# THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XXXIV : NUMBER 2 : DECEMBER 1992

CONTENTS



Editor: Judith Freedman

ISSN 0021-6534

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY Volume XXXIV Number 2 1992

# OBJECTS AND SPONSORSHIP OF THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

*The Jewish Journal of Sociology* was sponsored by the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress from its inception in 1959 until the end of 1980. Thereafter, from the first issue of 1981 (volume 23, no. 1), the Journal has been sponsored by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Limited, which is registered as an educational charity and has as its main purposes the encouragement of research in the sociology of the Jews and the publication of The Jewish Journal of Sociology. The objects of the Journal remain as stated in the Editorial of the first issue in 1959:

> 'This Journal has been brought into being in order to provide an international vehicle for serious writing on Jewish social affairs . . . Academically we address ourselves not only to sociologists, but to social scientists in general, to historians, to philosophers, and to students of comparative religion. . . . We should like to stress both that the Journal is editorially independent and that the opinions expressed by authors are their own responsibility.'

The founding Editor of the *JJS* was Morris Ginsberg, and the founding Managing Editor was Maurice Freedman. Morris Ginsberg, who had been Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics, died in 1970. Maurice Freedman, who had been Professor of Social Anthropology at the London School of Economics and later at the University of Oxford, succeeded to the title of Editor in 1971, when Dr Judith Freedman (who had been Assistant Editor since 1963) became Managing Editor. Maurice Freedman died in 1975; since then the Journal has been edited by Dr Judith Freedman.

*Applications for subscriptions* and enquiries regarding back numbers should be addressed to:

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY
187 GLOUCESTER PLACE
LONDON NW1 6BU
ENGLAND

TELEPHONE: 071 262 8939

# THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

**Volume XXXIV : Number 2 : December 1992**

CONTENTS



PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY, IN JUNE AND DECEMBER
by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd
(Published by the World Jewish Congress 1959–80)

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION FROM 1993
INSTITUTIONS: £16.00 (U.S. $30.00)
INDIVIDUALS: £12.00 (U.S. $23.00)
SINGLE COPIES: £6.00 (U.S. $12.00)

**Applications for subscriptions should be sent to The Jewish Journal of Sociology, 187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England. Telephone: 071 262 8939**

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY W. S. MANEY & SON LTD, LEEDS

# BOOKS REVIEWED

## NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Papers submitted to *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* should be addressed to the Editor at *187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England.* The papers must be original. They should not have been published previously, or be committed to publication elsewhere, in any language. When a paper has been accepted for publication, the author may not publish it elsewhere in any language, without the written consent of the Editor of the *JJS.*

Articles (please send at least two copies) should be typewritten on one side only and double-spaced with ample margins. Pages (including those containing illustrations, diagrams, or tables) should be numbered consecutively. All quotations should be within single inverted commas; quotation marks within quotations should be double inverted commas.

Notes should follow the style of this *Journal* and should be given at the end of the article in numerical sequence according to the order of their citation in the text.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

A. *Books*
Give author, title, place of publication, year, and page reference. Underline all titles of books.

B. *Articles*
Place titles of articles within single inverted commas. Underline the title of the book or journal in which the article appears.
In the case of a journal, cite numbers of volume and part, and year of publication.

PROOFS. An author making major revisions in proof will be required to bear the cost. Unless proofs are returned to the Editor promptly, author's corrections will not be incorporated.

OFFPRINTS. Each contributor receives twenty free offprints of his article. If there are two or more authors, the twenty offprints are shared between them.

# *STILLE ḤUPPAH* (QUIET MARRIAGE) AMONG JEWISH IMMIGRANTS IN BRITAIN

David Englander

*I*

MARRIAGES, if made in heaven, are registered on earth. Ever since the Reformation, the English government has been concerned to record and regulate the marital process. It has taken a position on the form and duration of marriage, the age and status of the contracting parties, and even the time and place of the wedding ceremony. Public interest in matrimony reflects normative and material considerations. The transmission of property was always a primary concern, and without proof of marriage, claims were difficult to establish and obligations difficult to enforce. In short, no record, no responsibility. Unmarried women could not easily claim maintenance from the natural father for the children of the union, who might become a charge upon the public purse if the mother could not provide for them.

The attempt to bring marriage under ecclesiastical control began in the twelfth century (possibly earlier, the chronology is contested) and won general acceptance in the early modern period. In Tudor and Stuart England, a church wedding was the norm — perhaps one of the few popular norms of which the secular authority approved.[1] The abolition of common law marriage took control a stage further. The Hardwick Marriage Act of 1753 made the due solemnization of marriage in church a necessary condition for the recognition of a valid union. In England, where the clergy acted as both celebrant and recorder, there was no provision for civil marriage until the passage of the Births and Deaths Registration Act of 1836, while divorce could be obtained only by a special Act of Parliament.

The involvement of the civil power in matrimonial matters, if in part motivated by material considerations, was also an expression of the norms and values of a Christian culture. In Victorian Britain, other faiths were suspect. Sir William Muir presented Islam as inferior and immoral, stating: 'Polygamy, divorce and slavery are maintained and perpetuated striking at the root of public morals, poisoning domestic

life, and disorganising society'. Englishwomen contemplating marriage with Hindus, Muslims, or others who professed a religion which tolerated polygyny or concubinage, were officially warned of the dangers to which they would be exposed.[2] Judaism was also said to be corrupting. The sacramental character of Christian marriage and the concomitant theory of its indissolubility were alien to Talmudic thought. The facility for Jews to divorce, which made Puritan Englishmen of the seventeenth century wary of admitting Jews to the rights of citizenship, continued to give cause for concern. Polygyny among European Jews generally ceased after an edict by Rabbi Gershom ben Judah (circa 965–1028) but Westermarck notes in 1891 that it persisted among Jews under Islam 'even to this day'. Minority practice differed in some other respects. Rabbinic law, for example, permitted Jews to marry within the degrees of consaguinity or affinity prohibited by the Christian canon — for instance, a man could lawfully marry his niece.[3]

The growth of liberty of conscience during the nineteenth century modified the marriage procedure without eliminating the habits and assumptions of its formation. Anomalies persisted. In Edwardian Britain, for example, it was the case that where one of the parties was resident in Scotland, the banns in respect of a Jewish marriage had nevertheless to be proclaimed in the parish church![4] Moreover, the imperial experience provided no preparation for the cultural and religious pluralism of a post-colonial order. As early as the 1930s, Hindu, Sikh, and Muslim immigrants, whose religion in relation to marriage and divorce was thought to be incompatible or at variance with British mores, were experiencing the kinds of difficulties which have since been identified as a significant social problem. Non-Christian minorities, desirous of expressing their identity and continuity, have had to revise their rituals and practices to comply with the laws and norms of the wider society.[5]

The settlement of large ethnic minorities, however, has not been a uniform process. The Jewish experience differed from that of non-Christian New Commonwealth immigrants in several respects. The newcomers from Eastern Europe were received into an established Anglo-Jewish community which was largely well-organized, well-heeled, and well-regarded. In the two-and-a-quarter centuries which separated their re-admission in England from the passage in 1882 of the Russian 'May Laws',[6] the Jews had prospered, acquired civil rights, and created an institutional framework for the regulation of majority-minority relations and the socialization of their co-religionists from the Pale. Asian immigrants, by contrast, have been received into communities which in terms of numbers, resources, and length of residence are markedly inferior. The seafarer settlers of South Shields and Cardiff who made up the 1,000-strong Muslim communities of inter-war Britain, for example, had neither the time nor the means to prepare for

the subsequent influx of immigrants from Pakistan. Sikhs from the Punjab were similarly circumstanced and likewise unable to develop communal support systems comparable with those of Anglo-Jewry.

Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe, then, took place under conditions in which cultural and religious conflicts were perhaps more manageable but still not rare. Jewish settlers, like later immigrants from the Indian sub-continent, came from an environment in which civil marriage and divorce were exceptional. Mielziner stated in a treatise of 1884 that Jewish law 'is still acknowledged as the rule and criterion of practical conduct . . . In those countries in which the law is adapted to the different forms of faith of the recognised religious bodies, and where consequently the Jews have also their own jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs, as is the case, for instance, in Russia, Poland and partially also in Austria, Hungary and other States, Jewish marriages are contracted and dissolved essentially solely in accordance with the ordinances of the Jewish Marriage Law'. In both Germany and the United States, the modernization of the marriage laws was an important source of cleavage between Progressive and Orthodox Jews.[7] In Britain, where Reform Judaism was at the time but a shadow of a shade, there was little disruption. Even so, the arrival of immigrants from Eastern Europe who followed Jewish law in regard to marriage and divorce created problems for an Orthodox establishment which sought to mediate relations between Anglo-Jewry and the state.[8] However, the ways in which those problems were tackled has not received much attention from historians.

The process of adjustment seemed to have occured fairly smoothly since Diaspora Jewry generally obeyed the Talmudic maxim that the law of the kingdom is the binding law. Immigrants, assisted by their Anglicized co-religionists, made the transition without a great deal of trauma. While in the Russian territories they prayed for the Tsar, in Whitechapel they prayed for the Queen.[9] On closer inspection, however, things were less simple. Rabbinical authorities, though respecting the law of the land in all matters affecting their relations with the general population, refused to surrender Jewish autonomy in religious or quasi-religious matters. Even where both parties submitted to the jurisdiction, the proceedings of a non-Jewish tribunal in matters of marriage and divorce were often held to be null and void within the community.[10] Over the course of the nineteenth century Anglo-Jewry, as Finestein and others have shown, had revised the concept of parallel jurisdictions and the role of the rabbi in relation to them. Rabbinic law was suspended rather than repudiated and rabbinic authority became concentrated in the Office of the Chief Rabbi. The Jewish law of marriage and divorce was deemed inapplicable where at variance with the law of the land. As the rabbi ceased to exercise judicial authority, so his role was transformed. Independence, scholarship, and knowledge

of Jewish law were not required of the Anglo-Jewish minister, who became a mere functionary modelled upon the English clergyman.[11]

However, the immigrant rabbi, reared in a traditional Eastern European environment, was not willing to abandon his judicial functions and to act purely as the spiritual guide and adviser of his congregation. Rabbi Rabinowitz of Kovno Synagogue (Vine Court, Whitechapel), for example, held no brief for bigamists but in a prosecution of 1925 'flatly refused to attend any Police Court to give evidence in a case, stating that it was against his principles as a Jewish Rabbi to do so, and that if he was compelled to go to the Court he would refuse to give evidence on Oath'. Significantly, it was a member of the Beth Din, the court of the Chief Rabbi, who agreed to accept service of the subpoena and to attend as directed.[12] Jewish adjustment was, then, a negotiated process in which the rabbinical norms were modified but not abandoned.

Has the Jewish experience a wider relevance? Is the process by which one religious minority came to terms with the law of the land useful for others who continue to struggle for a new identity in a multi-faith society? The role of Anglo-Jewry in the secularization of the state has been identified by some scholars as significant. Malise Ruthven tells us that Jewish integration transformed the character of the state and the place of Christianity within it, while Sheila Patterson has said that the evolution of the Jewish community in Britain 'indicates possible lines of development for more recent immigrant groups'.[13] Such views, alas, raise expectations which are doomed to disappointment. Jewish integration, as I hope to show, was *sui generis*, a great triumph in its way, but not a model for simple replication.

## *II*

The wedding ceremony of the Goldstones was conducted in Tschernitz in Poland in 1889 according to the Jewish rites; it was held in a private house. The marriage pronouncement was proclaimed according to the Talmudic formula. Wine was drunk, benedictions said, and at the end of the ceremony a glass was crushed underfoot by the bridegroom in the traditional manner. In the traditional manner, also, the bride received a silver coin in lieu of the ring which the groom was too poor to provide. The couple signed the *ketubbah* (marriage contract), which was handed to the bride. The newly-weds then left for England and settled in Leeds. The union was not happy and eventually in 1921 Israel Goldstone brought a suit for jactitation of marriage. In what the London *Evening Standard* described as 'one of the most unusual cases in the history of the Divorce Court', the petitioner denied that any Polish wedding had taken place; claimed that he had never set eyes on the respondent until he met her in Germany; that he was a boy of 14 at

the time of the alleged marriage; and that the respondent's contrary assertions were 'a ridiculous fabrication'.[14] The President, the Right Honourable Sir Henry Duke, dismissed the petition: he was satisfied that the petitioner had told a pack of lies and that the marriage, having been properly solemnized, remained a good and valid one.[15]

The evidence presented in *Goldstone v. Goldstone* appeared to raise important and disturbing issues about the status of marriage among Jews of foreign origin.[16] According to the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, comparable cases were numerous. Police files bulged with examples of marriages among parties professing the Jewish faith which did not comply with the law of the land. The Marriages and Registration Acts allowed Jews to contract marriages according to their usages provided notice had been given to the Registrar and his certificate obtained. But, as the Goldstone case so strikingly revealed, civil registration was not a Jewish ecclesiastical requirement. Dayan Feldman of the London Beth Din said so, as did Rabbi Hurwitz, another expert witness, who was quite emphatic that the validity of a Jewish religious marriage was not affected by non-registration.[17] The difficulties thus created were by no means unfamiliar either to the Jewish ecclesiastical authorities or to the civil power.

Anglo-Jewry never developed corporate self-governing institutions comparable with those of the European Diaspora. The voluntarist character of Jewish communal organization in the English-speaking world was in striking contrast with the state-enforced group autonomy which predominated in Continental Europe and elsewhere. In Britain, communal discipline was enforced through a network of lay and ecclesiastical hierarchies under the control of a highly acculturated haute bourgeoisie. The Rothschilds, Goldsmids, Mocattas, Montefiores, and other élite families supplied the leadership of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Board of Guardians, controlled the United Synagogue, and gave support and direction to the Office of the Chief Rabbi. It was this aristocracy of finance who selected the incumbent, determined his salary, and supported his decisions within the synagogues. Bill Williams has commented: 'The Chief Rabbinate was as much the ecclesiastical arm of the plutocracy, as the President of the Board of Deputies was its secular representative'.[18] The civil authority, though not directly involved in the management of the community, recognised the Board of Deputies as the essential intermediary between the state and the Jewish minority; the primacy of the Chief Rabbi owed much to state support, especially in the matter of the registration of marriages and divorces.

The Marriage Act and the Registration Act of 1836 were intended to afford civil registration to congregations of every religious denomination in the celebration of their marriages without interference by the state. This principle, however, was abandoned in the case of the Jews.

Whereas every dissenting Protestant congregation in England could have itself registered on application by members of its own communion or chapel for the celebration of marriages, Jews were required to marry according to their 'usages'. Marriages so celebrated were to be superintended by the secretary of a synagogue who, in his capacity as registrar acting on behalf of the state, was required to certify the observance of religious usages and rites.[19] The appointment of the marriage secretary, however, relied upon the recommendation of the President of the Board of Deputies. It was under his signature that any secretary of a synagogue was made a registrar of Jewish marriages. In practice this meant that authority to register marriages was conferred only upon officers of synagogues who were approved by the Chief Rabbi, since the President was bound by the constitution of the Board to consult the Chief Rabbi on all religious matters. Marriage secretaries proposed by non-Orthodox congregations were disadvantaged; for it was the status of the synagogue rather than the fitness of its officers that was at issue. David Salomons observed: 'The position assumed by the state has been of such a mixed character that it enabled the appointment of the registrar secretary to be so managed as to become an especial element of religious discipline. In fact the [Marriage] Acts have been so administered as to make the adhesion of synagogues to an *orthodox* Jewish *ecclesiastical standard* the very *substance* and *condition* of registration'.[20] Similar criticisms, reported by the Royal Commission on the Laws of Marriage, had little effect. The state, though willing to grant Jewish separatists facilities for obtaining recognition of their marriage secretaries similar to those which were given to other congregations of Nonconformists, continued to discriminate in favour of the Chief Rabbi and of those who acknowledged his spiritual authority.[21] Dissident synagogues, denied recognition as bona fide Jewish places of worship, found the Chief Rabbi's embargo a formidable obstacle to their legitimacy. But native Anglo-Jewry, which was largely middle-class in occupation and outlook, felt neither the need nor the inclination to liberalize the faith and disrupt an Orthodox establishment which in social terms performed a role comparable to that of its Anglican analogue.[22]

The state acknowledged the authority of the Chief Rabbi and he acknowledged the supremacy of the state; both parties benefited from the special relationship thus created. The Jewish ecclesiastical authorities received preferential treatment from ministers of state and from officials who valued their advice and approved of the loyal and responsible manner with which it was tendered. Questions concerning the status of marriage or the validity of a divorce, particularly among Jews of foreign extraction, were by arrangement referred to the Chief Rabbi and his Court.[23] The Registrar-General, the police, and the civil courts were pleased to accept rabbinical guidance in these matters.

Indeed, Jewish litigants in the civil courts were often advised to seek the prior adjudication of the Beth Din. The eminent Anglo-Jewish rabbis thus had a role in the governing process as well as opportunities to influence public policy and to diminish friction between observant Jews and the secular authority. The Chief Rabbi's claim to represent all sections of the Jewish community was, however, contested — and not only by the comparatively small number of British Reform Jews. Immigrants from Eastern Europe included large numbers who found the Anglo-Jewish ministry respectable and gentleman-like but wanting in spiritual warmth, enthusiasm, and religious learning. The desire for a more satisfying form of worship found expression in the proliferation of separatist synagogues with their own rabbis and alternative *shehitah* (ritual slaughter of meat and poultry for food consumption) facilities. Moreover, it was not only the faith of the ghetto but also its customs which were transplanted in Whitechapel.

In those parts of Eastern Europe from which most immigrants originated, the marriage ceremony was performed in a private house, possibly (but not necessarily) in the presence of a rabbi or other minister of religion. The service was short, the ritual attenuated. The minimal requirement of a valid marriage ceremony was that the bridegroom place a ring on the finger of his bride in the presence of two adult reputable Jewish male witnesses while reciting in Hebrew 'Behold thou art consecrated unto me according to the law of Moses and Israel'. The *ketubbah* (marriage contract) was signed by the parties but not put on record.[24] Not all Jewish marriages, though, were hole-and-corner affairs. Custom and practice varied. In Kovno, for example, there was much display: couples were married in the open-air before the eyes of the whole community 'as a sign that their children should be as many as the stars in the sky'. Then as now, however, elaborate Jewish weddings were expensive and synagogue ceremonies costly. Marriage solemnized in a private house according to Jewish ritual suited the needs of poor couples living under rabbinic jurisdiction.[25]

Mass migration from Eastern Europe changed all that. In the quarter of a century after 1881, about two million Jews left for the United States, Canada, the Argentine, South Africa, and France, while some 100,000 settled in Britain.[26] Many came from unstable domestic backgrounds. Although the character and composition of the migrant population is under-researched, it seems reasonable to suppose that matrimonial difficulties were extensive among the new arrivals. At the close of the nineteenth century, the Russian Jews in the Pale of Settlement had a divorce rate which was much higher than that of non-Jews. The Russian census for 1897 not only disclosed that Jews were more likely than other religious or ethnic groups to divorce but also that those Jews who lived in large cities had a divorce rate higher

than that of their co-religionists in towns and rural communities. The sources of marital breakdowns were various. Over-population, under-employment, poverty, and economic marginality, all could disrupt family life. State schools could also endanger Jewish tradition: compulsory education, it was argued, disturbed faith and family. Girls, exposed to secular learning, were said to be better informed than their husbands whose education had been largely limited to religious learning. 'The result of these unhealthy conditions', said a contemporary social investigator, 'is seen in the numerous unhappy marriages and dissolutions of marriages among the Galician Jews'.[27]

The process of emigration further disrupted family cohesion. Husbands usually made their way alone. Wives and children, if sent for, arrived after lodgings and employment had been secured. In too many cases, however, emigration proved preparatory to desertion. As with the Protestant refugees of an earlier period, removal to England enabled emigrants to escape from domestic difficulties. New liaisons might be entered into and old ones concealed. The uprooted from Poland and Russia, however, failed to develop a system of trans-Continental communal controls comparable with those of the Stranger churches of sixteenth-century London.[28] Communications between London and Eastern Europe were continuous but ineffective. The pressure of numbers and the absence of sanctions made it impossible for the British rabbinate to enforce marital obligations on spouses — usually men — who were determined to renounce their vows. Abandoned wives (*'agunot*) faced enormous hardship; for in the absence of a bill of divorcement, which only the husband could supply, they could not remarry. Moreover, death did not automatically bring release, since the wife might never learn of the demise of an absent spouse. For many such women, life was often not worth the living. 'The columns of the East European press', writes Lloyd Gartner, 'were replete with pathetic appeals from *'agunot* and their families and from local rabbis pleading for news of the whereabouts of husbands who had been gone anywhere from two to fifteen years'.[29] The difficulties thus created were considerable. Deserted wives and their offspring were heavy case-loads for the principal Jewish relief agencies.[30]

The situation was further exacerbated by the large number of irregular marriages which were allegedly solemnized by irresponsible immigrant rabbis who knew little of civil registration and cared even less. Rabbis who sanctioned marriages and divorces without the Chief Rabbi's authority, though acting entirely within the *halakha* (Jewish law), antagonized the Jewish establishment. 'For many years past', said D. L. Alexander of the Board of Deputies in 1910, 'these foreign rabbis have been a constant source of trouble'.[31] Clearly, these men not only continued to regulate the marital affairs of immigrants who came from their own native village or region, but also performed a service for

those Jewish couples who could not satisfy all the formal requirements of the civil law. Their proceedings, however, were considered to be nothing less than a philanderer's charter: in the absence of registration, the difficulty of proving the existence and validity of such marriages made it all too easy for unscrupulous husbands to desert their wives and children. But there was a darker aspect to these unions. Irregular marriages made women vulnerable to the traffickers in white slavery. The gullible poor, tempted by the promise of marriage, fell easy victims to the traders in commercial vice. Innocent dupes, married to procurers, were taken from their homes and forced to work in brothels. Most were involuntary participants, but not all. Where parents were too poor to care a *stille ḥuppah* (literally, 'quiet marriage') enabled daughters to be sold into prostitution and the transaction concealed.[32]

The United Synagogue considered the matter as one of 'the gravest importance'. These marriages, said a report of 1877, were largely confined to the immigrant poor and to that 'considerable number of Jewish persons holding no communion with the established synagogues'. The class of persons most affected, it added, were 'satisfied and contented with the services of any travelling hawker, whose abilities enable him to copy out the *ketubbah*, and to read the marriage service'. Their actions were considered an affront to the authority of the Chief Rabbi, a stain on the character of the community, and a personal disaster for the parties concerned. A scheme to make synagogue wedding fees less expensive was introduced and measures taken to caution the poor against the probably serious consequences of 'quiet' unions. East Enders, in particular, were reminded that marriages which were celebrated by unlicensed persons without legal notice of registration were by the laws of England null and void; that women entering into these so-called marriages had no legal claim for support on their husbands; and that children born of such marriages were illegitimate in the eyes of the civil law.[33]

The extent of *stille ḥuppah* is difficult to gauge. Returns collected by the Registrar-General record Jewish marriages which were solemnized and reported in the approved manner. The steady increase in registered marriages in the generation before the First World War was of interest on the grounds of both number and proportion. In 1906, the proportion of marriages recorded by synagogue secretaries accounted for 39.5 per thousand of all marriages; and since the parties were required to sign their name, marriage registers supplied an indirect measure of educational attainment.[34] Jewish marriage statistics, in fact, tell us about illiteracy rather than irregularity.[35] Nevertheless, *stille ḥuppah* was thought to be significant. In a valuable paper read to the Royal Statistical Society in 1905, Rosenbaum, the demographer, concluded that despite the recent efforts of the Board of Deputies and of the United Synagogue to bring synagogue fees within reach of the

immigrant poor, 'these marriages continue to be common especially in the case of re-marriages'. The authorities were also certain that illicit marriages were widespread. Police reports to the Home Office stated that such cases were 'not infrequent', 'many', and in fact 'considerable'. 'It is not uncommon among East End Jews even today to go through a form of religious ceremony in a private house and receive a printed certificate for a marriage which apparently can be annulled at any time', claimed the Metropolitan Police Commissioner in 1921.[36]

## *III*

'That wife-desertion is made easy is the real evil of the *stille ḥuppah*', wrote the chairman of the Law and Parliamentary Committee of the Board of Deputies. The want of civil registration left the Jewish wife without any legal protection for herself or her children. The remedies, though, were by no means simple. It was, in theory, possible to pursue wife-deserters under the Vagrancy Act of 1823; on conviction, these men became liable to fines, imprisonment, and corporal punishment. The provisions of the Act however, could be enforced only if the deserted wife was denied communal assistance and so became chargeable to the rates. Those who looked to legislation rather than to the courts for redress also faced difficulties. A measure which invalidated Jewish irregular marriages and made it a felony to take part in their celebration, would cause enormous hardship and injustice to the immigrant minority and do nothing to diminish the evil complained of. Quite the contrary: a declaration that such a ceremony could not constitute a legally-binding marriage, was thought likely to encourage rather than prevent desertion. The same objection applied to legislation which made it a criminal offence to participate or assist in a ceremony of *stille ḥuppah* without formally declaring it to be invalid. H. S. Q. Henriques stated: 'It is obvious that the result of such an enactment would necessarily be to deter all persons from coming forward as witnesses and so destroy the means by which the matrimonial obligation can be enforced'.[37] Rabbis who refused to acknowledge the exclusive power of the Chief Rabbi in the authorization of marriages, were more than a source of scandal and embarrassment, however. The Anglo-Jewish élite feared the influence of their actions upon the delicate balance between the civil power and Judaism.

During Queen Victoria's reign the status of the Jews, which previously had been fixed by the courts rather than the legislature, came to be defined by statute. The well-organized minority responded with little anguish and much success. Privileges and exemptions were secured to protect the faith on the understanding that Jewish law would always be administered in accordance with the law of the land. The

institution of civil divorce, following the passage of the Divorce Act of 1857, brought strenuous protests from Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler in defence of the right of the Jewish ecclesiastical authorities to supervise marriage and divorce without the intervention of the state. But when, in 1866, Beth Din divorces were not recognized by the Registrar-General, the Chief Rabbi ceased to register a Jewish divorce unless and until the marriage previously contracted had been annulled or dissolved by the civil courts.

Unsupervised foreign rabbis, who continued to solemnize marriages without due certification or licence, and to grant Jewish divorces not preceded by a civil dissolution, posed a threat to the standing of Anglo-Jewry and to the pretensions of its leaders.[38] These rabbis, the Registrar-General was informed, 'do not realise that their action involves great hardship, as neither party is enabled, according to the law of England, to re-marry after a mere religious divorce, and as a result it often happens that they either go through a form of irregular marriage or simply cohabit without even a marriage ceremony'.[39] The women and children of such brittle unions, it was claimed, all too often became dependent on charity. In these circumstances, lay and ecclesiastical leaders had no alternative but to summon the intervention of the civil power in support of their own authority. In the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the First World War, the Jewish lobby was active in pressing for legislation to outlaw these alleged evil irregularities. The Board of Deputies and the Chief Rabbi, however, were not the only ones who had serious difficulties.

The civil authorities seemed equally powerless. The whole question of marriage between foreigners in England according to their own religious rites and without observance of the requirements of English law had, in fact, been raised in sensational form by the Quilliam case of 1905. It involved a Lancashire woman who married a Muslim, Mohammed Ben Beilkhassen, and who, it was reported, was kidnapped by her husband and carried forcibly into the interior of Morocco to prevent her return to England. The marriage, which took place in the Liverpool Mosque, was solemnized by Mr Quilliam, a convert to Islam, acting in his capacity as a 'sheik'. Quilliam, a solicitor by profession, had given full notice that the ceremony was not, and did not purport to be, a marriage according to the law of England. The Director of Public Prosecutions, whose advice had been sought by the Home Office, concluded that since the ceremony did not constitute a marriage, no offence had been committed and that, regretfully, there were no grounds for an indictment against the solicitor.[40] Unless the law was amended to make these private celebrations a felony, there was little to be done. On this, Anglo-Jewry was divided. Proposals to outlaw all unions not approved by the Chief Rabbinate had been condemned by the *Jewish Chronicle* of 18 March 1892 as an outrageous interference

with fundamental freedoms.[41] And there the matter might have rested but for disruptive effects of the First World War.

## *IV*

War made the problem accute. Its influence upon family life and personal relations was reflected in the rapid growth of soldier-marriages. In some parts of the country the demand for matrimony was readily satisfied. In England, soldiers on furlough could be married in church without the proclamation of banns, by special licence from the Archbishop of Canterbury. In Scotland there was no such provision: ministers and registrars had no power to dispense with the ecclesiastical preliminaries, or with the notice published for seven days on the registrar's board, as a necessary condition of regular marriage. Soldiers with only a few days' leave and eager to wed were in consequence prone to contract an irregular marriage. The startling increase in such unions led to an outcry from the Scottish clergy, who declared that regularization 'might imbue men and women with the sanctity of marriage, remove or reduce the causes of divorce, and arrest the swelling tide of derelicts from Church influence'.[42] Measures were also required to prevent Allied servicemen in Britain from entering into bigamous unions, while the arrival of women army auxiliaries in France led to renewed concern about the arrangements for the solemnization of marriages overseas.[43]

The war also raised matrimonial difficulties among foreign Jews; these problems were primarily political in character and arose directly out of the process of internment and deportation. Between 1914 and 1918, 20,000 aliens were deported and 32,000 were interned. Most of them were males and some of them were married men. Many were Jews. For their families, the war was a disaster: large numbers of women were made destitute by the internment of their husbands and the discrimination of employers and landlords. Some 4,000 German internees had British-born wives for whom special provision was required, for both their safety and their upkeep. Denied maintenance by the German government, these women and their children subsisted on poor law relief.

Moreover, the disruptive effects of the conflict were not confined to enemy aliens but also affected the family life of non-naturalized Russian Jews. The Jewish immigrants from Russia who lived in the East End of London were ill-disposed towards any cause which involved the defence of the law of the Tsars and resisted enlistment in the Allied armies. Having failed with persuasion, the government resorted to coercion. The Anglo-Russian Military Convention of 1917 led to the 'voluntary repatriation' of some and to the deportation of others. In all, 7,500 Jewish immigrants elected to return to Russia

under the terms of the Convention rather than serve in the British Army. The number who actually sailed, though smaller, was considerable. The want of transport, however, compelled the families of these 'Conventionists' to remain behind. The plight of divided families exacerbated the growing antagonism between the government and the East End. The upsurge of immigrant marriages, in the wake of the Anglo-Russian agreement, was viewed in Whitehall as an act of protest. Marriage, it was argued, had been politicized by the anti-war party among the immigrants 'to swell the agitation about the separation of wives and families and to claim separation allowances here'. If so, it did no good. Wives and dependents languished on relief in Whitechapel; children were embarrassed by the absence of their fathers; and mothers were apprehensive and uncertain.[44] At the close of the war, British-born wives and children of interned or repatriated aliens in receipt of assistance numbered 9,029 persons; and there were 2,107 dependents of Russians in similar circumstances.[45] The condition of these people, however, did more than reflect the disruptive effects of the war. The existing anti-alien agitation made marital relations, regular and irregular, a subject for scrutiny and investigation.

## *V*

Until the passage of the Aliens Act of 1905, there had been comparatively few points of contact between the police and the Jewish minority. Jews were generally sober and peaceable and were under-represented in the prison population. Jewish criminality, if not negligible, was not unmanageable. Prostitution, gambling, and receiving were the offences with which the immigrant community was most readily associated. Crimes of violence were exceptional; policemen were not at risk in the ghetto. Police involvement with the Jewish community was affected as much by administrative arrangements as by considerations of crime. The naturalization process, which required the police to test the literacy and moral worth of applicants for British citizenship, sometimes gave rise to claims of discrimination and police prejudice.[46] For the rest, police interventions arose in cases of communal conflict with the native Gentile population and with well-established minorities like the Irish.[47]

Language was a major problem. 'Everybody is gabbling in an unknown tongue', wrote the unfortunate who had been assigned by Charles Booth to interview the street sellers of Petticoat Lane.[48] Consternation and conflict were unavoidable where English was neither spoken nor understood. A Polish girl who got lost and became confused was taken by the police to an asylum for the insane! A rabbi who went to a register office to make enquiries was married by mistake and had to secure an annulment![49] It was all very trying. From the

point of view of law enforcement, though, it was more than that. Effective policing was impossible where the people spoke little English and the police spoke nothing else. The want of Yiddish was not just a bar to routine police administration; it also impeded the investigation of political deviants. Superintendent Mulvaney, head of Whitechapel Division, stated in 1904: 'Bills and circulars in this language are distributed and posted all over the division, but police know nothing of their purport unless an interpreter is employed to translate them. As it is known that a number of these people are members of Continental Revolutionary Societies it would be very desirable to have members of the Service who could speak this language'. The Home Office agreed. It was decided to proceed with a modest scheme of instruction and to encourage individual effort by presenting prizes and small gratuities to police officers who obtained a certificate of proficiency. The aim was to have three or four Yiddish-speaking policemen readily available in the Whitechapel division.[50] However, the Metropolitan Police, unlike its American counterpart, did not seek Jewish recruits; but the under-recruitment of Jews had as much to do with the attitudes of Anglo-Jewry as with the culture of the police. Police employment, then as now, offered no special facilities for Sabbath observance and was frowned upon especially by the immigrant population which equated men in uniform with coercion and oppression.[51] Ambitious parents directed their children elsewhere. The Jewish policeman, like the Jewish shoe-black, largely remains a curiosity.

The First World War marked a watershed in the relations between the immigrant minority and the state. The system of internal migration controls, which had its origins in the procedures governing denization and naturalization, was developed by the Aliens Act of 1905 and considerably extended after 1914. Aliens were henceforth required to be registered with the police, restricted to specified areas, denied the right to enter or leave the country, and liable to deportation. These measures, though not directed specifically against Jews, struck hard at a community with an overwhelming preponderance of immigrants from Eastern Europe. The Aliens Restrictions (Amendment) Act of 1919 made the situation more precarious. Previous restrictions were consolidated and further controls imposed. Aliens in consequence were not allowed to serve on juries and were forbidden on pain of punishment to promote industrial unrest. In 1920 an Order in Council extended the Home Secretary's powers to deport, on his own initiative, any alien whose presence was deemed not to be 'conducive to the public good'.

During the war, and in its immediate aftermath, the alien population was perceived as a threat to national security and public order. Antagonisms between native and immigrant populations, intensified by the pressures of total war, led to civil commotion, agitation, and

unrest. Demands for more stringent supervision proved irresistible. Immigrant Jews found themselves subject to registration, enumeration, classification, and continual observation by the police and intelligence services. Their movements were monitored, their circumstances scrutinized, their opinions recorded, and their activities analysed. Special Branch opened fresh files on 'Jewish revolutionary matters' and the Home Office through the police established a window into the East London ghetto. Police officers with a command of Yiddish were in great demand. Sergeant Albers, of Special Branch, combed the Yiddish-language press with all the assiduity of a doctoral candidate. P. C. Greenberg developed the art of participant-observation; he attended in plain clothes various meetings, and posed as an activist, committing the speeches and declarations of political dissidents to memory 'as any attempt to take shorthand or other notes would have brought my immediate ejectment'.[52]

There was little privacy: police were everywhere. Immigrant minorities were harassed and oppressed. 'We have the police continually calling on us to see that we have not gone away', complained the British-born wife of an internee who resented the strict scrutiny of her every movement.[53] The end of hostilities brought no relief. The upsurge in anti-alienism in the post-war period was accompanied by expulsions of enemy aliens, many of them Jewish tailors who had spent the war feverishly engaged in the production of uniforms for British soldiers. The net of orders and restrictions in which those who were not naturalized were entrapped was more tightly drawn. Jews who failed to register a change of address made themselves liable to deportation. Those convicted of a minor offence might be expelled on the say-so of a magistrate. There was no right of appeal. The mere fact of conviction was sufficient for the Home Office to proceed, even if the court had not recommended deportation. Political activists were particularly vulnerable, but even harmless individuals who had lived in Britain for many years were at risk.[54]

Marital status and the verification of that status were critical features of the investigative process. Aliens, when registering with the police, were required to state when and where they had been married and to provide details of any children arising from the union. The reasons were twofold. Marital status not only affected nationality and therefore the rights of the individual; it also influenced standards of conduct and was thus an important part of the character test which was used to separate the desirable from the undesirable alien. During the war, the Registrar-General and the ecclesiastical authorities were persuaded to collaborate with the Home Office in developing procedures to register changes in the marital status of the alien population. Inter-departmental measures to prevent undesirable alien women from obtaining British nationality through marriage were revived during the

1920s and are said to be still operative.[55] Immigrants who failed to supply full and accurate particulars were deemed to have committed a criminal offence. Many did so. Eastern European Jews who married or divorced without civil notice or ceremony were particularly vulnerable. Deborah Hoffman, an unwitting offender who had given incorrect details of her status, was more fortunate than most. This twice-widowed mother of six children, who had come to London shortly before the war, was allowed to amend her registration without prosecution on the understanding that she would leave for Poland and not return. Faiga Ruchla Kaisman, a Belgian war refugee, who arrived in the United Kingdom in August 1914, and set up home with a non-naturalized Russian Jew, was likewise allowed to leave the country after the relationship had ceased; police investigation revealed that the offender, a cap-maker by trade who was 16 years old when she came to London, had falsely registered herself as the wife of Israel Stiglitz with whom she had lived for two years until parental pressure forced their separation.[56]

More shocking to the authorities were those cases where, for want of evidence, offenders escaped scot free. Berek Moscovitch, having contracted a Jewish marriage in Lodz with a woman by whom he had ten children and a second marriage in Stepney, was convicted of bigamy, but succeded in his appeal against conviction because no expert witness was available to testify as to the validity of the *stille ḥuppah* under Russian law.[57] The want of documentary proof similarly allowed Gedalie Turkisch to escape conviction. Turkisch, a tailor's presser, was a brute who beat his wife and neglected his children. He was married in Poland in 1907 and came to England with his wife and two children and fathered a child on another woman, before deserting them also for marriage with a third unfortunate. Yet the police were powerless. His registered wife, whom he had married in a Cracow synagogue and divorced by private ceremony, had lost her *ketubbah*. It was therefore difficult to prove that he had committed bigamy. The Secretary of the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women described him as 'a most unsatisfactory character'. The police agreed. Turkisch was recommended for deportation as an undesirable alien.[58] Morris Shapiro, by contrast, was recommended for trial. A cabinet-maker of sorts, he had married Annie Shaimsom and come with her to East London from Kovno in 1913. They had two children. In 1916 he joined the army, but shortly after demobilization, he deserted his family and burned his marriage contract. 'Now you have no proof for ever that I was married to you', he told his distraught wife. On 6 September 1925, Shapiro married Rachael Goldberg at Fieldgate Street Synagogue. Three months later, he was arraigned at the Old Bailey; the court upheld the first wife's testimony and he was sentenced to six months for bigamy.[59]

Of course, not all unsavoury characters were bigamists. Harris Sallison and Annie Applestein, who combined brothel-keeping with foster-parenting, were in fact properly married in Stepney Green Synagogue in 1919. Sallison, a tailor's presser, had come to England from Odessa in 1904, and before his marriage had lived with another woman who had been falsely registered as his wife. For the magistrate that was enough. Sallison was sentenced to two months' hard labour with a rcommendation for his expulsion. Lewis Dragaloff, a hairdresser, who came from Starabuk in Russia and served with the South Wales Borderers during the war, was also no bigamist. He went through a Jewish form of marriage with a Mrs Ostrovitch, a mother of five who had left her husband many years earlier, and set up home with her. Nothing was known against them other than that Mrs Ostrovitch, who came from Riga to England as a five-year-old, had registered in the name of Dragaloff. For the police this was proof positive 'that these people are of low moral character'. The couple were in consequence opposed in their attempt to re-open as a restaurant premises which had been formerly occupied by a Turkish brothel-keeper. Inspector Norton noted: 'There is not the slightest doubt that if they are allowed to re-open No. 32 Leman Street as a place of public resort it will soon become a resort of undesirable aliens, obnoxious to the residents, and a nuisance to the Police'. Superintendent Mackay agreed and commented: 'Those filthy holes require stern treatment'.[60]

Marriages of convenience were also a cause for concern; the connection between 'mock-marriages' and the trade in vice was a long-standing one which pre-dated the war. The Aliens Act of 1919 addressed the problem but offered no solution. The acquisition of British nationality through a convenience marriage enabled women of ill-fame to avoid deportation and therefore provoked the police. None more so than Esther Fourer, a Polish Jewess and a prostitute, who was convicted of soliciting and recommended for deportation. In September 1920, she had gone through a Jewish form of marriage to a Russian Jew who was awaiting deportation for desertion from the army. Arrangements for her deportation involved some delay; and during the interval she was legally married at Whitechapel Register Office to a British subject, and could not then be deported. The Commissioner of Police was furious. Something had to be done. Partners were allegedly exchanged like picture cards in a school playground. Police were defied, immorality unchecked. He told the Home Office that irregular marriages were the cause of all the trouble: 'In this country it cannot be said that any valid reason exists for marriages of this description, and it can scarcely be said to be of public advantage that they should be tolerated'.[61] Home Office officials agreed. One of them stated: 'The particulars given by the Commissioner indicate that many Jews are quite acute enough to play fast and loose with their religious marriages

on occasion'.[62] The Fourer case coinciding with the disclosures in the Goldstone jactitation suit made action imperative and legislation to suppress the mischief was drafted within a matter of weeks. Under the terms of the Jewish Marriages Bill, the celebration of irregular marriages among Jews became a felony. Those who unlawfully solemnized these marriages were henceforth liable to the same penalties as those celebrating irregular marriages among the general population. However, the process of consultation with the Jewish community proved unexpectedly difficult.

Now it was true that, as the Quilliam case had shown, no offence was committed if the ceremony did not purport to constitute a marriage according to the law of England. The Quilliam case, however, concerned a Muslim marriage. Jews were viewed differently. The authorities considered that since the law recognized Jewish marriages, Jewish marriages ought to recognize the law. The Registrar-General, to whom the matter was referred, had no doubt that the celebration of a *stille ḥuppah* ought to be made a criminal offence.[63] The Home Office also could see no reason why Jewish irregular marriages should continue to be tolerated. Communal spokesmen, it was concluded, ought to be pressed 'to explain what grounds there are either in the public interest or in the interest of Judaism for continuing to allow Jews knowingly and wilfully to solemnize invalid marriages with impunity when members of other religious bodies are liable to punishment for doing the same thing'.[64]

The Jewish community, however, was far from enthusiastic about proposals which were said to be excessive in their severity and an unwarranted intrusion into matters of faith. The *Jewish Chronicle* declared: 'It would . . . be intolerable if, as it seems probable is intended by the Home Secretary, the right to perform the ceremony of marriage should be restricted to certain recognized individuals, or even to recognized Ministers of religion. That would be a grave invasion upon Jewish Law'. The Chief Rabbi, who had previously welcomed the prospect of a state-approved ministry under his own direction, also had doubts. The Goldstone marriage had taken place abroad and was therefore irrelevant. Irregular Jewish marriages, he declared 'are very few in this country'.[65] Home Office officials concluded that it was 'of little use to go to the Jewish Authorities'.[66] At the close of 1921, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, who had expected quick results, was told 'that the matter is a difficult one to handle . . . and it is doubtful if legislation could be passed in the near future'.[67]

Neither the Chief Rabbi nor the Board of Deputies had any desire to condone bogus marriages. Both, however, were wary of any measure which might invalidate perfectly sound religious marriages contracted in Eastern Europe. Communal leaders, aware of the prevalence of *stille ḥuppah* among foreign Jews, and mindful of the consequences of a

criminal conviction for a non-naturalized person, hesitated to approve legislation which might expose an already vulnerable community to greater risk. But it was not the only source of unease. The discriminatory character of the Bill exposed the dangers of Jewish exceptionalism and persuaded the Board of Deputies to seek exemptions within the general law rather than apart from it. A spokesman for the Board stated: 'The Jewish community would greatly resent anything which looked like interfering in rabbinical authority and a Bill specifically labelled "Jewish Marriages" would give great offence'. A number of amendments were therefore suggested. It was proposed that the Bill should be so drawn as to make it an offence to perform a marriage without production of a registrar's certificate, and further, to make the person solemnizing a marriage responsible for the registration of the *ketubbah*. The offence created by the Bill, the Board insisted, should be treated as a misdemeanour and not as a felony. Finally, a change of title was suggested on the grounds that it would 'relieve the anxiety of those to whom it was distasteful to see a Bill apparently singling out Jewish marriages for exceptional treatment'.

Parliamentary draughtsmen cavilled at the proposed changes. The substitution of a misdemeanour for a felony, they argued, would again privilege Jews and there were the usual complaints against legislation by reference. But what caused particular resentment was the removal of the word 'Jewish' from the title of the Bill. One testy official commented: 'The Jews must be a more childish race than I have hitherto supposed if their susceptibilities are capable of being calmed by a verbal trick of this kind'. On the inclusion of a proviso to safeguard existing marriages (contracted without civil ceremony) against invalidation, the Home Office was more accommodating. One of its officials declared: 'Although it seems quite useless it is obviously harmless, and it might be well accepted if it will smooth the passage of the Bill'.[68]

The provisions of the proposed legislation were not the only cause for concern. The Jewish Marriages Bill was a police-initiated measure and this was also resented by Anglo-Jewry. Under pressure from the Board of Deputies, New Scotland Yard was asked to collect information on the extent of irregular marriages. 'But of course', a Home Office official remarked, 'the Police only hear of them occasionally and incidentally, and they have no statistics'.[69] The want of evidence was not considered grounds for delay. Demands for an investigation into the whole matter were ignored. But for the pressure on parliamentary time, the measure might have been enacted. As it was, there was to be no comprehensive review of the registration and marriage laws until the legislation of 1949. In the interval, irregular marriage among the Jews ceased to be a matter of public concern. Immigration from Eastern Europe, which had sustained the problem, came to an end in 1914 and was not

resumed on any significant scale thereafter. Second- and third-generation immigrants were less attached to the ways of their parents. Increasingly acculturated and prosperous, they found little to object to in the marriage arrangements which had been negotiated in the previous century.

To conclude. Prudence and pragmatism had served the Jewish community well. The redefinition of the rabbinical role, the emphasis given to pastoral rather than to judicial duties, the unobtrusive but influential interventions of the Beth Din, were all part of a process of adjustment that made for integration without loss of identity. The modest and undemanding requirements of the established community, moreover, were not incompatible with the pre-existing pattern of Church-state relations. The role of the Anglican Establishment and the privileged position of Christianity within the state were not disturbed by the minority religion. The Jewish community with its centralized structure and integrationist leadership, was confident that the adjustment of Judaism could be managed within the existing framework of civil law. Special provision for Jewish observances — be it the keeping of the Sabbath, the ritual slaughter of animals for food consumption, or religious marriages — represented a claim for distinctive treatment within a unitary legal system. The separation of church and state and the repeal of the blasphemy laws or of the laws relating to Sunday trading were deemed neither necessary nor desirable. The creation of a separate system of Jewish family law was scarcely considered at all. A niche within the Christian polity was all that was asked for. Progress in developing the infrastructure of a multi-faith society was in consequence slow.

*Acknowledgements*

I am grateful to Mr David Kessler and to my colleagues Michael Drake, Ruth Finnegan, Tony Lentin, and Clive Emsley for their comments on an earlier version of this article.

## NOTES

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| HH | Health and Housing |
| HL | House of Lords |
| HO | Home Office |
| MEPO | Metropolitan Police |
| PRO | Public Record Office |
| RG | Registrar-General |
| SRO | Scottish Record Office |

[1] On the timing of these developments, compare Jack Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*, Cambridge, 1983, with Michael Sheehan,

'Choice of Marriage Partner in the Middle Ages: Development and Mode of Application of a Theory of Marriage', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, New Series, vol. 1 (1978), pp. 3–33. A convenient summary of recent scholarship is presented in R. M. Smith, 'Marriage Processes in the English Past: Some Continuities', in Lloyd Bonfield, Richard M. Smith, and Keith Wrightson, eds., *The World We Have Gained. Histories of Population and Social Structure*, Oxford, 1986, pp. 43–99.

[2] Muir is quoted in James Lorimer, *Studies National and International, Being Occasional Lectures Delivered in the University of Edinburgh 1864–1889*, Edinburgh, 1890, p. 139. See also PRO RG 48/199–200, on the marriage of Englishwomen with Muslims and Hindus.

[3] On the facility of divorce among the Jews, see G. E. Howard, *A History of Matrimonial Institutions*, 3 vols., Chicago and London, 1904, vol. 1, pp. 421–22. On polygyny, see Edward Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, London, 1891, p. 432; Sereno Dwight, *The Hebrew Wife: or the Law of Marriage Examined in Relation to the Lawfulness of Polygamy, and to the Extent of the Law of Incest*, Glasgow, 1837; J. Colenso, *A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, Cambridge, 1862; and M. Mielziner, *The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce in Ancient and Modern Times and Its Relation to the Law of the State*, 2nd rev. edn., New York and Cincinnati, 1901, p. 31. On the theory of Jewish marriage, see David Amram, *The Jewish Law of Divorce according to the Bible and Talmud*, New York, 1898. On Jewish polygyny in Muslim lands, see Jacob M. Landau, *Jews in Nineteenth-Century Egypt*, New York and London, 1969; Landau states that the rabbinical court of Egypt sometimes allowed a polygynous marriage where the first wife was barren (p. 108). On uncle-niece marriages, see Israel Finestein, 'An Aspect of the Jews and English Marriage Law during the Emancipation: The Prohibited Degrees', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. VII, no. 1, June 1965, pp. 20–21.

[4] RG 48/300, report by C. S. Emmanuel, Solicitor to the Board of Deputies, August 1910.

[5] The Registrar-General's files provide an official perspective on the problems of non-Christian marriage. On Sikhs, see RG 48/1070; on Muslim marriages, see RG 48/1401, RG 48/1077. On post-war marital difficulties among Muslim immigrants, see Sydney Collins, *Coloured Minorities in Britain*, London, 1957, p. 213 and S. B. Poulter, *English Law and Ethnic Minority Customs*, London, 1986. On problems and responses among South Asians, see A. Brah, 'South Asian Teenagers in Southall: Their Perceptions of Marriage, Family and Ethnic Identity', *New Community*, vol. 6 (1977–78), pp. 197–206; Werner Merski, 'Legal Pluralism in the Hindu Marriage', in Richard Buzghazt, ed., *Hinduism in Great Britain, the Perpetuation of Religion in an Alien Cultural Milieu*, London, 1987, pp. 180–200; and Arthur W. Helweg, *Sikhs in England*, 2nd edn., Delhi, 1986.

[6] The 'May Laws' of 1882, introduced in the Russian Empire following the assassination of Alexander II, discriminated against Jewish employment, residence, commercial activities, and mobility.

[7] See Mielziner, op. cit., in Note 3 above, pp. 5–6, 22–24, 130–37.

[8] Alderman David Salomons, M.P., stated on 7 March 1866: '... there is very little required by the Jewish ecclesiastical law to make a marriage' — see *Report of Royal Commission on the Laws of Marriage* (4059), PP1867–68 (XXXII),

p. 86. According to Orthodox Jewish law, the marriage ceremony may be performed anywhere — that is, not necessarily in a house of prayer — and the presence of a rabbi is not essential; but the presence of two reputable male Jewish witnesses is necessary. A Jewish divorce requires the consent of both parties; it is effected by the husband handing to his wife a written bill of divorcement (*get*) in the presence of witnesses. It is important to note that 'while in secular divorce law, a court is required to establish a reason for the breakup of marriage . . ., In Jewish law a decision by the couple to terminate their marriage is sufficient reason for its dissolution'. See Hayyim Schneid, ed., *Marriage*, Keter Books, Jerusalem, 1973, pp. 24–29 and p. 70.

[9] See Salo W. Baron, *The Russian Jew under Tsars and Soviets*, 2nd edn., New York, 1964, pp. 102–03; and David Englander, 'Anglicised Not Anglican: Jews and Judaism in Victorian Britain', in Gerald Parsons, ed., *Religion in Victorian Britain*, 2 vols., Manchester, 1988, vol. 1, p. 267.

[10] Amram, op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 59–60, 140–41.

[11] See Stephen Sharot, *Judaism: A Sociology*, Newton Abbot, 1976, pp. 71–72.

[12] PRO MEPO 3/391, report of David Christopher, Leman Street Police Station, 22 December 1925.

[13] See Malise Ruthven, *A Satanic Affair. Salman Rushdie and the Rage of Islam*, London, 1990, p. 83; and Sheila Patterson, 'Immigrants and Minority Groups in British Society', in Simon Abbott, ed., *The Prevention of Racial Discrimination in Britain*, London, 1971, p. 48. Current strategies are discussed by Sebastian Poulter, 'Cultural Pluralism and Its Limits: A Legal Perspective', in *Britain: A Plural Society*, report of a Seminar organized by the Commission on Racial Equality and the Runnymede Trust, October 1989, London, 1990, pp. 3–28.

[14] *The Evening Standard*, 10 February 1922 and *The Times*, 11 February 1922. On the origins and significance of the ceremony and its symbols, see Louis M. Epstein, *The Jewish Marriage Contract, A Study in the Status of the Women in Jewish Law*, New York, 1927, pp. 32–56 and 70–71; and Moses Gaster, *The Ketubah*, Berlin and London, 1923.

[15] *The Times*, 15 February 1922.

[16] MEPO 2/1804, Home Office to Chief Rabbi Hertz, 23 March 1922.

[17] *The Evening Standard*, 15 February 1922.

[18] Bill Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry 1740–1875*, Manchester, 1976, p. 193.

[19] He was officially designated Secretary for Marriages in 1913: RG 41/6.

[20] Emphasis in the original text: see the full and informative evidence of Alderman Salomons, M.P., in *Report of Royal Commission on the Laws of Marriage*, op. cit., in Note 8 above, pp. 10–11, 83–87.

[21] Ibid., p. xxvii. See also H. S. Q. Henriques, *Jewish Marriages and the English Law*, Oxford, 1909, pp. 37–40. The difficulties encountered by dissident congregations, liberal and ultra-Orthodox, are well documented in RG 48/190–191. On the particular problems of the Liberal Jewish Movement, see also PRO HO 45/24303/922198/5 and the evidence of Louis Gluckstein, *Joint Select Commitee on Consolidation Bills — Marriage Bill [H.L.]* [232], PP VI 1948–49, pp. 8–16. On the experience of Orthodox dissidents, see Louis Jacobs, *Helping with Enquiries. An Autobiography*, London, 1989, pp. 36–40.

[22] See Sharot, op. cit. in Note 11 above, pp. 88–100.

[23] Some immigrant couples, like Jack and Sophie Eisenblatt who in 1922 travelled from London to obtain a *get* from the Warsaw rabbinate, posed nightmarish problems for the Registrar-General who was left to decide whether on their return the Eisenblatts were free to marry other parties under English law. The difficulties in determining the status of an ecclesiastical divorce in this case arose out of the fact that the laws of the three parts of pre-war Poland had not been unified. Several different codes with significant discrepancies between them were operative. On the Eisenblatts, see RG 48/213; on variations in the marriage laws of post-war Poland, RG 48/215.

[24] On the requirements of Jewish marriage law, see the statement of Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler, *Report of Royal Commission on the Laws of Marriage*, op. cit. in note 8 above, p. 45; and Mielziner, op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 78–88.

[25] On marriage in Kovno, see MEPO 3/391 statement of Annie Shapiro, 7 November 1925; report of Sergeant David Christopher, Leman Street Station, 18 November 1925; and W. M. Feldman, *The Jewish Child, Its History, Folklore, Biology and Sociology*, London, 1917, p. 67.

[26] See V. D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England 1850–1950*, London, 1954, p. 87.

[27] See Nathan Goldberg, 'The Jewish Attitude towards Divorce', in Jacob Freid, ed., *Jews and Divorce*, New York, 1968, pp. 53–55. However, it should be noted that divorce was very expensive for non-Jews. *Reports on the Laws of Marriage and Divorce in Foreign Countries* [*c.* 7392] PP LXX (1894), pp. 128–30. Quotation from Arthur Ruppin, *The Jews of Today*, London, 1913, p. 123.

[28] On the supervision of marriage and morals among the Strangers of Tudor London, see Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, Oxford, 1986, pp. 182–214; and David Englander, Diana Norman, Rosemary O'Day, and W. R. Owens, eds., *Culture and Belief in Europe 1450–1600*, Oxford, 1990, pp. 106–11.

[29] Lloyd P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England 1870–1914*, London, 1960, pp. 168–71.

[30] See V. D. Lipman, *A Century of Social Service 1859–1959: The History of the Jewish Board of Guardians*, London, 1959, pp. 89–102; and N. Kokosalakis, *Ethnic Identity and Religion, Tradition and Change in Liverpool Jewry*, Washington, 1982, p. 99.

[31] *Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes* [Cd. 6481] PP1912–13 (XX) Q. 41, 467.

[32] Edward J. Bristow, *Prostitution and Prejudice. The Jewish Fight agaainst White Slavery 1870–1939*, Oxford, 1982, pp. 103–106.

[33] Report of the Executive Committee of the United Synagogue on Wedding Fees, 13 June 1877. I am grateful to Charles Tucker, Archivist at the London Beth Din, for bringing this reference to my attention.

[34] *Seventy-fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages in England and Wales for 1912* [Cd. 7028], PP XVI (1913), p. 22.

[35] The negative effects of Jewish immigration upon the otherwise progressive decline in illiteracy was frequently noted in the annual reports of the Registrar-General.

[36] S. Rosenbaum, 'A Contribution to the Study of the Vital and Other Statistics of the Jews in the United Kingdom', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, vol. LXVIII, 1905, p. 551; MEPO 2/1804, Commissioner of Police to

Home Office, 21 February 1922; report of Inspector Waters, 4 January 1922; and Commissioner of Police to Home Office, 28 July 1921.

[37] Henriques, op. cit. in Note 21 above, pp. 53–56.

[38] See Geoffrey Alderman, 'The British Chief Rabbinate: a Most Peculiar Practice', *European Judaism*, Autumn 1990, p. 50.

[39] Board of Deputies to Registrar-General, 19 February 1909, in evidence of D. L. Alexander, *Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes*, op. cit. in Note 31 above, p. 413.

[40] RG 48/310 Memorandum of Director of Public Prosecutions, 14 June 1905; *Daily Chronicle*, 12 June 1905; Minute of H. B. Simpson, 15 June 1905; Minute of R. B. Finlay, 24 July 1905; and HO 45/203080/436597/2, Memorandum on Irregular Marriages among Jews, 1921.

[41] See Gartner, op. cit. in Note 29 above, p. 178.

[42] SRO HH 1/1244/9724/75.

[43] On the prevention of bigamy in Britain, see SRO HH 1/1245; on prevention overseas, see RG 48/634.

[44] HO 45/10821/318095/372, J. Henrici to John Pedder, 2 August 1917; Minute of J. H., 2 August 1917; and Sharman Kadish, *Bolsheviks and British Jews: The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain and the Russian Revolution*, University of Oxford D. Phil. thesis, 1986, pp. 304–14.

[45] HO 45/11068/374355/52, Aliens and Nationality Committee, Memorandum No. 82, 22 October 1919.

[46] See Eugene C. Black, *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry 1880–1920*, Oxford, 1988, p. 138.

[47] HO 45/24610/204124/14, Statistics and various testimonies as to the character of the Jewish Immigrant, 9 February 1911; Tom Divall, *Scoundrels and Scallywags*, London, 1929, pp. 150–51; and David Englander, 'Booth's Jews: The Presentation of Jews and Judaism in *Life and Labour of the People in London*', *Victorian Studies*, vol. 32, Summer 1989, pp. 551–71.

[48] Charles Booth Collection (British Library of Political and Economic Science), Correspondence and Reports, A 23 f. 92, report of Harold Hardy on London Costermongers and their Markets.

[49] *Report of the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women*, London, 1901, pp. 70–71; RG 48/301, Beth Din to Whitechapel Register Office, 1 April 1925; *The Law Times*, vol. 162, 1926, pp. 360–62; and *The Times*, 15 October 1926.

[50] *Royal Commission on Alien Immigration* [Cd. 1742] PP 1903 (IX), QQ. 7345–48, 7366–68, 7425–33, 7472–82, 8369–99, 8487–93, 8509–12; MEPO 2/733, report of Chief Inspector Monk, 25 November 1904; report of Supt. Mulvaney, 17 December 1904; and C. E. Troup to Commissioner of Police, 1 August 1906.

[51] *Jewish Chronicle*, 19 January 1990.

[52] HO 45/10819/318095/84, report of Sergeant Albers, 8 September 1916; HO 45/10819/318095/91, report of P.C. 100 R. Greenberg, Leman Street Station, 13 September 1916.

[53] HO 45/10762/270402/41a, Bertha Doring to Lady Constance Lytton, 31 March 1916.

[54] See David Cesarani, 'Anti-Alienism in England after the First World War', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 6, 1987, pp. 5–29.

[55] RG 48/201, Marriage of Aliens 1915–1919; J. C. Bird, *Control of Enemy Alien Civilians in Great Britain, 1914–1918*, New York, 1986, pp. 230–310 and Paul Gordon, *Policing Immigration. Britain's Internal Controls*, London, 1985, p. 62.
[56] HO 45/203080/436597/7, report of Inspector Waters, Leman Street Station, 9 May 1922; and report of Inspector Owen, Leman Street Station, 13 April 1922.
[57] MEPO 2/1804, Note re Jewish Marriages, 29 December 1927.
[58] HO 45/203080/436597/7, statement of S. Cohen, Secretary of the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women, 5 November 1920; and report of Inspector Eveson, Leman Street Station, 3 February 1921.
[59] MEPO 3/39, reports of Sergeant David Christopher, Leman Street Station, November–December 1925.
[60] HO 45/203080/436597/7, report of Inspector Hunt, Arbour Square Station, 29 November 1920; and report of Inspector Norton, Leman Street Station, 20 October 1920.
[61] MEPO 2/1804, Commissioner of Police to Home Office, 26 July 1921, On the powerlessness of the authorities in connection with marriages of convenience contracted between foreign-born prostitutes and British subjects in order to avoid deportation, see *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 114, 15 April 1919, cols. 2748, 2751; RG 48/205 and MEPO 3/309.
[62] HO 45/203080/436597/7, unsigned memorandum of August 1992.
[63] HO 45/203080/436597/3, Assistant Registrar-General to Home Office, 10 October 1921.
[64] HO 45/203080/436597/7, unsigned memorandum of August 1922.
[65] HO 45/203080/436597/6, J. H. Hertz to Home Office, 27 April 1922. Quotation from *Jewish Chronicle* press-cutting in HO 45/203080/436597/7.
[66] HO 45/203080/436597/2, Minute of J.E., 19 September 1921.
[67] HO 45/203080/436597/1, Troup to Commissioner of Police, 21 October 1921.
[68] HO 45/203080/436597/8, Hugh Godley to Sir Malcolm Delevinge, 27 June 1922; and Minute of A.J.E., 21 July 1922.
[69] HO 45/203080/436597/8, Minute of A. J. Eagleston, 21 July 1922.

# ANTISEMITISM AND SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Milton Shain

THE prominent liberal and deputy leader of the United Party, Jan Hofmeyr, delivering the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture in 1945, stated that antisemitism was not a natural growth in South Africa. This, he explained, was because of the country's traditions, its religious outlook and reverence for the Bible, and its love of freedom. Antisemitism, he claimed, had obtained a foothold in South Africa because of the influence of Nazism, 'an article meant for export'; the seeds of that evil thing were 'blown over the oceans even to South Africa' and antisemitism grew apace when Nazi propaganda came to be sedulously disseminated and sometimes skilfully adapted to local South African circumstances.[1]

Hofmeyr's argument that anti-Jewish manifestations in South Africa during the 1930s and early 1940s were an aberration, a departure from traditional patterns of interaction between Jew and Gentile, accords well with the dominant thrust of South African historiography[2] which has underplayed (if not entirely ignored) antisemitism in South African society. Jewish historians, especially those writing before the 1960s, turned a blind eye to anti-Jewish manifestations and instead lauded the pioneering decades as years during which Jews were accorded great respect and hospitality.[3] Afrikaners especially were singled out for their kindness and courtesy to the 'people of the Book'. The itinerant Jewish pedlar or *smous*[4] was generally considered to be a welcome addition to society. Israel Abrahams has noted that Jewish pedlars 'supplied almost all the requirements of the farming population, from agricultural implements and patent medicines to low-priced furniture and oleography'.[5] Gustav Saron, in the same volume which was published in 1955, made a similar observation when he stated that these pedlars 'brought to the isolated farmer living in semi-primitive conditions the material goods and also some of the cultural wares of civilization'.[6] It is argued that the farmer was forever grateful for these services and according to Abrahams, there are innumerable authenticated stories of the kindly hospitality which the Jewish *smous* received from the *Boerevolk* (Afrikaners), for whom the Jew 'irrespective of his occupation or appearance, was a member of the People of the Book and as such deserving of a cordial welcome'.[7] George Aschman, a historian of

Oudtshoorn Jewry, painted a similar picture, stating that when the Boers said 'My Joodje' to refer to their Jewish pedlars, they were using a term of endearment for those who had for years brought them news of the outside world, produce, and 'gossip from the town and the rest of the countryside'. Indeed, the farmer 'came to rely on that information and to seek the advice of the *smous* or *makelaar* (broker) who was in touch with the world beyond the aching Swartberg range'.[8] Jan Smuts also fondly recalled the visits of the *smous* to his father's farm and commented: 'It never entered our heads that they were any but the Lord's people of whom we read in the Bible'.[9]

No doubt, by comparison with their co-religionists in Eastern Europe, the newcomers in South Africa did enjoy much affection and the enviable social order which prevailed among the white community. But relations with the population at large were not without conflict. Nor, indeed, were perceptions of the Jews as favourable as those portrayed by historians who, eager to challenge anti-Jewish rhetoric during the comparatively insecure decades after 1930, emphasized the Jewish community's contribution to South Africa and the comfortable environment within which its members could exercise their talents.[10] For example, the articles in the standard history edited by Saron and Hotz, *The Jews in South Africa. A History*, concentrate mainly on communal origins and the contribution of Jews to the wider society. Scant attention is devoted to conflict, while anti-Jewish outbursts in the 1930s and 1940s are said by Saron to have represented a deviation from 'traditional attitudes of tolerance and fair play': he claimed that economic, political, ideological, and spiritual turmoil made the Afrikaner susceptible to Nazi propaganda emanating from South Africa's mandated territory, German South-West Africa.[11]

Thus, in its early phase South African Jewish historiography sought to minimize incidents of conflict and to maximize harmony, or at least accommodation, between Jew and Gentile. Since the 1960s, however, a new generation of historians, professionally trained and perhaps more comfortable with their South African Jewish identity, began to focus on conflict between Jew and non-Jew. Michael Cohen has examined the wide-ranging nature of antisemitism in the 1930s,[12] Edna Bradlow has reported on the measures to restrict the entry of Jews into the Union,[13] and Gideon Shimoni has alluded to the precarious position of Jews who settled in South Africa,[14] while my own 1983 study focused on antisemitism in the Cape Colony and its impact on Jewish communal organization.[15]

However, it must be stressed that the new historiography has neither denied nor ignored the many instances of hospitality accorded to Jews in South Africa[16] and the manifold ways in which they have been accommodated within, and have benefited from, the body-politic; but it has also shown that the 'accommodation' or 'hospitality' school did

not fully reveal the extent of antisemitism which did occur.[17] On the other hand, even the new historiography continues to depict antisemitism in the 1930s and early 1940s as essentially an alien phenomenon, a product of Nazi propaganda at a time of great social and economic trauma.[18] Shimoni, for instance, while more even-handed and perceptive in his description of Jewish-Gentile relations, still seeks an explanation for anti-Jewish manifestations within the Afrikaner's specific condition and his receptivity to Nazi propaganda. Acute race consciousness, anti-British sentiment, disillusionment with British parliamentarianism, frustrations with industrialization, and a vague sense of racial affinity with the Germans are all seen by Shimoni as factors which facilitated the Afrikaner's acceptance of Nazi ideology — apart from a fundamentalist Calvinism, which predisposed him to Christian-rooted prejudice. He stresses, however, that prejudice was apparent only in an urban context: in the rural setting, Calvinism encouraged a sense of fellow-feeling with the descendants of the 'Biblical children of Israel'.[19]

It is now acknowledged that South Africa did have a 'Jewish problem' in the 1930s and in the early 1940s. Indeed, Shimoni has demonstrated that the problem persisted into the 1950s and 1960s, when Jewish-Afrikaner relations remained tense because of the disproportionate involvement of Jews in anti-apartheid activities and Israel's pro-African stance in the United Nations in those years when it had friendly relations and exchanged diplomatic representatives with several African independent countries.[20] In a more recent study, published in the *American Jewish Year Book* for 1988, Shimoni has highlighted antisemitism and anti-Zionism in contemporary South Africa. He states that the white right-wing continues to have hostitle atttudes to Jews, and refers to the more disturbing trend of a burgeoning anti-Zionism and antisemitism of the Left, mainly expressed by Muslims but by no means limited to them.[21] While right-wing antisemitism has its roots in classical Afrikaner nationalism when threatened by political change and upheaval, left-wing anti-Zionism is part of a wider Third World perspective which condemns the Pretoria-Jerusalem axis and voices strong support for the Palestinian people. Shimoni cites as evidence the record of oral interviews collected by Tzippi Hoffman and Alan Fischer during their research for their book on the Jews of South Africa, published in 1988. Much of what they were told is perturbing — for Jews, at least. A strong anti-Zionist strain is clearly evident in African and Muslim sentiments arising from an identification with the Palestinians, links between the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the African National Congress, and Israel's alleged collusion with the South African government on military and security matters.[22]

Ironically, members of the White ultra-right group share many of the left-wing attitudes: they believe that there is too much Jewish influence

and wealth, that Jews are disloyal, and that they collaborate with the government.[23] Unfortunately, these authors do not account for, or assess, the power and extent of anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish prejudice. They merely suggest that a partial explanation is to be found in the transmission of anti-Jewish stereotypes.[24] But where and how these stereotypes evolved is not set out. Are they part of a broader cultural baggage or are they located in the South African experience? It is odd that the only writer I know of to hint at the specific rootedness of South African antisemitism was an outsider. Hannah Arendt, in her 1954 book on totalitarianism, has a section on South Africa[25] and her chief source is an article published in 1938 in *Der Weltkampf*, a German periodical. The author of the article was Professor Dr Ernst Schultze; he maintained that the Boers had never viewed the Jews with favour and that they had long feared that Jews would swamp South Africa and would dominate both the economy and the professions.[26]

I have written about early antisemitism in this Journal and elsewhere. There is no doubt that there is a great deal of evidence about deep-rooted anti-Jewish attitudes in South Africa among some sections of the population.[27] Since at least the 1880s, perceptions of the Jews were ambivalent: there was the image of the gentleman who was sober, enterprising, and loyal while at the same time there was another image of the Jew as a knave who exhibited dishonesty and low cunning. The influx of Eastern European 'Peruvians'[28] in the 1890s and the emergence of the cosmopolitan financier (exemplified in the cartoon caricature, Hoggenheimer, at the turn of the century) further contributed to the evolution of an anti-Jewish stereotype.[29] By 1914, the favourable perceptions of the Jew, associated mainly with acculturated Anglo-German pioneer immigrants such as Lionel Phillips and George Albu, had become substantially eroded and it was now the Eastern European Jew who generally came to typify 'Jewishness'. Even those who differentiated between acculturated, urbane Jews and the Eastern European newcomers tended to exaggerate Jewish power and influence and thus also exhibited sometimes anti-Jewish attitudes.

During the First World War, accusations that Jews evaded military service, followed by the linking of Jews with Bolshevism, consolidated the anti-Jewish stereotype. Later, in the context of the post-war economic depression and burgeoning Black radicalism, the Eastern European Jew emerged as the archetypical subversive and the Rand Rebellion of 1922 could be construed as a Bolshevik revolt. Meanwhile, those advocating eugenic and nativist arguments influenced South African discourse and the Jewish immigrants were increasingly perceived as a threat to the 'Nordic' character of white South African society as well as a challenge to the hegemony of the English mercantile establishment. However, antisemitism in a crude and programmatic sense was rejected. The 1930 Quota Act — which imposed a very

limited quota on Eastern European immigration and thus virtually curtailed that source of Jewish immigration — heralded the transformation of 'private' into 'public' antisemitism.[30] While this transformation was clearly related to specific conditions of the 1930s — most notably to the 'volkish' character of Afrikaner nationalism — it is essential to stress that anti-Jewish manifestations and policies of the 1930s were only an intensification of the antisemitism which had existed before 1930. In short, the anti-Jewish rhetoric of the 1930s and early 1940s was generally found acceptable precisely because a negative Jewish stereotype had been elaborated and diffused for decades.[31]

In his recent study of the radical right in South Africa, Patrick Furlong shows an awareness of anti-alienism and antisemitism at the turn of the century but according to him, anti-Jewish activity and ideology arose in the 1930s and 1940s because of political confusion, increased Jewish immigration, and Nazi propaganda.[32] Certainly these conditions are essential to an understanding of the nature of right-wing antisemitism, but without anti-Jewish stereotyping for decades, right-wing oratory would not have been embraced at the popular level. It was precisely because 'greyshirt' and other fascist propaganda had evoked a popular response and gained adherents that the National Party under D. F. Malan incorporated specifically anti-Jewish policies into the 'purified' Nationalist programme.[33] Of course, the illiberal and anti-modernist nature of Afrikaner nationalism during the 1930s explains why 'public' antisemitism was essentially an Afrikaner phenomenon and why it had an appeal across the whole spectrum of Afrikaner Nationalist opinion.[34] There is a parallel here with the perception of German antisemitism in terms of anti-modernism and illiberalism.[35]

When the Nationalists attained power in 1948 and saw the need for a united front of all Whites as they formulated their apartheid policies, antisemitism subsided. But then, a new stereotype of the Jew as a Communist or a liberal subversive emerged — a stereotype again built upon earlier anti-Jewish attitudes which found acceptance mainly among right-wing extremists.[36] One might have therefore expected the disenfranchised Black majority to hold philosemitic opinions, but this was not the case. Indeed, in a sociological study published in 1972, Melville Edelstein, who interviewed a sample of matriculation students in Soweto, found that Africans said that they experienced a greater 'social distance' towards Jews than they did towards English-speakers generally — but less social distance than towards Afrikaners.[37] They told him that an African who was very careful with his money was described as being as 'stingy as a Jew'.[38] Edelstein thought that such prejudice arose from the New Testament teaching in school and church. However, it may well be that there is an added cause: the resentment of the non-White population (Coloureds and Indians as

well as Blacks) against Jewish traders in town and country. Marcia Leveson in her examination of the fiction of these groups has shown that the authors often look upon Jews as exploitative and powerful.[39]

The groundswell of Black antisemitism and anti-Zionism must therefore be seen in a broader context. Disproportionate Jewish involvement in anti-apartheid activities and the struggle for civil rights are apparently forgotten by the younger generation of non-Whites and perhaps by their elders. No distinction is generally made today between Jews and other Whites in South Africa. Indeed, the conflation of Jews with Zionism (popularly associated with the repression of the Palestinians) tarnished the image of contemporary Jews in the eyes of the Blacks. On the other hand, it would be wrong to assume that popular hostility is irreversible and all-pervasive. Many prominent Blacks — including the Zulu leader, Mangosothu Buthelezi — have visited Israel and spoken highly of its achievements. Some 'homeland' leaders have even availed themselves of Israeli agricultural expertise. It must not be forgotten that the majority of South African Blacks are Christian, with a deep attachment to the Bible and the Holy Land. Such sentiments could generate an element of philosemitism or at least a position of neutrality. Further scholarly research and analysis of the data obtained will be necessary for a better understanding of Black attitudes towards Jews in both the historical and the contemporary setting of South Africa.

*Acknowledgements*

This article is based on a paper presented to a workshop on 'University Teaching on Antisemitism in the Contemporary Context' held in Jerusalem from 14 to 19 July 1991 under the joint auspices of the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization and of the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. I wish to thank the University of Cape Town and the Human Sciences Research Council for their financial assistance which enabled me to attend the workshop.

## NOTES

[1] Jan Hofmeyr, *Christian Principles and Race Problems*, Johannesburg, 1945, p. 18.

[2] The present article focuses essentially on South African Jewish historiography. Those historians dealing with South African history in general, pay little attention to the Jews. When they do relate to antisemitism they share the dominant paradigm critically discussed below. See, for example, Trevor R. H. Davenport, *South Africa: A Modern History*, 3rd edn., Johannesburg, 1987, p. 335.

[3] See, for example, Sarah Gertrude Millin, *The South Africans*, London, 1926, pp. 175–81; Israel Abrahams, *The Birth of a Community, A History of Western Province Jewry from Earliest Times to the End of the South African War, 1902*, Cape Town, 1955; Louis Herrman, *History of the Jews in South Africa*, London, 1930; Gustav Saron and Luis Hotz, eds., *The Jews in South Africa, A History*, Cape Town, 1955. Similar ideas have been appropriated by non-Jewish historians. See, for example, Newell M. Stultz, *Afrikaner Politics in South Africa 1934–1948*, Berkeley, 1974, pp. 44–45.

[4] The origin of the word *smous* is not certain. According to Pettman, the word 'appears to be a corruption of the name Moses brought over from Holland in the Dutch East India Company's days. The corruption arose from the manner in which the Dutch Jews themselves pronounced the name': Charles Pettman, *Afrikanderisms*, London, 1913, p. 453. Beeton and Dorner suggest that the word derives from 'Mauschel', the equivalent of Jewish trader: Douglas R. Beeton and Helen Dorner, *A Dictionary of English Usage in South Africa*, Cape Town, 1975, p. 160. An article in the Johannesburg publication, *The Ivri*, claims that the word is derived from the German *schmuss* (talk, patter) and from the Hebrew *sh'mu* (tales, news), the reference being to the persuasive eloquence of Jewish traders. See *The Ivri*, 1 August 1930. While the former explanation seems plausible in a folk etymological sense, *sh'mu* is problematic. The author may have meant *sh'mu'a*, which means rumour, report, news tidings, gossip, tradition: see Reuben Alcalay, *The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary*, Ramat-Gan, 1981. Certainly, *smous* usually referred to a Jewish trader or merchant. See Jean Branford, *A Dictionary of South African English*, Cape Town, 1978, p. 226.

[5] Israel Abrahams, 'Western Province Jewry, 1870–1902', in Saron and Hotz, eds., op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 27–28.

[6] Gustav Saron, 'Boers, Uitlanders, Jews', in Saron and Hotz, eds., op. cit. in Note 3 above, p. 183.

[7] Abrahams, 'Western Province Jewry', op. cit. in Note 5 above, pp. 27–28.

[8] George Aschman, 'Oudtshoorn in the Early Days', in Saron and Hotz, eds., op. cit. in Note 3 above, p. 136.

[9] *Zionist Record*, 4 June 1947; quoted in Gideon Shimoni, *Jews and Zionism: The South African Experience (1910–1967)*, Cape Town, 1980, p. 45.

[10] A similar process is evident in American Jewish historiography. See Jonathan D. Sarna, 'Anti-Semitism and American History', *Commentary*, March 1981.

[11] Gustav Saron, 'Epilogue', in Saron and Hotz, eds., op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 381–82. In a recent study, Albrecht Hagemann has shown that Nazi propaganda in South Africa was limited: Albrecht Hagemann, *Rassenpolitische Affinitat und Machtpolitische Ravalitat. Das 'Dritte Reich' und die Sudafrikansche Union 1933–1945*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Bielefeld University, 1987.

[12] Michael Cohen, *Anti-Jewish Manifestations in the Union of South Africa During the Nineteenth-thirties*, unpublished B.A. (Hons) thesis, University of Cape Town, 1968.

[13] Edna Bradlow, *Immigration into the Union, 1910–1948: Policies and Attitudes*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cape Town, 1978, pp. 186–341.

[14] Shimoni, *Jews and Zionism*, op. cit. in Note 9 above. See especially chapters 4, 9, 10, and 11.

[15] Milton Shain, *Jewry and Cape Society. The Origins and Activities of the Jewish Board of Deputies for the Cape Colony*, Cape Town, 1983. Charles van Onselen and Riva Krut have also indirectly touched upon conflict between Jew and Gentile. See Charles van Onselen, 'Randlords and Rotgut, 1886–1903', in Charles van Onselen, *Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Witwatersrand 1886–1914, vol. 1, New Babylon*, Johannesburg, 1982 and Riva Krut, 'The Making of a South African Jewish Community in Johannesburg, 1886–1914', in Belinda Bozzoli, ed., *Class, Community and Conflict: South African Perspectives*, Johannesburg, 1987.

[16] There were, indeed, many instances of goodwill. In Calvinia, for example, in 1878 the coinciding of *Nachtmaal* (Holy Communion) and the Jewish New Year meant that L. Rosenblatt, a Calvinia businessman, would lose the traditional *Nachtmaal* business when farmers came to town. After the Reverend Joel Rabinowitz had written to Professor N.J. Hofmeyr of the Stellenbosch Seminary explaining the position, the *Kerkraad* (Church Council) postponed *Nachtmaal* to accommodate Rosenblatt's interests: Abrahams, 'Western Province Jewry', op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 30. Numerous reports from South Africa in the 1890s appearing in the Eastern European press similarly indicate respect towards Jews on the part of the Boers. See G. Simonowitz, *The Background to Jewish Immigration to South Africa and the Development of the Jewish Community in the South African Republic, between 1890 and 1902*, unpublished B.A. (Hons) thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1960, p. 88.

[17] In private discussion, Edna Bradlow has suggested that 'school' is too generous a term for these historians. None were, after all, historians in the professional sense. However, it may be argued that they have provided a particular genre of history, albeit one that, in the opinion of this writer, has mythologized the past with respect to Jewish-Gentile relations.

[18] Much the same would apply to general South African historiography. See, for example, Brian Bunting, *The Rise of the South African Reich*, London, 1964, pp. 57–66; William Henry Vatcher, *White Laager. The Rise of Afrikaner Nationalism*, London, 1965, pp. 60–66; F.J. van Heerden, *Nasionaal — Sosialism as Faktor in die Suid-Afrikaanse Politieke, 1933–1948*, unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of the Orange Free State, 1972, pp. 76–80; and T. Dunbar Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom. Power, Apartheid and the Afrikaner Civil Religion*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1975, pp. 162–67.

[19] Shimoni, *Jews and Zionism*, op. cit. in Note 9 above, p. 64. When touching on Jewish-Afrikaner relations, general historians have similarly identified an affinity between the Afrikaner, steeped in Calvinism, and the 'Chosen People'. See, for example, Sheila Patterson, *The Last Trek. A Study of the Boer People and the Afrikaner Nation*, London, 1957, p. 290.

[20] Shimoni, *Jews and Zionism*, op. cit. in Note 9 above, chapters 7 and 10 *passim*.

[21] Gideon Shimoni, 'South African Jews and the Apartheid Crisis', in David Singer and Ruth Seldin, eds., *American Jewish Year Book 1988*, vol. 88, Philadelphia, pp. 49–56.

[22] Tzippi Hoffman and Alan Fischer, *The Jews in South Africa. What Future?*, Johannesburg, 1988, p. 392.

[23] Ibid., p. 392.

[24] Ibid., p. 390.

[25] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York, 1954, pp. 197–207.

[26] See Ernst Schultze, 'Die Judenfrage in Südafrika', *Der Weltkampf*, October 1938.

[27] See by Milton Shain, 'From Pariah to Parvenu: The Anti-Jewish Stereotype in South Africa, 1880–1910', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 2, December 1984; '"Vant to Puy a Vaatch": The Smous and Pioneer Trader in South African Jewish Historiography', *Jewish Affairs*, vol. 42, no. 9, September 1987', and 'Images of the Jew in Johannesburg 1887–1915', in Mendel Kaplan and Marian Robertson, eds., *Founders and Followers. Johannesburg Jewry 1887–1915*, Cape Town, 1991.

[28] 'Peruvian' was a term used since the mid-1890s to refer to Eastern European Jews. For various suggestions about the origin of the word, see my December 1984 article in this Journal, 'From Pariah to Parvenu', op. cit. in Note 27 above, p. 126.

[29] For the origins and evolution of Hoggenheimer, see Milton Shain, 'Hoggenheimer — The Making of a Myth', *Jewish Affairs*, vol. 36, no. 9, September 1981.

[30] These terms are used in the sense elaborated by Todd Endelman. Private antisemitism in this view refers 'to expressions of contempt and discrimination outside the realm of public life' while public antisemitism refers to the 'eruption of anti-Semitism in political life — the injection of anti-Semitism into matters of policy and the manipulation of anti-Semitism for partisan political ends': see Todd M. Endelman, 'Comparative Perspectives on Modern Anti-Semitism in the West', in David Berger, ed., *History and Hate. The Dimensions of Anti-Semitism*, Philadelphia, 1986, p. 104.

[31] For details of this argument, see Milton Shain, *The Foundations of Antisemitism in South Africa: Images of the Jew c. 1870–1930*, unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Cape Town, 1990.

[32] Patrick J. Furlong, *Between Crown and Swastika. The Impact of the Radical Right on the Afrikaner Nationalist Movement in the Fascist Era*, Johannesburg, 1991, p. 47.

[33] The 'Greyshirt' movement was founded in 1933 under the leadership of Louis T. Weichardt and had more than 2,000 members at its peak. It was patently inspired by Hitler's success and tactics, particularly 'brownshirt' thuggery and Nazi propaganda.

[34] Apart from this being illustrated in party politics, evidence is also provided in a survey of anti-Jewish opinion conducted in 1944 by Simon Herman, then of the Department of Psychology at the University of the Witwatersrand. For a full copy of his analysis which was based on interviews with 112 persons who held 'strategically' important positions in various sectors of South African public life, see Albrecht Hagemann, 'Antisemitism in South Africa During World War II: A Documentation', in *Simon Wiesenthal Center Annual*, vol. 4, New York, 1987. Also of significance in the report is concern about the 'dominant role' of the Jews in the professions and in commerce.

[35] See Shulamit Volkov, *The Rise of Popular Antimodernism in Germany: The Urban Master Artisans, 1873–1896*, Princeton, 1978; Peter Gay, *Freud, Jews and Other Germans, Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture*, New York, 1978; and Fritz Stern, *The Failure of Illiberalism: Essays on the Political Culture of Modern Germany*, New York, 1972. Of course, illiberalism and anti-modernism as components of nationalism were not unique to Germany.

[36] Such sentiments waned as South Africa and Israel established close relations from the 1970s. None the less, antisemitism and neo-Nazism did persist in some quarters. See David M. Scher, 'Defaming the Holocaust', in *Kleio* (a publication of the Department of History of the University of South Africa), vol. 21, 1989.

[37] Melville Edelstein, *What Do Young Africans Think?*, Johannesburg, 1972.

[38] Melville Edelstein, 'The Urban African Image of the Jew', *Jewish Affairs*, vol. 27, no. 2, February 1972.

[39] See Marcia Leveson, 'The Jewish Stereotype in some South African Fiction: A Preliminary Investigation', in Reuben Musiker and Joseph Sherman, eds., *Waters out of the Well. Essays in Jewish Studies*, Johannesburg, 1988, pp. 278–82.

# 'PRAYING WITH A RIFLE': A NOTE ON RELIGIOUS MOTIFS IN THE PROPAGANDA OF LEHI

Gerald Cromer

EVEN those scholars who differentiate between holy and secular terror are at pains to point out that the dichotomy is by no means clear-cut.[1] They acknowledge that secular terrorism often has religious dimensions. The justification of violent actions, for instance, is frequently couched in religious terms, especially in the case of movements of national liberation and independence. Church and the state-in-the-making are, it seems, closely intertwined. This point is most clearly illustrated in Tololyan's insightful analyses of the Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA).[2] He has shown that by using the vocabulary and imagery of the Church, the terrorists secularized traditional religious myths and consecrated their own cause at one and the same time. A study of the propaganda of the Jewish groups who fought against the British Mandatory power in Palestine[3] has shown that their rhetoric was very similar to that of the ASALA. In fact, their reinterpretation of religious tradition was even more complex: each movement drew more intricate analogies to the national past[4] and exhibited a much wider range of attitudes to religious texts and rituals[5] than did their Armenian counterparts.

The present Note deals only with the case of Lehi (Lohamey Herut Yisrael — Fighters for the Liberation of Israel), the smallest and most extreme of the groups which fought against British rule in Mandatory Palestine.[6] Its leaders were acutely aware of the need to fight simultaneously on two fronts — the 'front of fire and blood' and the 'front of propaganda and persuasion'. They therefore issued a wide variety of publications designed to justify both their political ends and the means used to achieve them. In 1982, all the different kinds of material were assembled in two volumes;[7] they include event-related communiqués, ideological tracts, geo-political analyses, educational programmes, newspapers, and transcripts of trials and underground radio broadcasts. It is these collected works of Lehi which constitute the subject-matter of the analysis which follows.

*Sanctifying Terror*

Lehi propaganda was replete with references to those religious commandments — for example, the Biblical precept of 'an eye for an eye',[8] and the Talmudic injunction that 'if anyone comes to kill you, kill him first'[9] — which seemingly provided support for the movement's actions. The twin concepts of obligatory and voluntary war were used very frequently in this respect. One kind of obligatory war — to completely wipe out the memory of Amalek — was regarded as so important that it took precedence over the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill'. Another obligation — to conquer the land of Israel — was considered as important as all the other commandments put together:[10]

> We were also present at the giving of the Torah on Mount Sinai. We heard the commandment, Thou shalt not kill ... but He also said you shall completely wipe out the memory of Amalek ... We also heard the commandment to Moses to conquer the land with blood and fire ... Why did Maimonides not include it amongst the 613 commandments? According to Rav Kook, he did not count the declaration of the unity of God and conquering the land as separate commandments because they are more important than all the others. They are all dependent on them.

The teachings of the prophets were also frequently invoked, but the references were all of a particularistic rather than a universalistic nature. Thus, the masthead of the monthly newspaper *Hamaas* (*The Deed*) was often adorned with prophecies of divine retribution upon those who did not revere the Lord. It was argued that the precepts of forgiveness, love, and justice are initially directed towards fellow-Jews, and that love of other nations is reserved for the Messianic era when those nations would have learnt the law of the Lord and would 'come to bow down at Mount Zion'. Until then, the Gentiles would be the object of divine revenge.[11]

But Lehi spokesmen did not only present a judicious selection of traditional texts in order to justify their violent activities; they also adopted or, to use Tololyan's term,[12] appropriated religious language. The vocabulary and imagery of traditional Judaism provided the basis for the movement's attempt to sanctify both its ends and the means used to achieve them. In such instances, the struggle for national liberation was not only regarded as the 'holiest idea' of the Jewish people; it was actually referred to as the Torah, and portrayed in exactly the same way — as unchangeable and all-inclusive:[13]

> Our Torah is the liberation of the motherland for the people. The return of the people to its national home and the establishment of the Kingdom of Israel is the expression of the creative Jewish spirit. It is forbidden to either add or detract from this Torah. Study it again and again, because everything is included therein.

The belief in the sacred nature of Lehi's ends led to a sanctification of the means used to achieve them. A phrase from one of Uri Zvi Greenberg's poems was frequently quoted in this context: 'A Jewish soldier prays with his rifle'. This attitude is best exemplified in one of the poems of Yair Stern — the founder of Lehi — which was printed in the monthly publication *Hehazit* (*The Front*):[14]

> Like my father who carried his bag with a prayer shawl to synagogue on the Sabbath
> So will I carry holy rifles in my bag to the prayer service of iron with a quorum of renascent men
>
> Like my mother who lit candles on the festive eve
> So will I light a torch for those revered in praise.
>
> Like my rabbi who taught me to read in the Torah
> I will teach my pupils: stand to arms, kneel and shoot
>
> Because there is a religion of redemption — a religion of the war of liberation
> Whoever accepts it — blessed be he; whoever denies it — cursed be he.

Religious terms were also used to describe those who died in the struggle against the British. They were invariably referred to as having 'sacrificed their life on the altar of the motherland'. An announcement of the death of one of Lehi's members concluded with the opening words of the Kaddish, the traditional prayer in memory of the dead. However, the emphasis was completely different. The fallen hero rather than the eternal God was being sanctified:[15]

> We stood to attention in his memory. Arieh! Listen to the memorial prayer of your brothers and the oath of allegiance to our cause. As long as we live, we will fight for the freedom of Jerusalem and pray, *like you*, for the peace of Israel: with a rifle and a mine. Blessed and praised be the memory of anonymous soldiers, the fighters for the Kingdom of Israel. Magnified and sanctified be his great name.

This kind of reverence was not reserved only for those who were killed while actually fighting the British troops. All members of Lehi who met their deaths at the hands of the Mandatory authorities were accorded the same treatment. Thus Sarah Bilski, an 18-year-old girl who died as a result of British gunfire, was eulogized in the following way:[16]

> Quietly, seriously and lovingly, she carried out every task that was imposed on her. There is nothing profane in the work of the underground. Everything is holy. She was still wearing her white apron and peeling potatoes for the trainees, when a round of ammunition . . .

The nature of the argument is clear. Lehi's aim — the liberation of the Jewish homeland — was holy. So too, therefore, were all those who fought for it, and any means by which they did so.

*Desanctifying Ritual*

The sanctification of violence does not necessarily lead to the abandonment of traditional religious observance. However, on a number of occasions, Lehi leaders did suggest that ritual acts should be discarded in favour of militant ones. This was particularly the case with regard to the traditional mourning customs and the celebration of some festivals.

Lehi fighters who fell at the hands of the British were always portrayed as the vanguard of the revolution. They were 'the minority with a deep historical consciousness' that would infuse the masses with the idea of engaging in a war of liberation. This was to be done in two stages — firstly by 'transforming the subconscious sympathy into a more aware one' and then, by 'converting it into positive action'.[17]

Traditional mourning customs were criticized on the grounds that they had exactly the opposite effect. By acting as a catharsis, it was argued, they precluded the possibility of transforming grief into action. According to this way of thinking, mourning should become 'a source of rage and a goad to action'. Thus, after 11 members of Lehi were killed in an attack on the Palestine Railroad workshops in Haifa, the readers of *The Front* were entreated as follows:[18]

> In remembrance of the 11 for whom the war of liberation was the entire purpose of their existence, who fell in battle holding their weapons, we fly our flag at half-mast. We will not express our pain in tears, our grief in eulogies, or our sorrow in words. We will forge the weapons of war from the blood of the fallen. Our pent-up anger will be transformed into a fighting rage. We will vent our anger in cruel and redemptive action. And when the victory chant will be heard, it will awaken the fallen of the nation to everlasting life.

The traditional festival prayers and rituals were viewed in a similar way. They were also portrayed as an obstacle to concerted action being taken against the British Mandatory authorities. Paradoxically, this was particularly marked with regard to two festivals — Passover and Hanukkah — which commemorate the liberation of the Jewish people from Egyptian bondage and from Greek dominion respectively. A rabbinic dictum recited during the Passover Haggadah service states that in every generation a person must behave as if he himself had personally left Egypt. Lehi's leaders believed that this injunction was not forceful enough:[19]

> No more vague yearnings without obligation. No more pious hopes of freedom. No more empty phrases. We are writing a new Haggadah with our blood. Many generations will envy us because we have the chance to act; because we are privileged to keep the Festival of Freedom with our bodies. Every Jewish person can become a letter inscribed in the book of redemption.

Lehi adopted a similar stance about the celebration of Hanukkah — the Festival of Lights which commemorates the Hasmonean victory over the Greek rulers, and the subsequent rededication of the Temple:[20]

> We will burn our bodies. Let our bodies be transformed into wicks. Let our hatred become oil and let our faith be the flame . . . Let our bodies turn into burning candles. Let our blood be the holy blood of Hanukkah. This blood and these candles are sacred and it is a religious obligation to use them.

Only 'redemptive actions' of this kind, it was argued, would fulfil the ultimate aim of the Jewish festivals — not just a recollection of the past but its reactualization.[21]

### *Attacking Secularism*

It is, of course, beyond the confines of this brief Note to present a detailed analysis of the debate between Lehi leaders and those of the Jewish *Yishuv* in Palestine. Mention must be made, however, of the way in which traditional Judaism provided one of the bases for the movement's attack on its secular opponents.

Labour Zionism, it was argued, constituted a revolt against an outmoded religious world-view. It had, however, been rendered obsolete by the tide of events. With the passage of time it, too, had become a 'tradition' or, to be more precise, 'a belief of yesteryear'. In a special youth edition of *The Front*, the members of the younger generation were therefore urged to repudiate the 'defunct ideas and superstitions' of their parents. They, in common with the religious faith that preceded them, were based on a belief in the power or willingness of external agents to help liberate the Jewish homeland. Unfortunately, however, human princes were as impotent, or unresponsive, as the divine king. The younger generation must therefore

> divest itself of the belief that there are people who hear our protests, our speeches and our prayers. [The previous generation] revolted against the prayer-book, claiming that our prayers are not heard in heaven. The younger generation must say the same thing with regard to the political arena. Gentlemen! Nobody is listening to your 'prayers' from your new 'prayer-book' . . . There are no good Englishmen. There is no conscience, no sense of justice . . . Even your strikes don't make them tremble. Like God, they are not moved by fasts.[22]

This argument was often taken a step further. Not only was the inaction of Labour Zionism equated with that of traditional Judaism — it was regarded as being even worse. Religious Jews could defend their passivity on the grounds that they believed in Divine Providence: all they had to do was to obey His commandments and wait for the

Messiah. The leaders of the *Yishuv*, however, had no faith in God. Their lack of action was, therefore, 'morally indefensible'.

Once again the Maccabean analogy was used to drive this message home. Whilst religious Jews have always regarded the Festival of Hanukkah as a commemoration of a divine miracle, the secular Zionists reinterpreted it as a reminder of the apogee of Jewish bravery and valour. Nevertheless, the leaders of the *Yishuv* had failed to follow in the footsteps of Judah the Maccabee. They were, therefore, much more blameworthy than their religious predecessors:[23]

> There is something even more shameful than the passivity of the Jews in exile . . Our forefathers . . . regarded themselves as Jews who had to bear the punishment of exile until God had mercy and redeemed them by means of a miracle . . . They celebrated the Festival of Hanukkah accordingly. As far as they were concerned, the events of Hanukkah were a miracle, not an allegory or a parable but a real miracle . . . They turned a blind eye to the war itself and the bravery of the Maccabees . . . They lit candles, recited psalms, and waited for another miracle. That was their Hanukkah . . . However, the holy people were destroyed, and those who replaced them are full of words and rhetoric . . . They always bear the names of the Maccabees on their lips, but they are not prepared to follow their example — to wage a war of liberation . . . against the Hellenists . . . and the foreign ruler in our land.

Nothing, it was argued, had really changed: 'They are in the East, but their hearts remain in the depths of the West'.[24]

### *Conclusion*

Traditional Judaism was used as a source of justification for the movement's actions against the British Mandate in Palestine. Nevertheless, it was also frequently attacked, and often in the most savage way. Thus, Lehi's rendering of traditional texts was always accompanied by a critique of previous interpretations. The sanctification of violence was often accompanied by a condemnation of orthodox practices, and in the most extreme cases, it was based on a complete reversal of images. Religious actions were portrayed as profane, violent ones as hallowed and sacred. Although, or perhaps because, Lehi rebelled against traditional Judaism, the leaders of the movement found it necessary to incorporate references to Jewish precepts into their propaganda. Appropriating religious language was, they believed, the most effective way of justifying their actions, both in their own eyes and in the eyes of their opponents.[25]

## NOTES

[1] David C Rapoport. 'Fear and Trembling: Terror in Three Religious Traditions', *American Political Science Review* vol. 78, no. 3, September 1984, p. 674.

[2] Khochig Tololyan, 'Cultural Narrative and the Motivation of the Terrorist', in David C. Rapoport, ed., *Inside Terrorist Organizations*, London, 1988, pp. 217–33, and 'Martyrdom as Legitimacy: Terrorism, Religion and Symbolic Appropriation in the American Diaspora', in Paul Wilkinson and Alisdair M. Stuart, eds., *Contemporary Research in Terrorism*, Aberdeen, 1989, pp. 89–103.

[3] Hilda Schatzberger, *Resistance and Tradition in Mandatory Palestine* (Hebrew), Ramat Gan, 1985.

[4] Ibid., pp. 47–69.

[5] Ibid., pp. 34–46.

[6] Lehi is often referred to as the Stern Gang after its founder Avraham (Yair) Stern. The most comprehensive account of the movement is by Joseph Heller, *Lehi: Ideology and Politics 1940–1949* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1989. For a general introduction in English, see J. Bowyer Bell, *Terror out of Zion: Irgun Zvai Leumi, Lehi and the Palestinian Underground 1929–1949*, New York, 1977.

[7] Fighters for the Liberation of Israel, *Ktavim* (Writings), Tel Aviv, 1982. These collected works have been published only in Hebrew. All the excerpts quoted in this article have been translated by me.

[8] Exodus 21:23–25.

[9] *Babylonian Talmud Tractate Sanhedrin*, 74b.

[10] *Ktavim*, vol. 2, pp. 483–84.

[11] Ibid., pp. 331–32.

[12] Tololyan, 'Martyrdom as Legimimacy', op. cit in Note 2 above, pp. 93–96.

[13] *Ktavim*, vol. 2, p. 837.

[14] *Ktavim*, vol. 1, pp. 207–08.

[15] Ibid., p. 76. Emphasis in original.

[16] *Ktavim*, vol. 2, p. 78.

[17] *Ktavim*, vol. 1, p. 444.

[18] *Ktavim*, vol. 2, pp. 127–28.

[19] Ibid., p. 1009.

[20] *Ktavim*, vol. 1, pp. 841–42.

[21] This term is borrowed from the historian Yosef Haim Yerushalmi. For details of the rather different way in which he uses it, see his *Zakhor: Jewish History, Jewish Memory*, Seattle, 1982, pp. 44–45.

[22] *Ktavim*, vol. 1, p. 246.

[23] Ibid., pp. 251–54.

[24] Ibid., p. 123.

[25] On this point, see David C. Rapoport, 'Some General Observations on Religion and Violence; *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 3, no. 3, Autumn 1991, pp. 119–25.

# RADICAL ASSIMILATION IN ANGLO-JEWRY

Israel Finestein

*(Review Article)*

TODD M. ENDELMAN, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (The Modern Jewish Experience Series), ix + 246 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1990, $29.50.

DR Todd Endelman, Professor of Modern Jewish History at the University of Michigan, established his high reputation as an historian of Anglo-Jewry with his well-known study entitled *The Jews of Georgian England*, relating to the period from 1714 to 1830. The book was published in 1979 by the Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, and was reviewed in the June 1981 issue of this Journal (vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 77–79). It is worth noting here that the subtitle of that volume was 'Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society', since those themes are no less evident in the work now under review. But they are examined in the new volume with greater particularity and in a special context, namely in connection with what might be called the pathology of the community. That is to say, he has now researched in greater depth and in respect of a far longer epoch (from the re-admission of the Jews in the seventeenth century to the end of the Second World War) assimilatory processes amounting to detachment from the Jewish community and resulting in absorption within the wider society: this is what he terms 'radical assimilation', the severance of all links with Jewry and with Judaism.

Social assimilation and political emancipation did not necessarily involve disaffiliation from the Jewish community. Indeed, many a leader in the campaign for emancipation was as concerned to ensure the Jewish viability of his community as he was to pursue that campaign.[1] But the circumstances of assimilation and the ever-growing integration into society led to greater degrees of assimilation. Generations of English Jews saw wider possibilities of personal success in public life if they distanced themselves from Judaism. There was the encouragement of fashion, friendships with Gentiles, and often common intellectual or recreational interests with them. Private recollections of older styles of Jewish life increasingly diminished.

The absence in England of any ghetto, and the distinctive libertarian tradition of the country (as well as the comparative lack of rigidity in the structure of English society), allowed greater social mobility than was the case on the continent of Europe. Moreover, there were not in England, as occurred in other Western lands, sudden changes in attitudes or in legislation or in the constitutional system, which dramatically altered and re-altered the status of Jewish citizens. The operation of emancipation and of assimilation in England was altogether less dramatic, and accordingly more pervasive and more readily perceived as being part of the natural order of things.

Out-marriage, personal ambition, and sheer lack of knowledge of Jewish religious norms and Jewish traditions led increasing numbers of families to lose interest in, or personal concern about, a distinctive Jewish continuity. This was especially the case when they were faced with what appeared to be an ineradicable anti-Jewish phobia in some quarters of national life. They came to see that phobia as an unnecessary burden for them to bear, and some decided that the remedy was to shed what had become the purposeless insignia of a frayed and unwanted Jewishness.

A crucial factor in such transformations in the West generally was the emergence of what Dr Jacob Katz, a former professor of Jewish History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, called 'the neutral society'.[2] According to him, a decisive turning-point was reached when Jews transferred their social goals to their Gentile environment. For them, that transfer became a source of social gratification. The 'neutral society, was one in which religion had lost its centrality in national life, so that in order to fulfil his social ambitions, a Jew did not have to convert to Christianity. Religious differences lost their 'circumscribing functions'.[3]

However, there was no general smooth progression away from Judaism on the part of the majority of English Jews. Some converted to the dominant faith, but Anglo-Jewry as a community resisted missionary activities and promoted measures in the fields of Jewish welfare and education in order to safeguard Judaism. Although indifference to Jewish religious observance was widespread, it did not escape castigation from the religious leaders and sometimes from the lay leadership and the Jewish press. Although there was social amity between Jews and Christians, there were also mutual reservations.

Some prominent and assimilated Jews remained attached to, and were proud to support, some of the principal institutions of the Jewish community. Sir Barrow Helbert Ellis (1823–1887), a former member of the Viceroy's Council, served as chairman of Jews' College during the closing two years of his life. Henry de Worms (1840–1903), later Lord Pirbright — a kinsman of the Rothschilds and a leading Tory politician — became a vice-president of the United Synagogue and president of

the Anglo-Jewish Association. His daughters married Christians and he directed that he be buried in Christian consecrated ground. The cause of oppressed or threatened Jewries in other countries retained its appeal to Jews whose active association with Jewish concerns at home was limited.

In exploring the particular case of Anglo-Jewry, Professor Endelman has raised wider and more general issues about the status of the Jew in modern society, the nature of Jewish identity, and the capacity for, as well as the likelihood of, the survival of Judaism in the modern open society. In Continental Europe in the early decades of social emancipation, there were cautionary Jewish voices fearful of assimilation: Jacob Emden of Altona (1697–1776) and Moses Schreiber of Pressburg (1763–1839, better known as the *Chatam Sofer*) expressed special concern. In England, however, such warnings were little heard and less noted. Community leaders tended to adopt the attitudes of their environment — pragmatism, government through patronage and inherited authority, and a non-ideological approach to public issues. Higher Jewish learning did not have many patrons and there was little encouragement for publishing Judaica in whatever language. The tests of wise leadership were believed to lie in the field of care for the community's poor and of sound synagogal management.

The established church admittedly wielded considerable influence and nonconformist denominations had a great impact on public life, but entry into 'society' gradually became less dependent upon a Christian identity. It was therefore possible for Jews to effect and to secure that entry while at the same time sharing in the spirit of the 'neutrality'. Sir Moses Montefiore was continually uneasy at the possibility that the Jewish leaders who were most active in the struggle for emancipation might engender a fashionable disregard for the rules and traditions which to him defined and sustained the characteristic elements of Judaism.[4]

Professor Endelman's impressive study ranges from the time when it was believed that entry into 'society' depended upon a Christian identity, to the period when that idea had clearly waned and ultimately lost most of its lingering hold. This means that he has made an important contribution not only to Anglo-Jewish history, but also to general British history. In seventeenth-century England, some Sephardim who came to settle in the country were already long accustomed to public association with Christian religious ways in their life as Marranos (official converts to Christianity who often retained Jewish practices in secret) in Continental countries. Some Ashkenazi commercial magnates in the next century were also inclined towards fairly rapid assimilation; the affluent often led sophisticated lives and developed an indifference to Jewish religious identity; they regarded their epoch as possessed of a rationality which their elders could not

have known either in England or abroad. Then the nineteenth century's commercial and scientific innovations, following upon the great political and ideological changes in the decades around the turn of the century, furthered the trend towards eventual radical assimilation. These influences were not confined to the social and economic 'upper' levels of Anglo-Jewry.

Professor Endelman has been especially interested to discover why some individuals and some families opted out while others did not do so, and which were the factors at work that determined the speed of disaffiliation in England. The volume therefore includes many case histories of individuals and of families as part of his research findings. Chance, love affairs, personality, and opportunity all played their part. But it is clear that there operated in England features of public life which rendered that country unique in Europe with respect to the manner, pace, and extent of radical assimilation. That type of assimilation, the author asserts, in the case of 'scores of Sephardim in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century England had no parallel in the Jewish communities of Europe at that time. Political and social conditions favorable to Jewish integration were not duplicated elsewhere until the nineteenth century, and in some reactionary states they never existed at all'. As for the Ashkenazim, he goes on to note (p. 33) that those 'who arrived in England during the Georgian period encountered the same set of social and political conditions, but their response was not identical, for they came in greater numbers and, most importantly, they came as heirs of a very different historical and communal experience'.

Professor Endelman also notes that a central element in the Anglo-Jewish scene was that the community was the first one in Jewish history to be established on a purely voluntary basis. That had far-reaching consequences. The absence of effective sanctions reinforced the practical effect of the voluntary character of the communal system. It was easier to take the opportunities for freedom from synagogal and communal attachment. Moreover, the remarkable fact that in 1870 the group of London congregations which established the United Synagogue obtained an Act of Parliament to give statutory authority to their union, did not impair the essentially voluntary nature of the system.

There is an extensive historiography of the influential German Jewish immigration into Victorian England, but it is less voluminous than that of the Eastern European immigration between 1881 and 1914. This is so on account partly of the far greater weight in numbers of the later arrivals and partly because of the widespread effects of that later immigration (to this day and probably beyond) upon the Jewish community of England. However, the circumstances of the First World War intensified the assimilatory impulse and by the start of the Second World War, the assimilation of the descendants of the German

immigrants of the Victorian era was complete. The author notes that since the outbreak of that war, 'drift and defection have continued to thin the ranks of English Jewry' (p. 203). Many have been absorbed fully into the wider society as a result of broader opportunities in education and in gainful occupations as well as of residential dispersion.

Professor Endelman rejects the theory that toleration in itself is inimical to the perpetuation of Jewish life and argues that what in reality threatened communal cohesion was the type of toleration which existed in England and in other liberal countries, 'a toleration that was qualified, hedged around with reservations, and thus ultimately ambiguous ... The stigma of Jewishness, however slight, however muted, persisted, continuing to work its corrosive effect on Jews whose faith and ethnicity were already receding' (p. 209). In the final sentences of his conclusion (ibid.), he refers briefly to the more recently arrived ethnic groups:

> Whether the influx of Asian, African, and Caribean [*sic*] immigrants into England in the years after World War II will ultimately lead to a shift in attitudes toward cultural diversity remains to be seen. At the moment there is no reason to be sanguine that it will.

Professor Endelman is in error in stating (p. 74) that Jews gained in 1871 the right to take degrees at Oxford and Cambridge. The Oxford University Reform Act of 1854 gave professing Jews the right of admission to Oxford colleges and of receiving Oxford degrees, while in 1856 Parliament abolished the religious test for degrees at Cambridge. Jews had not been barred in law from admission to Cambridge. But he is correct in stating that they obtained in 1871 the right to hold fellowships at Oxford and Cambridge. In fact, it was the Universities Tests Act of 1871 which gave Jews that right; it also allowed them to occupy, with some exceptions, teaching posts at these two universities. The lifting of all these restrictions was not confined to Jews but extended also to Christian denominations outside the Anglican communion.

In connection with the Act of 1871, it would have been relevant and fitting to refer to the remarkable career of the short-lived Numa Hartog (1846–1871) who headed the mathematics tripos at Cambridge. His refusal to use the obligatory Christian formula for accepting the proferred fellowship at Trinity College, played a significant role in the passage of the measure of 1871. Sir George Jessel's entry into Gladstone's government as Solicitor-General in 1871 was not as telling as his appointment two years later as Master of the Rolls. He was the first Jew to be appointed to the judiciary in England and the event was rightly seen at the time as opening a new phase in Jewish advancement.

Professor Endelman reminds us that out-marriage 'occurred at all levels of the community, in both London and the provinces. Among the

very wealthiest families, which had been relatively immune to intermarriage for most of the Victorian period, such unions became less novel after the turn of the century' (p. 105). Yet in 1895, when Arthur Cohen's daughter Margaret married a Christian, he resigned as President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews (despite being urged by Orthodox friends not to do so) on the grounds that he believed her decision to have compromised his position. (Two other daughters of Arthur Cohen later also married outside the Jewish community.) Cohen was the nephew of Sir Moses Montefiore and a leading commercial lawyer, and is said by Todd Endelman to have been 'an agnostic' (p. 86). Whatever his personal isolation from Jewish traditional beliefs and practice, I doubt whether this is an accurate description. Like many of his contemporaries of his class and education, Cohen veered between deism and theism. He felt a strong bond with the history of the Jewish people, was disenchanted with rabbinic Judaism, and was aware of his own need to be associated with the organized life of his community of birth. He is quoted as commenting on a Passover evening: 'It warms my Jewish blood and makes me feel that I belong to a peculiar race of which and of whose history I am proud'.[5] He had genuine pride about the Jewish role in Western civilization and in British public life. His combination of attitudes could also be found in a large section of the Jewish leadership both of his day and of several decades into the present century.

The years since 1945 have seen many developments which have both accentuated some of the tendencies explored by Todd Endelman and transformed some of the others. The impact of the creation of the State of Israel and of that country's embattled history continues to sharpen Jewish self-consciousness, including both the religious attachment of Jews and forms of Jewish secularity. Responses to the calamitous events of the Nazi dominance from 1933 to 1945 also continue to weigh upon the Jewish mind. Continually since 1945, there have been mounting signs of Jewish revivalism on both the religious 'right' and the religious 'left', while there were just as clear indications of indifferentism and erosion in the broad middle ground. Anglo-Jewry has probably never been as alert or as responsive to the issue of Jewish viability as it is today.

Professor Endelman's book will long endure as an authoritative work in a field which he has made his own, and as a source-book for many ideas and themes for scholarly enquiry by future researchers.

## NOTES

[1] See Israel Finestein, 'Jewish Emancipationists in Victorian England: Self-imposed Limits to Assimilation', in Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein, eds., *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Cambridge, 1992, pp. 38–56.

[2] Jacob Katz, *Tradition and Crisis*, New York, 1971, p. 245.

[3] Ibid., p. 251 and see pp. 245–59 generally.

[4] See Israel Finestein, 'The Uneasy Victorian: Montefiore as Communal Leader', in Sonia and Vivian D. Lipman, eds., *The Century of Moses Montefiore*, Oxford, 1985, pp. 45–70.

[5] See Lucy Cohen, *Some Recollections of Claude Goldsmid Montefiore*, London, 1940, pp. 230–31.

# LAND AND POLITICS IN ISRAEL

Max Beloff

*(Review Article)*

ISSA KHALAF, *Politics in Palestine: Arab Nationalism and Social Disintegration, 1939–1948* (SUNY Series in the Social and Economic History of the Middle East), xix + 318 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1991, $18.95 (hardback, $57.50).

CHARLES S. KAMEN, *Little Common Ground: Arab and Jewish Settlement in Palestine, 1920–1948*, xi + 327 pp., University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 1991, $39.95.

YAEL YISHAI, *Land of Paradoxes: Interest Politics in Israel*, xvi + 414 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1991, $17.95 (hardback, $54.50).

NO one who has to deal with the problems of Israel and its neighbours can claim that what is lacking is factual material. From its inception, social scientists have been interested in the functioning of the Jewish State, as they had been in the *Yishuv* which preceded it; more recently, there has been an upsurge of interest in the Palestinians. American universities and academic publishers have made a large contribution to satisfying both interests — sometimes in the writings of American scholars, sometimes by publishing the work of Israeli scholars for an audience wider than Hebrew can reach, and sometimes by giving scope to residents of the United States of Palestinian descent.

Professor Khalaf belongs to the last category and his book covers important, and for Western readers largely new, ground. He is concerned to explore the reasons why the Palestinian Arabs in the period from the outbreak of the Second World War until their defeat in the Israeli War of Independence failed to achieve any of their goals, and were largely driven into the position of being homeless exiles — a position from which they have not yet managed to extricate themselves. The explanation, as the author sees it, cannot be limited to the final struggle. One has to take into account that the Arab population, when the British succeeded the Ottomans as the rulers of Palestine, and when the impact of Zionist settlement began to be a factor, were already

subject to rapid economic and social change, not uncommon in other developing countries. Such change involved a challenge to the existing social and political élites, themselves dominated by a number of competing families or clans for the most part urban-based. By its inevitable support of existing élites, the Mandatory regime did nothing to assist in the development of a more modern society. The members of the élite used the new national awareness to further their attempts both to oust the Zionists and to retain their own position, but were frustrated by their own internal divisions and by the other interests in play — notably those of the two branches of the Hashemite dynasty. Military defeat was the product of the internal disintegration of the Palestinian community, its class divisions, and its localism.

Professor Khalaf can document in detail his view of the internal affairs of the Palestinian community, but on the international dimension his touch is less certain. He writes, for instance, that the British really had no intention of carrying through the 1939 White Paper which he believes most Arabs would have accepted as the best arrangement within reach (p. 66). But he gives no evidence for holding that the British had no intention of abiding by the policy which remained in force until the very different situation which emerged after the war. Yet this is important, since he believes that it was the failure to carry through this policy that discomfited moderate Arabs and gave the opportunity for national leadership to al-Haj Amin al-Husayni, the Mufti.

It is obvious that the author's attitude to the Mufti is an ambiguous one — seeing him at the same time as a potential national leader of a Palestinian State, and yet as someone whose determination to assert his personal authority by the intimidation and assassination of his opponents helped to destroy the chances of Arab unity in the final struggle.

One other claim by Professor Khalaf is rather ironical for those who are used to look at this story from the Zionist point of view. Reflecting on the Mandatory period, many Jewish observers have remarked that one problem with their British rulers was that the latter were used to dealing with 'colonial' peoples in whom they looked for qualities which the Jews did not possess; they thus personally preferred the Arabs. Yet when Professor Khalaf tries to explain the bias towards the Jewish side which he detects in the comparative leniency shown (in his view) by the British towards the Jewish insurgents after 1945 — while admitting that the Holocaust and the support for the Zionist cause in the international community had some effect — he continues with these remarkable words (pp. 200–01):

> Perhaps after all, there was an additional, more subtle reason: unlike the Jews who were, after all, Western, the Palestinian Arabs were, in the colonial mind, the dehumanized 'natives' reflecting a culture and religion that Europeans feared, distorted and despised, and whose rights and lives could be snuffed out with more impunity.

Dr Kamen's book also has a political thrust, though of a very different kind. An American sociologist resident in Israel from 1967 to 1985, Dr Kamen found himself involved in attempts to bridge the gap between the Jews and the Arabs in an Israel now extended after the Six-Day War of 1967. He believed that in order to bridge that gap, it was essential to discover the truth about the relations between the two communities in Mandatory Palestine, and since the Arab population at that time was predominantly rural, this led him into an examination of the situation of Arab agriculture and in particular to an attempt to answer the question as to whether the Zionists had been right to claim that Jewish settlement had involved actual gains to the Arab population or whether — as the Arab nationalists claimed — it had a wholly deleterious effect upon their economic and social as well as their prospective political goals. It is Dr Kamen's contention that all too little is known about the subject, since the Arabs themselves did not go in for such investigations, since the Jewish accounts of the period were dedicated to advancing the Zionist cause, and since the Mandatory government had neither the resources nor, in the absence of any positive policy of development, any incentive to fill the gap. I would find the argument about ignorance more convincing if Dr Kamen did not inform us that he is unable to read Arabic — could there not be sources that have therefore remained inaccessible to him? I do not know — but his tackling of such a topic without knowing the language of the community he was studying does cast a rather worrying light on the nature of the dialogue that Dr Kamen was so keen to sustain.

One result is that the book is largely an effort to wring out of sheer statistics what they have to offer; there is no attempt to look at individual or family experience or at particular communities: it is a book virtually without proper names. Yet the conclusions are clear and probably correct. In Dr Kamen's view, the Jewish immigration during the Mandatory period was only marginal in its effect upon the local populations — whether for good or for ill. The Arab rural world was being transformed (a process begun in the previous century) partly through the impact of external commercial forces but in the Mandatory period also through the rapid increase in its own population — owing to the fall in the death rate (that is, to 'natural increase') and not, *pace* Joan Peters, to immigration from other Arab lands. The proper recourse for a society placed in this position would have been a modernization of agricultural techniques along the lines the Jews were following, or the finding of alternative outlets for employment in industry. The former was not possible, given the existing systems of land tenure, and the non-availability of capital; as so often in countries of variable climate, the nexus between peasant and moneylender becomes all important. Lack of capital also prevented much Arab entrepreneurship while the Zionist policy (for ideological reasons) of

not employing Arabs cut off what might otherwise have been an important contribution of the Jewish presence. It could be argued that the attempt to look at what happened in the light of conditions in other 'settler colonies' in the then British Empire is not very helpful, as Dr Kamen indeed admits. It would have been much more helpful if he had done a parallel study of what happened to rural Arab societies in countries where there was no Zionist presence — Syria, the Lebanon, or even Iraq. But such studies in the field are not open to the wandering Jewish sociologist.

All democratic countries find a role for what are usually styled 'interest groups', though 'pressure groups' would sometimes seem a more appropriate designation. Israel is no exception, and Professor Yishai has made herself an authority on the subject after many years of research into it. Her book will be very helpful to anyone seeking to go behind the formal institutions of the Israeli State to see how particular interests and particular schools of thought have tried successfully or unsuccessfully to get their way. The title 'Land of Paradoxes' may, however, baffle the reader. It seemingly arises from the author's decision to cast her enquiry along a pattern of types of relationship between government and interest groups set out by some American political scientists some years ago. Such relationships, they held, must be either 'élitist', 'corporatist', or 'pluralist', using all three words in a not altogether obvious sense — 'élitism' standing for the patronage of the groups by the State or by political parties; 'corporatism' for institutionalized co-operation between the State and interest groups; and 'pluralism' for the various devices by which the latter can seek to influence the former. Why should one find it paradoxical that Israel should not fit into any of these definitions, and why should Professor Yishai care whether the definitions are borne out by Israeli experience?

From whichever angle one approaches Israeli politics, the country is *sui generis*, having emerged with its institutions from a pre-State era which has no parallel and having had as a major determinant of all its activity the necessity for physical security and the encouragement of new waves of immigration which help to contribute to it. Where else do the army and the defence industries play so important a part? Where can one find among 'interest groups' even an approximation to the role of the Israeli Federation of Labour, the Histadrut? The paradoxes are not in non-conformity to any formal external criteria but are to be found internally. Professor Yishai indicates that of all the interest-group organizations, those which have met least understanding from the authorities are those representing new immigrants — even since she completed the book, the same such discontents have surfaced among new arrivals from the former Soviet Union. On the other hand, she suggests that the great success story is that of Gush Emunim, the political party which forced the government's hand into settling in

areas of dense Arab population in the occupied territories. By contrast, a movement like Peace Now — which on the surface has had many adherents — has been almost wholly ineffective.

One difficulty, as the author makes clear, is that Israel even in its short period of existence has been a society rapidly changing in size, composition, ideology, and internal organization. And that means that questionnaires and other research instruments used a few years ago, or secondary literature of an earlier period, cannot do justice to current actuality. Professor Yishai would have done better to jettison her schema and to treat the subject historically; that would have given room for some explanation as to the degree to which, and the methods by which, some welfare functions are actually carried out by 'interest groups'. She has written a very good book which could have been better.

# ELIE KEDOURIE
# (1926–1992)

ELIE KEDOURIE, C.B.E., F.B.A., Emeritus Professor of Politics at London University, died suddenly in Washington D.C. on 29 June 1992. He was born in Baghdad on 25 January 1926 and came to England after the Second World War in order to study at the London School of Economics and Political Science. After graduating, he went to St Antony's College, Oxford University, and in 1953 returned to the L.S.E. as Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Government; in 1965, he was appointed to the chair of Politics and retired in 1990. Both before and after his retirement, he lectured and wrote on Politics and on Middle Eastern History at several universities and institutes — in Australia, in France and the Netherlands, in Israel, and in the United States.

In 1964, he was the founding Editor of *Middle Eastern Studies* (published by Frank Cass) and he continued to edit that scholarly periodical until his untimely death last June. His wife, Sylvia G. Haim, was the Associate Editor and she now assumes sole editorial responsibility for that journal. Elie Kedourie was the author of several learned volumes and he also edited several books dealing with the Middle East and with Jewish affairs — listed in his entry in *Who's Who*; his last publication was the volume he edited, entitled *Spain and the Jews. The Sephardi Experience 1492 and After.*

*The Independent* newspaper published an obituary on 3 July 1992 by Kenneth Minogue, who stated: 'Elie Kedourie was the most profound historian of his generation. Among his achievements was that of transforming our understanding of nationalism'.

He was a valued member of this Journal's Advisory Board and was always willing to give the Editor of *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* the benefit of his expert opinion whenever he was consulted about the merits of an article which had been submitted for publication. His wise judgement will be very greatly missed; his comments were always lucid and concise.

Mr Alan Beattie, who was his colleague at the L.S.E., gives below an appreciation of Elie Kedourie the scholar. (An abbreviated version of this text was published in *The Guardian* newspaper in London as an obituary on 6 July 1992.)

To those with liberal or progressive dispositions, exposure to Elie Kedourie could be shocking. His philosophy had been influenced by his mentor, friend and colleague Michael Oakeshott, but Kedourie's expression of it was direct, with little of Oakeshott's allusive balm. He found in the doctrine of nationalism a central example of the crude and dangerous abridgement of complicated political questions which constituted Oakeshott's notion of ideology. His historical writings detailed the baleful influences of this doctrine, from its origins in Europe to its importation into Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. His history defended the political virtues of the Empires destroyed by nationalism, and ridiculed the romantic illusions of British admirers of Arab nationalists in particular. For him, the proper business of government was to accommodate divergent interests through wise judgement, respect for tradition, and the maintenance of the rule of law. It had no business promoting economic growth, redistributing wealth, or enforcing false virtues through the illusive comfort of a sense of national identity.

Nationalist regimes represented, by contrast, the importation of an absurd and foreign political doctrine, put to the service of ruthless politicians with no respect for local traditions and no purpose other than the exploitation of their subjects. The rulers of Britain and the United States, he believed, had been too willing to sacrifice their own national interests in the pursuit of indulging these fateful nationalist ambitions. The cryptic comments in which Kedourie sometimes encapsulated this enterprise could be startling and appear designed to end rather than to invite debate: 'He was a Whig' (a dismissal of Burke); 'It is a slave plantation' (Nasser's Egypt); 'He is the intellectual counterpart of Madam Blavatsky' (Marx). Such remarks were usually accompanied by a seismic shrug, or by the characteristic chuckle which emphasized the degree of his contempt.

Some critics (like the anonymous reviewers of the *Times Literary Supplement*) adopted the *ad hominem* approach, reducing his views to 'Zionism' or to his early experiences in Iraq. This had the tactical advantage of not having to confront the immense scholarship displayed in his writings, or the extent to which even his most provocative epigrams turned out to be but the tip of a carefully constructed and massive intellectual iceberg. One sometimes came to appreciate his insights only years after they were recounted. The undergraduate who 20 years ago presented him with a banal 'Whiggish' essay on the British Constitution complained to me then that Kedourie had merely remarked: 'Go to the Foreign Office. Look at the buttons on the uniform of the messengers. You will see the Crown on them'. I shared the student's bewilderment then; I see the historical point now. Moreover, most of the verbal epigrams were reserved for students, colleagues, and friends; his writings were what mattered to him, and on

which he expected his scholarship to be judged. He refused interviews on public broadcasting because they could not provide an adequate opportunity for him to develop his views. Those who initially knew only his verbal responses were usually astonished by the clarity and richness of his prose once they turned to his writing.

Kedourie's learning was immense, and was matched by his archival skills. Colleagues who sought his advice about what to make of a particular source never failed to learn from him, even when the field concerned was remote from his own. He turned out to know about the most surprising and disparate subjects; those who took it upon themselves to impress him with their knowledge of (say) opera, poetry, or painting were often disconcerted to discover later (and never through *his* telling them) that he knew more than they did.

His view of the university was as a community of scholars, where students were inducted by teachers into an appreciation of a variety of intellectual languages. The ideas of 'training' and 'social relevance' were inimical to such an education. 'What does he know?' was his usual query about academics whose work he had not encountered. 'Knowing' involved familiarity with a body of substantive knowledge. In his own discipline of politics, it meant working with historical or philosophical texts. He taught by a process of teasing out the significance and intellectual location of texts, an almost Talmudic exercise affectionately captured by a colleague's description of one series of his seminars as 'a Bible class'.

In his later years at the London School of Economics, he became increasingly hostile to developments in British universities in general and at the L.S.E. in particular. He usually concealed how much the School and his department meant to him, and therefore how much the changes there had distressed him. He wrote of a combination of politicians and ambitious academics turning these 'diamonds' — the universities — into the 'glass' of manpower training, technical skills, and moralizing opinion. In Political Studies, he detested the intrusion of the assumptions and empirical methods of economics or the natural sciences, recommending (with the chuckle) the example of the ancient ruler whose recipe for political stability was the expulsion of all mathematicians. He did not expend his energies on lengthy political battles to counter these trends. That would have distracted him from his work, and in any case his international reputation was such as to give him immediate access to whatever scholarly community he found agreeable.

Kedourie was not an easy colleague for those who liked small talk or superficial clubbability. He knew little and cared less about the private lives of most of his colleagues; he was impatient of gossip about them; he judged them primarily as scholars. The judgement could appear forbidding, even in informal circumstances. A visiting academic,

staying with Kedourie, recounted producing at Sunday breakfast a copy of the 'quality' Sunday newspaper which he took. Kedourie read aloud, without comment, the headlines and sub-headings in the paper. 'He made them sound', his visitor recalls, 'either utterly trivial or absurd, and made me feel foolish for subscribing to them'. But Kedourie was generous with his advice and help to those who asked for it; and those of us who came to feel a great personal affection for him did so in part because of his capacity to be companionable without feeling (or making us feel) the need to chatter.

The felicity of his own family life and his quiet but firm views about proper conduct must have made the sometimes tangled personal lives of others puzzling and distasteful to him; but those he liked and respected were offered quiet and effective support when they needed it. He was unique in my experience as an academic who exemplified the Aristotelian virtues: admirable in character, quietly sociable, a friend in need, always the teacher yet blissfully unaware of the onus he imposed by treating the pupil as simultaneously his intellectual peer.

It is a great pity that his long-projected work on English Conservatism, and his book on Hegel, will now never be completed. But his view of English Conservatism will live through his beautifully crafted essay on the third Marquess of Salisbury, whose deep but unstrident religious convictions and firm but sceptical politics he admired. Once he had done everything he could to take the right decision, declared Salisbury, 'with the consequences I have nothing to do'. Elie Kedourie found one of his ideal modern politicians in Salisbury, and Salisbury's beliefs are the best guide to Kedourie's own political dispositions.

He would have continued to enlighten us had he lived. But few others have left behind a scholarly *corpus* of such breadth and depth of learning. A full appreciation of his character may be the possession only of those fortunate enough to have known him, but Kedourie's own fortune is that he will live through his works. 'He is a scholar' was Kedourie's highest praise of a colleague; no one who knew anything ever doubted its appropriateness to him, and no one ever will.

ALAN BEATTIE

# BOOK REVIEWS

ROGER BERG, *Histoire du rabbinat français (xvi^e^–xx^e^ siècle)*, 280 pp., Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1991, 240 francs.

Roger Berg — for 14 years the secretary-general of the Consistoire Central — has set out to write an institutional history of the French rabbinate through biographical sketches of its more noted members and brief surveys of some of the more compelling issues it has encountered. For those interested in the evolution of French Judaism, a survey and synthesis of this sort is welcome, especially since earlier studies were often limited to the nineteenth century and are no longer readily available. Relying on classical works such as that of Abraham Cahen and recent research by Gerard Nahon, René Moulinas, Simon Schwarzfuchs, and J. M. Chouraqui, Berg provides the reader with a panoramic view from the sixteenth century to the present as well as an understanding of the diversity of experience which characterized the Jewish communities of south-western and eastern France and the four 'carrières' of Avignon, Carpentras, Cavasillon, and L'Isle-sur-la-Sorgue. He concludes with a discussion of the contemporary rabbinate and the impressive contributions of *Grands Rabbins* Jacob Kaplan, René-Samuel Sirat, and Joseph Sitruk to the expanding and revitalized Franco-Jewish community.

While Berg describes differences in interpretation among historians, he stops short of offering analyses of his own. His work, therefore, is less an historical or sociological study than a generally useful catalogue and reference work. To this he has attached invaluable annexes, for example the complete list of students studying at the *École rabbinique de France* and the *Séminaire Israélite de France* as well as nineteenth- and twentieth-century texts of the various regulations defining the role and position of the rabbis of France. He also includes the text of the 1856 conference of *Grands Rabbins*, the 1975 by-laws and statutes governing the rabbinic body of the Central Consistory, and a number of revealing internal documents concerning such matters as sermons, rabbinic habit, marriage, the role of rabbis, and religious authority.

The reader must beware, however, the limitations of such historical analysis as Berg provides. He also makes some errors. On p. 46, for instance, he names David Sintzheim as 'one of two delegates from the Jews of Alsace to the Estates General' but Jews did not have any deputies in the Estates General. He also suggests (p. 66) that when Theodor Herzl witnessed the degradation of Dreyfus, 'this led him immediately to the idea of the Jewish State'. This is fanciful and

historically misleading. And when discussing the decree of 1808, which established the consistorial organization of French Judaism, Berg omits the accompanying 'infamous' decrees, thereby denying the reader a full understanding of the historical context.

The value of this volume lies in the documents it publishes and the *dictionnaire biographique* it provides. As a reference work, it will be welcome by researchers. As an historical and sociolgical analysis, it has shortcomings — even, regrettably, in book construction: this reviewer's copy came unglued as it was being read.

FRANCES MALINO

ISAIAH FRIEDMAN, *The Question of Palestine. British-Jewish-Arab Relations: 1914–1918*, second expanded edition, lxv + 433 pp., Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and London, 1992, $24.95 or £18.95.

JEFF HALPER, *Between Redemption and Revival. The Jewish Yishuv of Jerusalem in the Nineteenth Century*, xiii + 290 pp., Westview Press, Boulder, San Francisco, and Oxford, 1991, £23.95.

Professor Friedman's two books on the antecedents of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and hence of the British Mandate for Palestine — *The Question of Palestine*, first published in 1973, and *Germany, Turkey and Zionism, 1897–1918*, published in 1977 — remain the standard works on the subject. They set out clearly and on the basis of diplomatic sources the reasons why the opposing Great Powers in the First World War sought to woo Jewish opinion while pursuing their own strategic aims, and how this competition ultimately came out. Attempts to describe British policy as based upon sentiment, the accidents of personality, or other adventitious elements in the situation are shown to be unfounded and it is no longer possible seriously to assert that some kind of betrayal of the 'Arab' cause was involved or that Palestine deserved the sobriquet of 'the twice-promised land'.

Since the publication of Isaiah Friedman's two books, much more has nevertheless been written on the subject and it is a pity that the author has not used the appearance of a new edition of *The Question of Palestine*, if not to revise the text, at least to indicate perhaps in an introduction how far, if at all, his views have been modified by subsequent work, and to update the bibliography. (A student embarking on the subject is not much helped by a bibliography now some 20 years out of date.) What Professor Friedman has done instead is to write a new introduction of some 50 pages about a quite different topic — the extent to which there was in nineteenth-century Britain a sympathy largely on religious grounds for the sufferings of the Jewish people, and at the same time an interest in the return of the Jews to the

Holy Land both as a solution for their own problems and as a possible instrument of Britain's growing concern with the future of this part of the Ottoman Dominion. Herbert Samuel's famous memorandum of January 1915, in which he advocated the annexation of Palestine to the British Empire and the encouragement of Jewish immigration and Jewish colonization under British rule, did not come altogether as a bolt from the blue.

Although this introduction is marred by some minor errors, it is a learned and challenging survey of the subject. Much attention is paid to pointing out the considerable interest shown by Palmerston in the Jews, since although the appointment of the first British consul at Jerusalem in 1836 was not connected in anyone's mind with the position of the Jews, their role and fate played an increasing part in the activities of the first holder of the post and of those of his successors. For his part, Palmerston seems to have been somewhat equivocal as to whether the consul's role as a protector of Jews applied only to those of British citizenship and other Europeans claiming British protection or extended to the local Jewish residents, most of whom were Ottoman subjects. The other most important figure among nineteenth-century statesmen was in this context the reforming seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. His interest has been dismissed by Leonard Stein among others as arising solely out of a concern in the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. Professor Friedman, on the contrary, is prepared to regard Shaftesbury as a proto-Zionist.

In 1914–18 and again in 1945–48, it was as a consequence of the actions of the Great Powers that events in the Middle East worked themselves out. The arena in which influence or domination was sought was even stranger in the 1830s than it became later on, when new modes of communication, pilgrimages, and tourism had altered the local picture. Professor Halper's original and exciting book helps one to understand how alien that world was to the society in which Palmerston and his rivals moved. The crisis year of the 'Eastern question', 1840, was for some of the Ashkenazi Jews of Jerusalem a year of disappointment and disillusion, since for them it had been the year of the promised Redemption. The story that the author has to tell — and he brings to it the freshness of approach of an anthropologist as well as historical skills — is a strange one, and one which has been largely obliterated in the conventional stories of modern Israel. The nucleus of the Jewish inhabitants of the city of Jerusalem, still confined within its Turkish walls, was composed of Sephardim who had arrived there in the sixteenth century.

Since early in the eighteenth century, there had been a gradual accretion of Ashkenazi elements differing in their territorial origins and sectarian allegiances, but united in their belief that their role was to prepare for the coming of the Messiah by total immersion in the

devotional life and by strict observance of Jewish religious law. In the view of most of their leaders, this precluded the ordinary struggle for a living — accepted by the Sephardim as well as by the city's non-Jewish inhabitants — in favour of total reliance on subsidies from their brethren in their countries of origin and in Western Europe and North America. To engage in productive work was a diversion, while begging was not an admission of defeat but a virtue in itself. A community whose spiritual cornerstone was the dole is something unique and worth recording in the detail which Halper has collected for this study.

It was something which could not last. Not only did some members of the community find themselves obliged from time to time to become involved in some economic activity, but they had also to reckon with the changing outlook of their potential benefactors in the West. In 1840 again, members of an important group of Lithuanian Jews on their way to Jerusalem were held up in Istanbul by the political turmoil of the time, and met there a group of Western European Jews on their way to investigate the Damascus 'blood libel'. Their leaders were Adolphe Crémieux, later to be famous for the granting of rights to the Jews of Algeria, and Sir Moses Montefiore. The history of the Jews of Jerusalem for the next 40 years could almost be written in terms of a dialogue between their (divided) leadership and Montefiore — the latter seeking to encourage the creation of a sounder economic foundation and at the same time being unwilling to offend the Orthodox community. For while some progress was made towards creating an economic base, the fear of the ideas of the *Haskalah* (the movement for Jewish Enlightenment — for spreading modern European culture among Jews) always acted as a countervailing factor, especially when it concerned any kind of secular education or training. Crémieux's *Alliance Israélite Universelle* and the Rothschilds fought some of the same battles. The early 1880s, with the pogroms in the Russian Empire and elsewhere in Eastern Europe, and with the beginnings of mass emigration, settled the issue. Zionist activity, even if restricted numerically, was sufficient to alter both the composition of the Jewish population of the Holy Land and its dominant ideology. The New *Yishuv* defeated the Old *Yishuv* — or so at least it would have seemed to Weizmann, Ben-Gurion, and their coevals.

However, Professor Halper is not so sure. Writing when the Likud's domination of the Israeli political scene seemed unbreakable, he suggested in both his opening and his concluding pages that the core of the new majority was a Jewish consciousness, religiously based if sometimes secular in expression, which was closer to the outlook of the Old *Yishuv* than to the secular Zionism of the second *aliyah* and of the third. Is the heart of the modern Israel to be found then in Meah She'arim rather than in the Weizmann Institute or even the Hebrew University of Jerusalem? The trouble is that Jeff Halper puts forward

this idea without arguing the case for it. But it is not necessary to accept this notion to be grateful for the recreation in the body of the book of a lost Jewish world.

MAX BELOFF

RUTH GAY, *The Jews of Germany. A Historical Portrait*, with an introduction by Peter Gay, xiii + 297 pp., maps and illustrations, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1992, £19.95 or $35.00.

Mrs Gay's remarkable and absorbing book cannot have been easy to write. Any study of the subject written only about half a century after the complete destruction of the community which it depicts, and while survivors are still among us (including Ruth Gay's eminent husband, who contributed a thoughtful introduction), is bound to be coloured by the knowledge of what was to come. But of course this knowledge was not there among the successive generations whose history Mrs Gay chronicles; indeed, if the possibility had been more patent to the last generation of German Jews, more might have got out while there was still time.

For the members of each successive generation, there was only their own experience; and it is on re-creating that experience that the author rightly concentrates her efforts — not only through summarizing both the internal history of the Jewish communities in what became 'Germany' and their relations with the host society, but also through the buildings, artefacts, and manuscripts which survived their makers. For this reason, the illustrations and documentary inserts are an essential part of the work. The photographs are particularly valuable, since so many of the buildings (the synagogues above all) were destroyed in the final catastrophe. How the Jews were perceived is part of the story, and from illustrations to medieval chronicles to twentieth-century antisemitic cartoons, nothing relevant has been omitted. However, all is not gloom. Where Jews had room to breathe, their instincts to celebrate the best in life was not absent — witness their *ketubbot* (marriage contracts), their Passover *Haggadot*, and the beautiful painted walls of a *sukkah* of 1825, splendidly reproduced here in colour.

What interests Ruth Gay is not merely the social history of everyday life but the naure and structure of the society itself; underlying her narrative, there is a solid foundation of demographic and geographical scholarship. From such basic information, four conclusions can be drawn. And all four have parallels in the histories of other branches of the Diaspora. First, the Jews in Germany were never very numerous — given the importance attached to the 'Jewish question' in its medieval, religious, or modern racial-political form, it comes as a shock to see how

few Jews there were. The number of Jews in the German lands at the end of the fourteenth century has been variously estimated at 20,000 to 50,000 (pp. 6 and 8). In 1871, they accounted for only 1.25 per cent of the total population (p. 146) while by 1910, when there were 600,000 Jews, that proportion had dropped to slightly less than one per cent. Even in Berlin in 1910, the focus of claims of Jewish 'domination', there were only 142,000 Jews — four per cent of all the city's inhabitants (p. 181).

Second, there is the changing geographical distribution of the Jewish population, moving outwards from its original concentration in a multitude of small settlements in the valleys of the Rhine and its tributaries in the Dark Ages and the Carolingian period, to a largely rural setting in the German interior and to new urban concentrations in central and eastern Germany, above all in Berlin. Third, there is the constant interposition of the external world — through the massacres accompanying the first crusade, which ended what may well have been German Jewry's golden age; then, the further massacres and expulsions at the time of the Black Death; and the pattern of community responsibility and hence community self-government (of which the Frankfurt ghetto is the most conspicuous example) imposed upon the Jews by their rulers.

Finally, there is the failure of the Enlightenment. No degree of legal equality — and this was still incomplete at the beginning of this century — could make the Jews fully acceptable in German society; even conversion could not end the separation, nor did the attraction of German culture for educated German Jews and their not inconsiderable contribution to that culture, whether in its scientific or in its literary garb.

One particular aspect of this last part of the story is in the history of language, particularly relevant at a time when Yiddish is having, at least in the scholarly world, something of a revival. For in the early centuries, the Jews in Germany were distinguished not merely by their religious observances and the communal structure designed to support them but also by their language: they spoke Yiddish, while their Gentile compatriots used one or other branch of German. When Emancipation came, one of its consequences in the Jewish community was the abandonment of Yiddish for German, so that in the course of the nineteenth century it ceased to have a role among Jews in the heart of Germany proper. Meanwhile, however, with the eastward movement of Jewish migration, Yiddish had become — and remained until the Holocaust — the distinguishing mark of the *Ostjüden*, who carried it with them to further exile in the New World.

After the First World War and the Russian revolution, there was an increased reversal of the Jewish migratory tide, with *Ostjüden* coming into Germany and indeed making up demographically for what was a

diminishing Jewish population; but the experience was too short for the consequences to figure in what is a history of German Jews, not of Jews in Germany. Certainly, German Jews looked down upon the newcomers and were disconcerted to discover, when they found refuge in Palestine after 1933, that it was the *Ostjüden* who formed the upper strata of the *Yishuv* and who, in their turn, looked down upon the *Yekkes*.

I am inclined to think that just as Mrs Gay downplays the importance of German Jews for Zionism, so too she underrates the contribution which even the comparatively small number of German Jews made to the *Yishuv*, certainly in academe, even if perhaps mediated through America. But this is a very slight quibble to set against a major achievement in the writing of Jewish history.

MAX BELOFF

DANIEL GUTWEIN, *The Divided Elite. Economics, Politics and Anglo-Jewry 1882–1917*, 501 pp., E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1992, 210 Dutch guilders or U.S.$125.75.

Dr Gutwein has written a challenging critique of the current standard version of the history of Anglo-Jewry before the First World War. According to that version, the affairs of British Jewry were dominated by the 'cousinhood' — a closely related group of families who headed the community's principal institutions, religious and philanthropic; they warded off the challenges from the Jewish lower middle class and working class, mainly immigrants who had arrived in the last decades of the nineteenth century. The aim of the elite was to make the most of the civil and political equality it enjoyed and to accelerate the assimilation of newcomers, so that they would in turn form part of a single British nation, differentiated only in their manner of worship. The members of that elite showed concern for their less fortunate brethren abroad, but their reaction was to help them on the spot or, if they sought refuge in other lands, to divert the stream away from British shores, lest it upset the assimilatory process and revive or sharpen antisemitism in Britain itself.

Dr Gutwein does not deny that such a complex of ideas and attitudes was to be found among the Anglo-Jewish elite but he argues that our understanding of the conduct of its leaders in the various crises which arose makes it necessary to discard the view that it ever acted as a unit. On the contrary, there were deep divisions among that elite's members, who had conflicting interests and ideologies. He believes that previous studies have neglected the business interests of the principal families in the 'cousinhood', and the extent to which their business rivalries coloured their approach to communal affairs. He also questions

whether a concentration on the Jewish institutions themselves has not blinded historians to the involvement of some of their leading figures in British politics, where they took different sides in the party conflicts of the time.

As Dr Guwein sees it, the central conflict in the earlier part of the period with which he is concerned was that between Nathaniel Rothschild, the first Lord Rothschild, and Samuel Montagu, the first Lord Swaythling. Both headed important finance houses — but houses with a difference. Rothschild's in London was part of an international network with an ability to look at European finance as a whole; Montagu was a latecomer from provincial England, seeking to claim parity of esteem. In addition, as Dr Gutwein explains in a chapter of some technical complexity, Rothschild was committed to policies directed towards maintaining the gold standard, where his interests linked up with those of the Bank of England and of other merchant banks — while Montagu shared with the joint stock banks a concern with the interests of industry and he was for a time a fervent bimetallist.

All the members of the 'cousinhood' had naturally supported the Liberal Party, which had been the vehicle for Jewish emancipation, but Rothschild followed the Chamberlainites out of the Liberal Party on the Home Rule issue, and within the Unionist Party figured on its protectionist wing, while Montagu stayed close to Gladstone and later to Asquith. These party battles were fought out in part over the Whitechapel constituency with its large Jewish vote, represented from 1885 to 1900 by Montagu himself, while Rothschild supported Unionist candidates even if they were non-Jews.

Dr Gutwein also argues that even where Jewish concerns were publicly given as reasons for particular courses of action — as in the case of Rothschild's cancellation of a loan to Russia, after the Tsarist government's expulsion edict of 1881 against the Jews of Moscow — business reasons would have been sufficient to explain the decision. Early attitudes towards proto-Zionism — in particular, the *Hovevei Zion* — can also be explained by Rothschild's basically anti-Russian stance, while Montagu on general Gladstonian principles was anti-Turkish, and wished international pressure to concentrate on the Ottoman Empire.

With Swaythling's death in 1911 and Rothschild's in 1915, the interest shifts to the next generation. Politically, the Montagus were in the ascendant; Edwin Montagu and his cousin Herbert Samuel were prominent members of the Asquith governments, although neither was as involved as his father had been in Jewish affairs. Walter Rothschild (the second Lord Rothschild) and Baron Edmond's son James, who settled in England, were less prominent figures on the Tory side — although the Rothschilds were still generally seen as the accredited voices of Anglo-Jewry. In the final part of his book, Gutwein brings his

general arguments together to explain the differences which emerged over what became the Balfour Declaration of 1917.

Again, Dr Gutwein firmly disagrees with the traditional view that Anglo-Jewry was largely divided along class lines in its reactions to political Zionism, by then embodied in the person of Chaim Weizmann. The members of the old elite (that is, of the 'cousinhood') were sceptical, fearing that the recognition of the Jewish 'nation' would imperil their own position as Englishmen of the Mosaic persuasion, while the Jewish rank and file were moved by the new vision of the Jewish future. Edwin Montagu is seen as the representative figure of the Jewish elite in this context, and his cousin Herbert Samuel as a somewhat eccentric and unexpected supporter of the Zionist cause.

Not so, says Dr Gutwein, who argues that again such an explanation does not take account of the wider political context. The views of Edwin Montagu — while expressed in terms of fears about the impact which the creation of a Jewish political entity might have upon the Jews of the Diaspora — should not be classified along with those of genuine exponents of the assimilationist anti-Zionist case such as Claude Montefiore and Lucien Wolf. These two men had genuine Jewish concerns and a committed view of what should be done to defend Jewish interests while Edwin Montagu, in reaction against his father's religious orthodoxy, had repudiated both his traditional Judaism and his family tradition of community involvement. We need to take a wider view in order to explain the divergences. What did British interests dictate?

At this point, Dr Gutwein's salutary impatience with accepted views leads him into rather dangerous paths. It is of course perfectly true that throughout the First World War, both strategy and the considerations of what might serve to break up the coalition of the Central Powers affected the parallel discussions of what might constitute a suitable peace settlement. Given also the internal political pressures playing upon first Asquith and then Lloyd George, it is not surprising that such differences were never resolved and cropped up again in the negotiation of the post-war treaties. In this respect, 1917 makes a curious terminus for a study which might more appropriately have been taken to 1921 — as to some extent is in fact the case.

But it is also true that in such circumstances, consistency on the part of individuals is likely to be elusive. What Dr Gutwein does is to confuse the issue by postulating the existence of two political tendencies within the political establishment — the Maximalist and the Moderate — which he spells with initial capital letters as though they existed in the same way as Liberals and Conservatives. The Maximalists in his view were determined *inter alia* to break up the Turkish Empire and to divide the spoils between the Allies so as to give Britain a new footing in the Middle East — that is, Palestine. The Moderates *inter alia* wished to

preserve Ottoman hegemony in one form — Montagu's Indian Muslims come in here — but if this were not possible, they wanted to introduce some international system in which the United States would play a leading role. With Lloyd George's triumph over Asquith, the Maximalists established a clear advantage; Herbert Samuel, a natural Moderate, did not play an important role in the final stages of the contacts between the Zionists and the government, while Montagu was isolated in the face of the Maximalist triumph.

The temptation for historians to invent patterns of behaviour or allegiance into which the characters involved in the story are seen to conform overlooks the high degree of confusion in which decisions are actually made, particularly in wartime. One has the feeling that for all Dr Gutwein's erudition and originality, he is more concerned with his argument than with seeing things as fallible and ignorant mortals saw them at the time. How this can be done in relation to British strategy and war aims was shown by Paul Guinn in his *British Strategy and Politics 1914–1918* (Oxford, 1965), which does not appear in Dr Gutwein's bibliography.

Dr Gutwein writes with commendable clarity but there are occasional lapses in his command of English usage (his choice of American spelling is perhaps inevitable). More important is his failure to follow the proper rules of nomenclature where his dramatis personae are concerned, and his occasional shakiness over the designation of public offices. One would have expected a book dealing with British history to have been submitted in typescript or proof to a native English-speaker. That might also have prevented the misspelling of some proper names, including my own (pp. 465, 466, 475).

MAX BELOFF

LOUIS JACOBS, *Structure and Form in the Babylonian Talmud*, xi + 138 pp., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 1991, £25.00 or $44.50.

This slim volume is a welcome complement to the author's earlier books, *Studies in Talmudic Methodology* (London, 1961) and *The Talmudic Argument* (Cambridge, 1984). Like them, it presents examples of the literary structure of the *sugya* ('topic'), an Aramaic term often used to refer to literary units of the Talmud, ranging in length from the equivalent of a paragraph to a few folio pages; *sugya*, however, really means 'topic', and it is misleading to refer to the Babylonian Talmud as if it was comprehensively organized on this principle.

An early chapter, deriving from an influential study published by Rabbi Dr Jacobs in 1977, makes the point that the Talmudic attributions of statements to individual rabbis are frequently not to be taken

literally; they are 'pseudepigraphic', if not in the sectarian sense of that word at least in the sense that they are surmised or even deliberately fabricated. Anyone familiar with Talmud will know that, in the context of a debate, a statement that 'Rabbi A held view X' is not intended as a report of Rabbi A's view, but as a speculation that *if* the line of argument followed was correct, that is the view that Rabbi A *would have* held. Also, no one would doubt the precarious and sometimes contradictory status of some of the attributions even in the 'source' works of Talmud, such as *Mishna*, *Tosefta*, and *Midrashim*, especially as all the texts have been mediated to us through generations of redactors. But it seems to me equally obvious that the attributions in the 'source' works are, by and large, *intended* as reports, and I would wish that Jacobs could have drawn a clearer picture of when and how the Talmud slips fom fallible reportage to deliberate reconstruction; such knowledge is essential to the historian and not, I think, as chimeric as Jacobs seems to imply.

The literary units analysed have been carefully selected for their intrinsic interest and wide range. Some are purely halakhic; others have theological or historical interest, such as the passage in which the rabbis discuss who set each of the biblical books in writing without, of course, questioning their divine authorship (chapter 3). Perhaps the clinching example in the attempt by the author to demonstrate the dramatic arrangement of the *sugya* is the collection (chapter 10) of three instances of the use of *addehakhi* ('just then') where a difficult situation is resolved by the sudden and unexpected appearance of some individual, rather like a *deus ex machina* (Jacobs does not use the expression).

Yet in a sense nothing quite clinches. The analysis of a mere dozen or so *sugyot* in a vast work like the Babylonian Talmud is instructive, but a much more comprehensive survey, with careful definition of the types of structure involved and a statistical analysis of their relative quantities, would be necessary to prove any general theory. But structure itself must relate to meaning, and one must ask what is signified by the redactional processes involved, for instance, in assembling over some centuries into the form in which we know it the story of Rabbi Joshua and the elders of Athens (chapter 8). What does it tell us about people or society?

The book will be enjoyed by many as a companion to their Talmudic studies, and appreciated by scholars as a contribution to understanding the activity of the *stamaim* whose work so strongly differentiates the Bavli from the Yerushalmi. Though a lot of questions remain, we can accept the author's judgment (p. 101) that 'in the Babylonian Talmud we do not have a *record* of what went on in the learned circles of the Amoraim, but a *story* of what went on . . .'. And in some measure we will be helped to share the excitement, the sense of drama, which has long been part of the experience of traditional Talmud study at its best.

NORMAN SOLOMON

DAVID M. LEWIS, *The Jews of Oxford*, vi + 130 pp., Oxford Jewish Congregation, 21 Richmond Road OX1 2JL, 1992, £16.50 or $30.00 (inclusive of postage).

FREDA SILVER JACKSON, compiler, *Now and Then. A Collection of Recollections*, 186 pp., Oxford Jewish Congregation, 21 Richmond Road OX1 2JL, 1992, £16.50 or $30.00 (inclusive of postage).

Although Oxford was an important centre of medieval English Jewry, its settled Jewish community in the modern period has never been more than a few hundred strong. Since the late nineteenth century, however, increasing numbers of Jewish students have registered at the university and have played a significant role in revivifying Jewish religious life in the city. Oxford is unusual among Anglo-Jewish communities (and differs significantly from Cambridge) in its tolerance, within one institutional umbrella, of all strands of Jewish worship — Orthodox, Reform, and Liberal. Part of the reason, as David Lewis shows in his history of the congregation, lies in its origins as a marriage, not always harmonious, of town and gown. No less important is the fact that for most of the twentieth century Oxford has not had a resident minister — with the accompanying pressures for conformity of one sort or another common in the British context.

Both these books appear on the 150th anniversary of the foundation of the modern Jewish community in Oxford in (or around) 1842. Lewis, who is Professor of Ancient History in the university; has written a carefully reconstructed congregational history. He draws on most of the evidence available in minute books and local newspapers, and on his own considerable fund of personal knowledge. Some readers may regret that he has interpreted his task rather narrowly, focusing closely on such matters as repairs to the synagogue roof and other congregational minutiae while only rarely venturing into the intellectual dimension of Jewish life in this of all cities. But Anglo-Jewish historians will be grateful for his close attention to the details of the community's beginnings in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and for his correction of a number of errors, based on insufficient evidence, in accounts by Cecil Roth — a prominent character in both books.

It is perhaps a pity that Professor Lewis's focus on the congregation has led him to ignore the many Jews who, while sometimes not religiously active, have left their mark on Oxford in the past two generations. An example is the late Richard Walzer, a distinguished Arabic scholar, whose legacy of several fine impressionist paintings to the Ashmolean Museum remains as a permanent memento. Others among the refugee scholars of international standing — such as Samuel Stern, Eduard Fraenkel, and David Daube — also surely merited mention. The last-named, in particular, played a significant role in the spiritual life of the university and the synagogue during his years in Oxford.

The late Freda Silver Jackson's compilation is an unpretentiously pleasing scrapbook of reminiscences by Jewish residents of Oxford, permanent and temporary, over the past half century. Isaiah Berlin recalls that he was only the fourth Jew elected to a tutorial fellowship of an Oxford College (in 1932). As an index of how things have changed, he notes that a year or two ago no fewer than seven heads of houses were Jewish. In Berlin's long experience there have been no serious rows in the community — save when one member brought a dog to the synagogue. Professor J. B. Segal (whose father, M. H. Segal, later a professor at the Hebrew University, acted as minister to the community in the early years of the century) remembers Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz preaching in his purple cummerbund. Several former students discuss the activities of student organizations such as the Jewish Society, Israel Society, Adler Society, and Choolant Society. Professor David Weitzman, a founder of the last-named, explains its origins, and his wife Avis provides a recipe for the eponymous delicacy, though some of the ingredients are unfamiliar even to this reviewer (a sometime president of the society — but it must be confessed that the cooking of the main attraction was left to others than the society's all-male officers). The current president of the synagogue, Dr Lionel Wollenberg, explains the origin of the spelling of 'choolant' (*not* cholent). Sir Zelman Cowan recalls the first Lord Samuel reading a book (not his *machzor*) in the synagogue on a high holy day.

The name that recurs most often in both books, and rightly, is that of the late George Silver, Freda Jackson's first husband and a long-serving president of the Oxford community. A restaurateur renowned for his enormous girth, and a successful film actor in his later years, Silver kept open house to guests who flocked to the ballroom of his north Oxford home to hear visiting Israeli concert artists or to discuss community reactions to Middle East crises. He led the successful effort to raise the substantial funds required for the construction of the new Oxford synagogue and Jewish centre, opened in 1974. His hospitality and that of his wife, who died in 1992, are reflected in the wide range of contributors, both town and gown, who populate her book.

In the past two decades the Oxford community has slowly grown so that it is now larger than at any time except during the Second World War, when is was temporarily invaded by large numbers of evacuees from London and refugees from Germany. Any remaining resistance to the appointment of Jewish college fellows disappeared within the past generation. Indeed, Lewis makes the interesting suggestion that in the 1950s, Catholics encountered more prejudice than Jews in some college appointments. The tradition of sectarian co-operation within the community has been maintained, although it has come under

strain recently as a result of the incursion from the United States of a Lubavitch Hassidic mission which proselytizes stridently among the Jewish students.

What is disappointingly missing in both these books is discussion of the role of Hebrew and Jewish studies in Oxford. Over the past two decades the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, founded by David Patterson, has grown into the largest centre for research in Jewish studies in Britain, indeed in Europe. This formidable enterprise has brought all branches of Jewish learning, including even Yiddish language and literature, into the university curriculum to an extent unimaginable in the 1960s.

BERNARD WASSERSTEIN

# CHRONICLE

At the end of the Jewish year 5752 (in September 1992), the population of Israel stood at more than five million: 5,155,000; it had grown by three per cent since the previous year. More than four-fifths of the Israelis (81.9 per cent or 4.22 million) are Jewish; 13.9 per cent are Muslim; 2.4 per cent are Christian; and 1.7 per cent are Druze. During the year 5752, 92,000 immigrants came to settle in Israel — down from 235,000 in the previous year. Last August, 5,000 newcomers arrived from the former Soviet Union and the following month the number had increased to 7,000.

*

HIAS (the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society) was reported to have stated last October that a record number of Jews from the former USSR, 46,870, had emigrated to the United States during the year ending 30 September 1992. There had been no change in the United States policy of refugee admissions, but there had been a 'one-off' refugee ceiling of 61,000 for Jews and non-Jews in order to make up for the shortfall in arrivals in the previous fiscal year. The new fiscal year (from 1 October 1992 to 30 September 1993) has a ceiling of 50,000 admissions.

*

The Community Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews published last summer its 'Report of Vital Statisitics for 1991'. There were 1,082 marriages solemnized in synagogues in 1991, compared with 1,098 in 1990. The decrease occurred among the Central Orthodox group (from 722 synagogue marriages in 1990 to 679 in 1991) and among the Sephardim (from 48 to 26). On the other hand, the right-wing Orthodox group showed an increase (from 103 to 126), as did the Progressive group (Reform: from 167 to 190; and Liberal: from 58 to 61). The Report comments: 'The proportionate decline in Sephardi marriages is marked, as is the proportionate increase in the Right-Wing but both these percentage changes relate to small base numbers

and their importance must not be over-stressed'. Under three-quarters (72.5 per cent) of synagogue marriages took place in London and the remaining 27.5 per cent in the provinces.

Religious divorces (*gittin*) registered 'by all Batei Din (Orthodox & Reform)' totalled 271 in 1991, a rise over the 1990 total of 261; 230 occurred in London and the remaining 41 in the provinces. However, it must be noted that the figures 'obviously underestimate the extent of divorce within the community since many couples only follow secular procedures'.

There were 4,431 burials and cremations under Jewish auspices in 1991, compared with 4,615 the previous year. The Orthodox group officiated at 3,501 burials; the Reform at 627 and the Liberals at 303 burials and cremations.

*

The Spring 1992 issue of *Tel Aviv University News*, received in London last June, states that the universities of Tel Aviv and of Granada (Spain) are joint sponsors of annual meetings entitled 'Encounter of Three Cultures'; the aim is to promote 'intellectual interchange among Jews, Muslims and Christians'. The seventh annual Encounter was held in Granada and its theme was 'Science in Medieval Spain'.

*

A legal colloquium on racial and religious hatred and on group libel was held at Tel Aviv University during a three-day conference. Participants from several countries 'debated pros and cons of anti-racist legislation on the national, regional, and international levels'.

*

A conference on 'Federalism — A Solution to Ethnic Conflicts' took place at Tel Aviv University with the co-operation of the Swiss Embassy in Israel and of the Israel–Switzerland Friendship Association; it was organized to mark Switzerland's 700th anniversary. The participants considered whether the Swiss model could be applied to Israel. One of them, the President of Tel Aviv University, is quoted as stating: 'Why not have 10 cantons, six of which will have a Jewish majority and four with an Arab majority?' The Swiss ambassador reviewed the history of his country and noted that conflicts between Catholic and Protestant cantons went on for centuries until the first federal constitution was set up in 1848. He added: 'The federal system we know since 1848 has preserved the country from internal difficulties and the conflicts we have known in the past centuries have been forgotten' and concluded that the federal system can be an option when different peoples inhabit the same country.

*

A four-day international seminar on 'Identity Renewal: Studies in East European Jewish Life Histories' was held at Tel Aviv University; it was attended by psychologists and historians from Germany, Hungary, Israel, Poland, and the former U.S.S.R. who considered the rebirth of Jewish identity among young people of Jewish origin in Eastern and Central Europe. One of

the participants, a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, stated that although Jewish assimilation in Hungary is widespread, 'awareness of Jewish identity has increased and the Zionist Federation, founded only in 1990, boasts a membership of 1,000' in the country.

*

The First International Conference on the History of the Jews of Romania was held at Tel Aviv University. Scholars from Romania and Israeli specialists discussed 'various aspects of the history, social structure and cultural legacy of Romanian Jewry'. Romania was the only country of the Eastern bloc which did not sever diplomatic relations with Israel after the Six-Day War of 1967. 'Tel Aviv University researchers have already been given permission to photograph documents in the national archives in Bucharest, including the three main Fascist newspapers published in Romania from the end of the 1930s to 1941. Negotiations are also in progress for collaboration between institutes of higher learning in Romania and Israel', according to the Spring 1992 issue of *Tel Aviv University News*.

*

The Institute of Contemporary Jewry and the Rothberg School for Overseas Students (both of which are part of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem) sponsored last July a field study course in Israel on 'America and the Holy Land 1620–1648'. The course included seminars on five central themes: 1) political and diplomatic dimensions of the America–Holy Land relationships; 2) inter-religious perspectives on the Holy Land; 3) American ideas and institutions in the Holy Land; 4) American travel and exploration in the Holy Land; and 5) American Zionism. There were also guided trips to historical sites and to major archives in Jerusalem, as well as study tours.

It is planned to hold another field study course on America and the Holy Land in July 1994.

*

The International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization sponsored in Jerusalem in July 1991 the first Jewish Civilization Studies Regional Development Conference devoted to Europe. Volume 32, 1992, of *Jewish Studies* — the annual publication of the World Union of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem — includes 'the lectures delivered at the conference and a precis of the salient points of the discussion'.

*

The Summer 1992 Report of the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization includes a review by Professor Angel Sáenz-Badillos, of the Universidad Complutense of Madrid, on Jewish Civilization Studies in Spain. He states: 'Spanish universities today offer courses in Bible, biblical archeology, Oriental and *Targum* studies, rabbinic language and literature, medieval Hebrew, Judeo-Spanish literature, Jewish history, and modern Hebrew language and literature'.

*

It was stated last August that the German Minister of the Interior has compiled a report which shows that there were now 76 neo-Nazi groups in Germany, with a total membership of 40,000 — several thousands more than the 1990 total of 32,300. There was also a great increase of punishable offences committed by neo-Nazis. Since German unification in October 1990, 367 Jewish cemeteries had been vandalized or damaged; nearly three-quarters (70 per cent) of those responsible for these and other offences were young persons, aged between 16 and 20 years. About a third of the incidents had occurred in the former East Germany and the Minister of the Interior is quoted as saying that police in that part of Germany did not act firmly enough against right-wing extremists.

*

The first international scholarly conference on the history of the Jews in China took place on 16–18 August 1992 at Harvard University under the auspices of the Fairbank Center for East Asian Studies and the Sino-Judaic Institute of Palo Alto (California). There were more than a hundred participants and they included both sinologues and scholars with interests in various aspects of Jewish studies; they came from several countries, including Australia, China, Israel, Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom — as well as the United States. Of special interest were papers presented on the ancient Jewish community of Kaifeng, on the Baghdadi Jewish merchants of Shanghai, on the Russian-Jewish communities at Harbin and Tientsin, and on those who were refugees in Shanghai in the 1930s and 1940s.

Among those attending the conference were a descendant of one of the Kaifeng Jewish clans; former Jewish residents of Shanghai, Harbin, and Tientsin; and the former editor of *China Reconstructs* who is still a resident of Peking. The President of the Chinese Association for Jewish Studies is a professor at Nanking University and he hoped that there would be a follow-up conference in China in a few years.

*

The Summer 1992 issue of *East European Jewish Affairs* — vol. 22, no. 1, formerly *Soviet Jewish Affairs*, published in London by the Institute of Jewish Affairs — includes an article by Adam Rok on antisemitic propaganda in Poland (pp. 27–37). The author quotes statements in articles and in pamphlets published in Poland in 1990 and 1991 which state that Jews were 'the creators of Communism', that 'Christianity's authority is being exploited to subordinate Poles to the Jews', and that more than 20,000 Polish officers who were massacred in Katyn were 'killed by the NKVD Jews'. The first post-war Polish edition of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was published at the beginning of 1992 and was a bestseller. After considering whether the book infringed articles in the Criminal Code about 'incitement to ethnic strife', the authorities were reported to have decided in mid-February 'not to prosecute the publisher on the grounds that the book filled a gap of historical significance in the publishing market' (p. 36).

The same issue of *East European Jewish Affairs* also includes a brief report (pp. 97–99) on an international symposium, held in Budapest in October 1991, on 'Hungarian-Jewish Co-existence and its Central European

Background, 1848–1991'. The symposium was sponsored by the European Foundation for Sciences, Arts and Culture in France, the American Jewish Congress, and the Batthyány Association in Budapest.

*

The American Jewish Historical Society decided in 1976 to sponsor a comprehensive history of American Jews in time for the Society's centennial in 1992. That has been achieved and the Johns Hopkins University Press of Baltimore, Maryland, has published a five-volume boxed set of *The Jewish People in America*. The General Editor of the volumes is Henry L. Feingold. The first volume, by Eli Faber, is entitled *A Time for Planting. The First Migration 1654–1820*; the second volume, by Hasia R. Diner, is entitled *A Time for Gathering. The Second Migration 1820–1880*; the third volume, *A Time for Building. The Third Migration 1880–1890*, is by Gerald Sorin; the fourth volume is by Henry L. Feingold and is entitled *A Time for Searching. Entering the Mainstream 1920–1945*; and the fifth volume, *A Time for Healing. American Jewry since World War II* is by Edward S. Shapiro. Individual volumes cost $29.95; the five-volume boxed set will be available until 15 February 1993 at $95 and later at $145. In a press release, the Johns Hopkins University Press notes (on the basis of data in these volumes) that there were one hundred Jews in New York City in 1695; in 1927, there were 1,765,000; while in 1992 the total had declined to 1,450,000. The first permanent Jewish settlement in the New World was in 1654, when 23 Jews landed in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam on Manhattan Island. In 1658, 15 Jewish families settled in Newport, Rhode Island; this was the first Jewish community in an English colony on the North Amercian mainland.

*

The Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics (S.A.S.E.) will hold its Fifth Annual International Conference in New York City on 26–28 March 1993; the theme of the Conference will be 'Incentives and Values as Foundations of Social Order'. Those who would like to present a paper, to organize a session, or to learn more about S.A.S.E. should write to the Society at 714H Gelman Library, 2130 H Street NW, Washington D.C.20052, U.S.A.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*(Books listed here may be reviewed later)*

Alderman, Geoffrey, *Modern British Jewry*, xiii + 397 pp., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992, £40.00.

Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin, *Despair and Deliverance. Private Salvation in Contemporary Israel*, vii + 221 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1992, $17.95. (paperback).

Beloff, Max, *An Historian in the Twentieth Century. Chapters in Intellectual Autobiography*, iv + 138 pp., Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1992, $25.00 or £18.95.

Bensimon, Doris, *Religion et État en Israël*, 296 pp., Éditions L'Harmattan, 5–7 rue de l'École Polytechnique, 75005 Paris, 1992, price not given.

Bernstein, Deborah S., ed., *Pioneers and Homemakers; Jewish Women in Pre-State Israel*, xii + 312 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1992, $16.95 (paperback).

Deshen, Shlomo, *Blind People: The Private and Public Life of Sightless Israelis*, x + 197 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1992, $44.50 (paperback, $14.95).

Eilberg-Schwartz, Howard, ed., *People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective*, State University of New York Press, Albany, 1992, $59.50 (paperback, $19.95).

Fishman, Aryei, *Judaism and Modernization on the Religious Kibbutz*, xv + 202 pp., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992, £32.50 or $49.95.

Frank, Daniel H., ed., *Autonomy and Judaism: The Individual and the Community in Jewish Philosophical Thought*, viii + 229 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1992, $49.50 (paperback, $16.95).

Gillon, Philip, ed., *Recollections of a Medical Doctor in Jerusalem. From Professor Julius J. Kleeberg's Notebooks 1930–1988* with a Foreword by Anni Kleeberg, ix + 174 pp., Karger, P.O. Box Ch-4009 Basel, 1992, 70 Swiss francs or £30.50 or $56.00.

Heinze, Andrew R., *Adapting to Abundance. Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption, and the Search for American Identity*, xi + 276 pp., Columbia University Press, New York, 1992, $43.00 (paperback, $17.00).

Helmreich, William B., *Against All Odds: Holocaust Survivors and the Successful Lives They Made in America*, 349 pp., Simon & Schuster, New York, 1992, $23.00.

Hundert, Gershon David, *The Jews in a Polish Private Town: The Case of Opatów in the Eighteenth Century*, xvi + 242 pp., Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1992, £28.50.

Idinopulos, Thomas A., *Jerusalem Blessed, Jerusalem Cursed. Jews, Christians, and Muslims in the Holy City from David's Time to Our Own*, xiv + 369 pp., Ivan R. Dee, Inc., 1332 North Halsted Street, Chicago 60622, 1991, $20.99.

Kedourie, Elie, ed., *Spain and the Jews. The Sephardi Experience 1492 and After* (with 44 illustrations), 248 pp., Thames and Hudson, London, 1992, £24.00.

Kochan, Lionel, *The Jewish Renaissance and Some of its Discontents*, x + 125 pp., Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York, 1992, £35.00.

Near, Henry, *The Kibbutz Movement: A History. Volume I: Origins and Growth, 1909–1939*, xviii + 431 pp., published for the Littman Library by Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992, £55.00.

Siegel, Rachel Josefowitz and Ellen Cole, eds., *Jewish Women in Therapy: Seen But Not Heard*, xv + 126 pp., Harrington Park Press, New York and London, 1991, $9.95 (paperback).

Weitz, John, *Hitler's Diplomat: The Life and Times of Joachim von Ribbentrop*, xv + 376 pp., Ticknor & Fields, 215 Park Avenue South, New York, 1992, $25.00.

Werner, Mark, ed., *Fighting Back: A Memoir of Jewish Resistance in World War II by Harold Werner*, with a Foreword by Martin Gilbert, xxxii + 253 pp., Columbia University Press, New York, 1992, $24.95.

# NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

BEATTIE, Alan; B.Sc. Econ(first class), Senior Lecturer in the Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science. Chief publications: *English Party Politics, 1660–1970*, 1979; 'Neville Chamberlain', in J. P. Mackintosh, ed., *British Prime Ministers in the Twentieth Century*; 'Conservatives, Consensus and the Constitution', in *L.S.E. Quarterly*, Summer 1989; and forthcoming, 'Ministerial Responsibility and the Theory of the British State', in P. Dunleavy, B. O'Leary, and R. Rhodes, eds., *The Core Executive in Britain*.

BELOFF, Professor Lord, F.B.A. Emeritus Professor of Government and Public Administration in the University of Oxford and Emeritus Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Chief publications: *The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia* (two volumes, 1947 and 1949); *Imperial Sunset, 1897–1942* (two volumes, 1969 and 1989); *Wars and Welfare: Britain 1914–1945*, 1984; and the British editor of seven volumes of *L'Europe du XIX^e et XX^e siècles*, published between 1959 and 1967.

CROMER, Gerald; Ph.D. Senior Lecturer in the Department of Criminology of Bar-Ilan University. Chief publications: 'Repentant Delinquents. A Religious Approach to Rehabilitation', in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 23, no. 2, December 1981; *The Debate about Kahanism in Israeli Society*, 1988; and forthcoming, 'Withdrawal and Conquest: Two Aspects of the Haredi Response to Modernity', in Lawrence Silberstein, ed., *Jewish Fundamentalism: Religion, Ideology and the Crisis of Modernity*, to be published by New York University Press.

ENGLANDER, David; Ph.D. Senior Lecturer in European Humanities Studies at the Open University. Chief publications: *Landlord and Tenant in Urban Britain 1838–1918*, 1983; co-editor of *Culture and Belief in Europe 1450–1600*, 1990; co-author of *Mr Charles Booth's Inquiry: Life and Labour of the People in London Reconsidered*, 1992; and editor of *The Jewish Enigma: An Enduring People*, 1992.

FINESTEIN, Israel; M.A.(Cantab). Queen's Counsel and former Senior Crown Court Judge; President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. Chief publications: 'Anglo-Jewish Opinion 1828–1858', in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, vol. XX, 1964; 'An Aspects of the Jews and English Marriage Law during the Emancipation: The Prohibited Degrees', in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. VII, no. 1, June 1965; 'Jewish Immigration in British Party Politics', in Aubrey Newman, ed., *Migration and Settlement*, 1971; 'Early and Middle 19th-Century British Opinion on the Restoration of the Jews: Contrasts with America', in Moshe Davis, ed., *With Eyes towards Zion* (Volume II), 1986; and 'Some Modern Themes in the Emancipation Debate in Early Victorian England', in Jonathan Sacks, ed., *Tradition and Transition: Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Sir Immanuel Jakobovits*, 1986.

SHAIN, Milton; Ph.D. Senior Lecturer in Jewish Studies, University of Cape Town. Chief Publications: *Jewry and Cape Society, The Origins and Activities of the Jewish Board of Deputies for the Cape Colony*, 1983; 'Diamonds, Pogroms and Undesirables. Anti-alienism and Legislation in the Cape Colony 1898–1910', *South African Historical Journal*, no. 12, November 1980; 'From Pariah to Parvenu: The Anti-Jewish Stereotype in South Africa, 1880–1910', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 2, December 1984; and forthcoming, *From Pariah to Parvenu: The Foundations of Antisemitism in South Africa*, Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

# THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR: Judith Freedman

VOLUME THIRTY-FOUR 1992

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

# CONTENTS



# BOOKS REVIEWED



# AUTHORS OF ARTICLES



# AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS