix 2

Interview Questions (English)

Identity

Tell me a bit about yourself. Background, upbringing.

What do you see yourself mainly as? Why?

Do you have a Jewish identity?

- How do you maintain it?
- What does it mean to you?
- Is it an important part of your life?
- Would you pass it on to future children, grandchildren?

Is a person more Jewish the more “religious” s/he is?

Different settings

How do you present yourself in new/different settings? School, work, friends etc.

In which settings does your Jewish identity appear the most?

In which settings or situations does your Jewish identity become important?

Have you ever felt misplaced in a setting because of your Jewish identity?

Israel

What meaning does Israel have for you?

Does conflicts or other incidents in Israel affect you and your Jewish identity? How?

Anti-Semitism

How would you explain anti-Semitism in your own words?

- What do you think anti-Semitism is based on?
- How is anti-Semitism manifested?

What is your opinion about anti-Semitism in Sweden? Is it an issue?

Is your Jewish identity affected when there is anti-Semitism?

- Reinforces, weakens? Why?
- Does anti-Semitism affect the way you show your Jewish identity openly? If so, how?

Have you experienced anti-Semitism?

- If yes. What happened and what did you feel?
- If no. Who/where would you turn to if you experienced anti-Semitism? Why?

Would it be relevant to approach the Jewish community?

What would you feel if you or someone else in the Jewish community experiences anti-Semitism?

Do you think anti-Semitism will increase in Sweden?

If yes. Why and in what way?

If no. Why?

What would be your biggest fear when it comes to anti-Semitism?

Is there something you would like to add?

Appendix 3

Interview Questions (Swedish)

Identitet

Berätta lite om dig själv. Bakgrund, uppväxt.

Vad ser du dig främst som?

Har du en judisk identitet?

- Hur upprätthåller du den?
- Vad innebär den för dig?
- Är det en viktig del av ditt liv?
- Kan du tänka föra över din judiska identitet till barn och barnbarn?

Är en person mer judisk ju mer ”religiös” personen är?

Olika sammanhang

Hur framställer du dig själv i nya/olika kretsar och miljöer? Jobb, skola, kompisar etc.

I vilket sammanhang framträder din judiska identitet mest?

I vilka sammanhang blir den judiska identiteten viktig för dig?

Har du någon gång känt dig felplacerad/obekväm i en gemenskap pga av din judiska identitet?

Israel

Vilken betydelse har Israel för dig?

Hur påverkar händelser i Israel dig och din judiska identitet?

Antisemitism

Hur skulle du förklara antisemitism med egna ord?

- Vad baseras antisemitism på?
- Hur utspelar sig antisemitism?

Hur upplever du antisemitismen i Sverige? Är det ett problem?

Påverkas din judiska identitet när det blir aktuellt med antisemitism?

- Stärks eller försvagas identiteten? Varför?
- Påverkar antisemitism sättet du visar din judiska identitet öppet? Hur?

Har du blivit utsatt för antisemitism?

- Om ja. Vad hände och vad kände du?
- Om nej. Vem/vart skulle du vända dig till om du utsattes för antisemitism? Varför?

Blir det relevant att närma sig den judiska församlingen när antisemitism aktualiseras?

Vad skulle du känna om du eller någon in den Judiska kretsen utsattes för antisemitism?

Tror du att antisemitism kan/kommer eskalera?

Om ja. Varför och på vilket sätt?

Om nej. Varför?

Vad är din största rädsla när det kommer till antisemitism?

Har du något du vill tillägga?