

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XXVIII : NUMBER 2 : DECEMBER 1986

CONTENTS

The Non-Zionists in Anglo-Jewry, 1937-1948

GIDEON SHIMONI

Jewish Religious Observance in Early Victorian
London, 1840-1860

STEVEN SINGER

W. E. B. DuBois on Black Nationalism and Zionism

BENYAMIN NEUBERGER

Ideology and the Holocaust

ROBERT BENEWICK

Book Reviews

Chronicle

Editor: Judith Freedman

ISSN 0021-6534

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: 01 262 8939

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Volume XXVIII : Number 2 : December 1986

CONTENTS

The Non-Zionists in Anglo-Jewry, 1937-1948 GIDEON SHIMONI	89
Jewish Religious Observance in Early Victorian London, 1840-1860 STEVEN SINGER	117
W. E. B. DuBois on Black Nationalism and Zionism BENYAMIN NEUBERGER	139
Ideology and the Holocaust ROBERT BENEWICK	145
Book Reviews	149
Chronicle	161
Books Received	166
Notes on Contributors	168

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

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION
INSTITUTIONS: £12.00 (U.S. \$24.00)
INDIVIDUALS: £10.00 (U.S. \$20.00)
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: 01 262 8939

EDITOR Judith Freedman

ADVISORY BOARD

R. Bachi (<i>Israel</i>)	Lloyd P. Gartner (<i>Israel</i>)
Howard Brotz (<i>Canada</i>)	Nathan Glazer (<i>U.S.A.</i>)
Percy S. Cohen (<i>Britain</i>)	Jacques Gutwirth (<i>France</i>)
Moshe Davis (<i>Israel</i>)	Elie Kedourie (<i>Britain</i>)
S. N. Eisenstadt (<i>Israel</i>)	S. J. Prais (<i>Britain</i>)

© MAURICE FREEDMAN RESEARCH TRUST LTD 1986

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

BOOKS REVIEWED

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Page</i>
Saul Bernstein	<i>The Renaissance of the Torah Jew</i>	Louis Jacobs	149
Christopher Browning	<i>Fateful Months. Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution</i>	Robert Benewick	145
Galvin Goldscheider	<i>Jewish Continuity and Change: Emerging Patterns in America</i>	Lloyd P. Gartner	150
Nancy L. Green	<i>The Pletzl of Paris. Jewish Immigrant Workers in the Belle Epoque</i>	V. D. Lipman	152
Abraham Halkin and David Hartman	<i>Crisis and Leadership: Epistles of Maimonides</i>	Louis Jacobs	154
Jehuda Reinharz	<i>Chaim Weizmann: The Making of a Zionist Leader</i>	V. D. Lipman	157
Simon Taylor	<i>Prelude to Genocide. Nazi Ideology and the Struggle for Power</i>	Robert Benewick	145
Robert Wistrich	<i>Hitler's Apocalypse. Jews and the Nazi Legacy</i>	Robert Benewick	145

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 *J.S.S.*

MSS (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. Authors making major revisions in proof will be required to bear the cost. Unless proofs are returned to the Managing Editor promptly, authors' corrections cannot be incorporated.

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

THE NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY, 1937-1948

Gideon Shimoni

A PREVIOUS article, which appeared in the last issue of this Journal,¹ dealt with the development of the non-Zionist position in Anglo-Jewry from the Balfour Declaration in 1917 until the Peel Commission's partition proposal of 1937. There was a progressive shift from anti-Zionism (active opposition to the Zionist Organization) to non-Zionism, which was ideological disagreement with Zionism but willingness to co-operate with the Zionist Organization in certain practical and political spheres. The present article is mainly concerned with the activities of non-Zionists and their reactions to Zionist assertiveness from 1937 until the establishment of the State of Israel.

The non-Zionist position rested on the assumptions that sovereign Jewish statehood was not a practical proposition and that the Zionist leadership had reconciled itself to the White Paper of 1922 in which Britain committed itself to a Palestine policy which fell far short of granting Jewish sovereignty in the Holy Land. However, in 1937 the Royal Commission headed by Lord Peel recommended a partition solution to the Palestine problem. Since that recommendation, if implemented, would lead to the creation of a Jewish state, albeit a small one, the non-Zionists were bound to oppose it. When the Zionist leaders, especially David Ben-Gurion and Chaim Weizmann, accepted the principle of partition, the basis for the non-Zionists' co-operation with the Zionist Organization was undermined.

A schism in the enlarged Jewish Agency (consisting of both Zionists and non-Zionists) was averted only because the British government withdrew the partition proposal soon after it had been made and then went on to adopt a new policy which greatly favoured the Arabs. The White Paper of 17 May 1939 declared that the government's objective was the establishment, within ten years, of an independent Palestine state; that only some 75,000 Jewish immigrants would be admitted to Palestine over the subsequent five years, after which Arab agreement would be required for any further Jewish immigration; and that restrictions would be placed upon land transfers to Jews. That meant in effect that Palestine was to become another independent Arab state and

that the Jews were to remain a minority numbering no more than about one third of that state's total population.

This drastic retreat from Britain's mandatory responsibility — as non-Zionists no less than Zionists understood it — temporarily reunited the members of the British Section of the Jewish Agency. In a speech at the Board of Deputies of British Jews, even Robert Waley Cohen (who, of all the non-Zionists, was the one most critical of Zionist policy) sharply condemned the White Paper as 'a gravely mistaken proposal . . . bad for England . . . and bad for the further progress of civilisation for which the British Empire stood'. He said that apart from questions of bad faith and broken promises it was a surrender 'of one of the great constructive achievements of the world' to the forces of banditry and destruction and added: 'I do not believe that there has been such a setting of the sun of British Imperial destiny as to justify this ignominious retreat'.² (The Balfour Declaration of November 1917, which was approved by the Cabinet, had stated: 'His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object . . .' while Article 2 of the Mandate for Palestine in July 1922 made Great Britain 'responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home . . .'.)

However, the united opposition to the 1939 White Paper had only a temporary cohesive effect. The fundamental disagreement between Zionists and non-Zionists over the question of a Jewish state re-emerged at a crucial meeting held at the Rothschild offices at New Court in September 1941 between Weizmann, Ben-Gurion, Brodetsky, and other Zionist personalities, and eleven leading non-Zionists, including Anthony de Rothschild, Lionel Cohen, Lord Bearsted, Leonard Montefiore, and Neville Laski. Chaim Weizmann used all his powers of persuasion to try to convince those present that, unless the Jewish Agency were granted authority tantamount to statehood, absorption of the anticipated mass of displaced Jews who would survive the war would not be assured. (Neither he nor anyone else present could then know how few would in fact survive.) Although the non-Zionists at that meeting agreed to the demand that the gates of Palestine be opened more widely, they still balked at the notion of a Jewish state and clung to the objection that the state the Zionists wanted 'seemed to be based on one religion and one race', and that it gave preferential rights to one section of the population of Palestine.³ Neither then, nor even after late 1942 when they knew that the systematic annihilation of Jews was taking place in Europe, did they drop their opposition to the notion of a Jewish state. Indeed, by the time partition resurfaced as the preferred option (or, rather, least evil

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

option) after the Second World War, the relations between Zionists and non-Zionists in Britain had deteriorated to a level of acrimony reminiscent of the 1917 confrontation. The cause of this acrimony was the heightened assertiveness of the Zionist Federation in the late 1930s and particularly its militant actions during the Second World War.

The assertiveness of the Zionists

The English Zionist Federation, after a period of decline in its activities and its membership in the 1920s, when the number of its constituent bodies fell from 216 in 1920 to 144 in 1929,⁴ was reinigorated in 1930. The immediate stimulant was the public struggle against the October 1930 Passfield White Paper which attempted to reinterpret Britain's mandatory responsibilities in a manner aimed at arresting the development of the Jewish National Home. The English Zionist Federation organized impressive protest rallies throughout the country and a group of militant Zionists in the East End of London exploited the fortuitous by-election campaign of 1930 in Whitechapel to condemn the Labour government's White Paper and demand its withdrawal. Moreover, they tried to rally a 'Jewish vote' for a particular candidate who was both Jewish and a known Zionist, Barnett Janner.⁵ Not since the intra-communal struggle which preceded the Balfour Declaration of November 1917 had the Zionist Federation achieved such salience in the communal arena. Thenceforth, Zionism became a force on the ascendant in Anglo-Jewry during the 1930s and made dramatic strides in the 1940s. Its constituent bodies rose to 250 by 1939 while the shekels (or annual membership certificates of the World Zionist Organization) increased from 9,721 in 1928-29 to 17,719 in 1932-33 and 23,513 in 1938-39.⁶

The growth and heightened assertiveness of Zionism in the 1930s were primarily a reaction to Nazism and to the distressing deterioration of the Jewish situation in Europe. The contagious side effects were felt even in Britain, where various fascist groups mushroomed. In response, a mood of political activism animated an increasing segment of Anglo-Jewry, especially the offspring of immigrants. By associating themselves with this activism and expressing dissatisfaction with the timid conventionality of the patrician communal leadership, Zionists were able to enlarge their base of support in Anglo-Jewry.⁷

Because of his pivotal role as president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews from 1933 to 1939, Neville Laski bore the brunt of this popular dissatisfaction. His policy, like that of most members of the Jewish establishment, was that the Board of Deputies ought not to associate itself officially with any boycott of German goods and services. Laski also advocated restraint in the face of rising fascist provocation on the local scene. He urged total reliance upon the

governmental and police authorities, with whom he maintained discreet liaison. He also believed that communal monitoring and self-criticism of the business practices of some Jews could help to reduce antisemitism. Many Jews were discontented with Laski's policy and there was a spontaneous emergence of boycott committees directed against German goods and of organizations to combat local antisemitism.⁸ The Zionist Federation as an institution was not directly involved in these activities but individuals of prominence in the Zionist Federation — notably Phineas Horowitz, Philip Guedella, and Maurice Perlzweig — were associated with a mass protest march of Jews through the streets of London on 20 July 1933, in defiance of the Board of Deputies' official policy. They also took a leading role in the formation, in November 1933, of a body styling itself, in flagrant challenge to the Board of Deputies, the Jewish Representative Council for the Boycott of German Goods and Services. The Association of Young Zionist Societies, as well as a number of other Zionist groups, joined the representatives of various synagogues, friendly societies, and trade associations at the founding conference of the Jewish Representative Council.⁹

To be sure, Zionism was a lesser beneficiary of this popular political awakening of Jews than was the political left. One reason for this was the World Zionist Organization's 1933 'transfer agreement' with Nazi Germany whose purpose was to facilitate the emigration of German Jews to Palestine with at least some of their capital transferred in the form of German goods. That agreement put Zionists in a difficult position with regard to the boycott of German goods in Britain.¹⁰ Another reason was the greater militancy of the communists in organizing confrontations with fascists in the streets of East London. On the other hand, the Zionist movement benefited from the new mood of militancy and from the erosion of public confidence in the official leadership of the Board of Deputies. The gains made by Zionism were most evident amongst first-generation, British-educated, offspring of Jewish immigrants. In 1935, the segment of the Zionist movement generally referred to as 'Young Zionists' was consolidated when the Association of Young Zionist Societies combined with the University Zionist Council to form the Federation of Zionist Youth (FZY). Its membership was not very large — some 2,500 by the end of the 1930s — but it brought to the fore a generation of young leaders such as Aubrey Eban, Abe Herman, Abe Kramer, Elchon Hinden, Nat Goldenberg, David Tabor, Mischa Louvish, and Kopul Rosen, who deepened the ideological content and commitment of Zionism and some of whom were destined to play important roles both in Anglo-Jewry and in the State of Israel. There was also some overlap between this young leadership and that of the rapidly growing *Habonim* youth movement which had been founded in 1929 as a Jewish scouting

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

movement of a Zionist orientation, with members both in the middle-class suburbs and in London's East End. By 1939, *Habonim* could claim some 4,000 members, over 1,000 of whom attended its annual summer camps. Under the influence of refugee *halutz* (Zionist pioneering) youth from Germany and of *shlichim* (emissaries) from Palestine, *Habonim* began to undergo considerable Zionist-Socialist radicalization and to adopt a new educational orientation towards *halutz* settlement in Palestine.¹¹

In July 1936, the leftist Jewish Labour Council (which represented Jewish trade unions, socialist societies, and branches of the Workers' Circle) took the initiative in forming another body which challenged the policy of the Board of Deputies — the Jewish People's Council against Fascism and Antisemitism. The Federation of Zionist Youth, under Abe Herman's presidency, joined that body notwithstanding criticism from members of the Zionist Federation's Executive who disapproved of the influence which Communists had in it.¹² Partly in alliance with the anti-Zionist left, but mostly in ideological rivalry with it, the 'Young Zionists' balked at the style of communal leadership, patrician and non-Zionist, epitomized by Neville Laski. Typical was Aubrey Eban's editorial statement in *The Young Zionist* of March 1937 that the 'greatest obstacle in the face of Zionism and all progressive movements in the community is the antiquated tradition of Anglo-Jewish aristocracy'. Eban called for abandonment of the 'suicidal neutrality advocated by the Board of Deputies'. He argued that the only force which could offer effective political opposition to fascism was that of working-class and democratic organizations: 'Not the defence of Jewry but the attacking of Fascism' was what was called for.¹³ The generation of Zionists whose mood was reflected by such views invigorated the Zionist movement in Britain, enhanced its public image at the expense of the largely discredited non-Zionist leadership of the Board of Deputies, and generated greater Zionist assertiveness in the communal politics of Anglo-Jewry.

At the Board of Deputies Neville Laski and Sir Robert Waley Cohen, two of the most prominent non-Zionist communal leaders, found themselves under periodic attack from some deputies who were Zionists. (The Zionist Federation as such was not represented on the Board; these Zionists sat there in the capacity of deputies from other communal bodies.) On one occasion, in May 1936, Laski faced a highly unpleasant situation when a group of them publicly accused him of deliberately withholding information from them in order to gain an unfair advantage in his endeavours to win the votes of certain other deputies against the Board's participation in the World Jewish Congress.¹⁴ On another occasion, in August 1936, Waley Cohen suffered an unexpected blow to his prestige when a resolution tabled by the Palestine Committee was carried by an overwhelming majority in

spite of his forceful submission of an amendment.¹⁵ *The Zionist Review* commented with satisfaction that the defeat of his amendment 'must have come as a shock to the mover, who, by virtue of his position in many communal institutions, is unaccustomed to his suggestions being treated in so summary a fashion'.¹⁶ In March 1937 Lavy Bakstansky, general secretary of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, had an altercation with Laski, prompted by the complaints of some young Zionists that in some of his speeches Laski had been denouncing Zionism as 'aggressive nationalism' and deploring the excessive allocation of money for purposes abroad at the expense of home charities.¹⁷

Finally, in January 1938, the muscle which Zionists at the Board of Deputies had been developing was exercised in a major debate over Palestine. It concerned a resolution submitted by the Board's Palestine Committee, in which Zionists had a clear majority, stating that the Board 'would welcome a solution for the future of Palestine which will provide for the establishment of a Jewish Dominion within the British Commonwealth of Nations'. The resolution was vigorously opposed by the leading non-Zionists on the Board: Sir Robert Waley Cohen, Sir Osmond d'Avigdor Goldsmid, and Lionel Cohen. Although they welcomed the retention of Palestine within the Commonwealth, they rejected the idea of a Jewish Dominion on the familiar non-Zionist grounds that it entailed the establishment of a Jewish nationality, would harm the interests of Diaspora Jews, and would reduce the Arabs of Palestine to minority status. In spite of their opposition, the original resolution was passed by the Board with an overwhelming majority. The Zionists hailed the event as 'a Zionist victory comparable only with the days of 1917'.¹⁸

Neville Laski was subjected to further attacks from Zionists after the publication in 1939 of a book of his essays and speeches in which the following passage appeared:¹⁹

To Western Jewry, as represented by many prominent English and American Jews, the idea of a Jewish State is no less distasteful now than it was twenty years ago . . . What they want to see in Palestine is a system which will give both to the Jewish population, which is almost a third of the total, and to the Arab population complete political and civil security and self-government in matters that concern each community alone. They want to see in Palestine neither a Jewish nor an Arab State, but a Palestinian State, and they want the Jews of Palestine to count as Palestine citizens (as, in fact, they are now), just as the Jews of England are English citizens or the Jews of France French citizens, as in this way the danger both of a 'dual allegiance' and of injustice to the Arabs would be avoided.

Although this statement no more than expressed the standard non-Zionist position, it drew severe criticism at the Board of Deputies, in the Zionist press, at a meeting of the British Section of the Jewish Agency

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

and, most sharply of all, at a conference of the Federation of Zionist Youth held in Manchester in June 1939.²⁰

By that time, Neville Laski, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, and the other non-Zionist members of the 'Cousinhood' had in practice lost their grip over affairs at the Board of Deputies. Yet what irked the leaders of the Zionist Federation was precisely the discrepancy between the prevalent Zionist sentiments of rank-and-file deputies and the disproportionate number of non-Zionist office-holders at the Board. The latter were from patrician families and, it was alleged, they 'utilised their influential positions by seeking in private discussions with eminent British statesmen to undermine the Palestine movement, by declaring that a Jewish state in Palestine was "inconsistent with British citizenship"'.²¹ This was the background to the concerted campaign orchestrated by Lavy Bakstansky of the Zionist Federation finally to 'capture' the Board of Deputies for Zionism. The dramatic events and controversies associated with that campaign have been related in the December 1980 issue of this Journal.²² Only the most salient facts need be repeated here as background to the non-Zionist response.

The first step towards 'capturing' the Board was the election of Selig Brodetsky in November 1939 as its first avowedly Zionist president. However, the major thrust of the capture took place in July 1943 when a Zionist caucus assiduously engineered by Lavy Bakstansky dissolved the sixty-five-year long partnership of the Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association in the Joint Foreign Committee (known as the Conjoint Foreign Committee till 1917) and elected Zionist majorities to all the Board's major committees. This manoeuvre was the outcome of Zionist radicalization at an international level. It stemmed from the decisions of the Extraordinary Conference of American Zionists held at the Biltmore Hotel in New York in May 1942. The Conference was attended by Weizmann, Ben-Gurion, and other non-American Zionist leaders and it not only vehemently denounced Britain's 1939 White Paper, but also boldly called for the post-war establishment of Palestine as a 'Jewish Commonwealth'. It demanded that full powers to achieve this aim be transferred from the British Mandatory power to the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which was 'to be vested with control of immigration into Palestine and with the necessary authority for upbuilding the country'. Britain would retain its sovereignty over Palestine, but only until such time as a Jewish majority had been established.

The Biltmore Declaration alarmed British non-Zionists even more than it had done the American Jewish Committee. Not only did it revive the spectre of a sovereign Jewish state which, to their minds, would undermine the emancipated status of Jews in all lands of the Diaspora, but it also threw down the gauntlet at their own British government. The Zionist Federation's leaders therefore now

considered it essential not to give the Jewish 'grand dukes' the opportunity to obstruct the crucial thrust towards Jewish statehood in a repetition of the events of 1917, at the time of the Balfour Declaration. They determined to ensure that the official voice of British Jewry be heard to speak now unequivocally in favour of a Jewish state. They were successful and captured the Board of Deputies of British Jews in July 1943.

The first fruits of Zionist hegemony at the Board were reaped in November 1944, when the Board issued a major 'Statement on Post-War Policy' which closely followed the wording of the Biltmore Declaration. The Board's statement stressed that 'future policy in regard to Palestine must clearly begin with the abrogation of the White Paper' and urged that 'Palestine be designated to become, after an agreed period of transitional government, a Jewish State or Commonwealth' which might find a place within the British Commonwealth of Nations. It asked that²³

during the transitional period, before the full establishment of the Jewish State or Commonwealth, the Jewish Agency, recognised under the Mandate as the authorised representative of the Jewish people in relation to Palestine, be vested with authority to direct and regulate immigration into Palestine . . . and to utilise the uncultivated and unoccupied lands for Jewish colonisation and for the benefit of the country as a whole.

The rump of opponents of Zionism at the Board strongly opposed this statement. Louis Gluckstein and Basil Henriques, who were now their leading spokesmen, advocated an amendment which would eliminate all mention of the words 'State' or 'Commonwealth'. But their amendment was roundly defeated: 159 voted against it while only 18 were in favour.²⁴

The response of the non-Zionists

The Zionist 'capture' of the Board of Deputies was bitterly resented by the non-Zionists. They condemned as unworthy and contrary to tradition the caucus method by which the Zionist Federation had conspired to take over the Board's committees; and they accused the Zionists of harming the true interests of the Anglo-Jewish community by attempting to dominate its affairs and by recklessly ousting leaders of stature and experience. Lavy Bakstansky and his Zionist Federation colleagues, for their part, defended their actions in the name of 'the democracy' of the Jewish community and rejoiced in the defeat of the 'grand dukes' who had for too long been allowed to dominate Anglo-Jewry. Ironically, the editor of *The Jewish Chronicle*, Ivan Greenberg, although himself a fervent Zionist, sharply criticized the Zionist caucus

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

in the columns of his paper. Greenberg regarded the 'capture' as an irresponsible act because it had destroyed the representative character of the Board of Deputies and would not advance the true interests of Zionism. As for Selig Brodetsky, he was unhappy to find himself caught in the middle of this acrimonious controversy. He believed that Bakstansky had gone too far and that it was a disadvantage to have the leading non-Zionists ousted from the Board's executive rather than kept inside it although subject to a Zionist majority.²⁵

The non-Zionists in Anglo-Jewry were discomfited and in disarray. Although the League of British Jews had not been formally dissolved, it had become virtually defunct after the formation of the British Section of the Jewish Agency in 1929. Not until the founding of the Jewish Fellowship in 1944 (which will be discussed below) was the assimilationist ideological viewpoint again to be formally expressed and defended in an organization dedicated especially to that purpose. Although there was in the Jewish Agency in Britain theoretical parity of Zionists and non-Zionists, in practice the non-Zionists were in the minority since their selection was vested in the Board of Deputies and that body invariably chose a number of persons of known but unofficial Zionist conviction. Indeed, after 1939 the British section of the Jewish Agency, although not dissolved, was moribund. In the Anglo-Jewish Association alone — a body encompassing only a few hundred members — was there clear non-Zionist predominance owing to the members of the patrician families who still directed it. This had ensured the non-Zionists at least an equal say in the important Joint Foreign Committee which, as noted above, was a partnership of the Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association.

When the Zionists at the Board brought about the unilateral dissolution of the Joint Foreign Committee in July 1943, the Anglo-Jewish Association was left as the sole organized body of non-Zionist views. Even then, however, it was not by any means thoroughly non-Zionist, for not only its membership but even its Council included persons of Zionist leanings. Indeed, its president since 1939, Leonard Stein, had played a major role in the affairs of the World Zionist Organization in the 1920s and was legal adviser to the Jewish Agency in the 1930s. He continued to regard himself as a Zionist²⁶ but his views on the future of Palestine and its relationship to Diaspora Jewry were by now substantively closer to those of self-avowed non-Zionists like Neville Laski, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, and Anthony de Rothschild. To the latter Leonard Stein explained in August 1943 that he opposed the White Paper of 1939 and advocated that Palestine be opened after the war to Jewish immigration on the largest possible scale. He recognized that Palestine must sooner or later become self-governing but did not consider that it necessarily must become an independent state, nor was he at all sure that it was desirable that it should.²⁷

GIDEON SHIMONI

Leonard Stein did not share the deep aversion from the nationalist ideological implications of Zionism which still characterized non-Zionists like Anthony de Rothschild or Sir Robert Waley Cohen. However, the critical dividing line between Zionist and non-Zionist positions had shifted ever since the partition recommendation of 1937 first raised the prospect of full Jewish statehood. It was no longer a matter for theoretical discussion whether the Jews were purely a religious group or also constituted a nation. The issue had become one of practical politics. Leonard Stein was against Jewish statehood and therefore sided with the non-Zionist majority in the Council of the Anglo-Jewish Association. Nor was he willing to capitulate and leave the field to the Board of Deputies. The AJA formed, under Stein's chairmanship, its own committee for foreign affairs and in October 1943 Stein wrote to the Foreign Office to express his trust 'that the Secretary of State may be willing to extend the same facilities for placing their view before him as have been accorded them in the past'.²⁸ The Foreign Office acceded to that request and, briefed by Harold Beeley (the expert on Jewish affairs in its Research and Press Section at Balliol College) was quick to recognize the implications for itself. They were, as Beeley phrased it:²⁹

(1) That the policy of the Board of Deputies of British Jews will be directed by the leaders of the Zionist Organization in this country; and (2) that views . . . will be put before H.M.G. [His Majesty's Government] by two distinct bodies with different outlooks — the one elected by a wide constituency but controlled in the last resort by an international organisation with a single objective, the other representing a small upper class of assimilated British Jews.

The Foreign Office officials, guided by the perspicacious Beeley, were well aware that there was in fact an overwhelming consensus of support for Zionism in Anglo-Jewry and that even the Anglo-Jewish Association was not wholly without Zionist members. But they also knew that there was a split over the specific question of a Jewish state and could exploit this to justify their own opposition to any policy which would further alienate the Arabs.³⁰

Thus, notwithstanding the Zionist victory at the Board of Deputies, to all intents and purposes there still was not a unified Anglo-Jewish voice in unequivocal support of the World Zionist Organization's policies and the non-Zionists continued to have access to the British government and to find it receptive to their views. Within the community itself, however, the balance of power had decisively moved over to the Zionists, a fact best attested to by Neville Laski's own description in a confidential letter to his American friends: 'In geometrical progression the Zionists have assailed and captured the synagogues, literary societies, youth institutions, and quasi political institutions of the community'.³¹ This situation was regarded by the

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

non-Zionist notables with a mixture of frustration and indignation — frustration at the loosening of their grip over the affairs of the community which they had been experiencing since the mid-1930s and which now had become final; and indignation at the effrontery of the Zionists and their 'bad form' in organizing a caucus to capture the Board of Deputies. Their indignation may without unfairness be described as self-righteous, since it rested on a presumption of prerogative right to govern the affairs of Anglo-Jewry and overlooked the fact that they themselves practised a form of caucus in their periodic consultations at the Rothschild offices at New Court.

Laski's frustration was exacerbated by the fact that he alone of the entire circle of non-Zionists had been willing to devote the enormous resources of time and energy required for the presidency of the Board. He had found it necessary to resign from that presidency since he otherwise ran the risk of the imminent collapse of his professional legal career as a result of seven years of intense dedication to his tasks at the Board.³² He had done so reluctantly, knowing full well that none of the other leading non-Zionists from the elite families was willing to take over and he lamented to his American friends 'the lack of readiness on the part of the Anglo-Jewish families . . . to devote hard and daily work, like the Zionists, to the job . . . we have no organisation and no people willing to sacrifice leisure to countering the devotion which the other side give to their task'. He complained:³³

During my presidency of the Board of Deputies, I urged without success that unless the older and well-known Anglo-Jewish families took a more active part in the affairs of the community, not merely in their international, but in their day-to-day, continuity, the power of control would pass into the hands of those whom they regarded as protagonists of ideas which were anathema to them. I think it fair to say that at the end of my tenure of office, Sir Robert Waley Cohen and I were the only two activists of what I shall call the non-Zionist, anti W.J.C. [World Jewish Congress] point of view.

Laski doubted whether the Anglo-Jewish Association (on whose Council he himself sat) under Leonard Stein's presidency could provide an adequate counterbalance to the 'present Zionist capture and totalitarian dictation to the community'. He added that while appreciating Stein's 'ability, integrity and selflessness', he believed that Stein had 'a loyalty to his Zionist past and present which makes him feel himself to be uncomfortable in the same bed as those who do not think with him on Zionism'.

The American non-Zionists, shaken by the assertiveness of the Zionists who had organized the American Jewish Conference in August 1943, were anxious to co-operate with their British counterparts. They recognized that the Zionist campaign to attain communal hegemony was following similar lines in both countries. Morris Waldman, the Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee, received a

letter from one of his observers in London which stated: 'The similarity to the story of our relations with the American Jewish Conference is striking. In fact it is practically identical'. Referring to the 'Zionist political manipulators', he said that 'the local Lipsky' was called Bakstansky.³⁴ While Laski had been president of the Board of Deputies, liaison with the American non-Zionists had been almost wholly in his hands although it gave the impression of being with the Board of Deputies as a body. After the 'Zionization' of the Board, liaison was effected by the Anglo-Jewish Association. However, Leonard Stein's somewhat equivocal position on Zionism and the comparative weakness of the AJA led Morris Waldman to rely increasingly on his own representatives in London. Initially, these were unofficial; later, in 1945, the American Jewish Committee established a small office of its own in London with William Frankel as its incumbent. One of his tasks was the despatch to Waldman of monthly reports on the Jewish situation in Britain.³⁵

The Anglo-Jewish Association was at one with the American Jewish Committee in rejecting the Zionist policy adopted at the Biltmore Conference of 1942;³⁶ and since it found the November 1944 Statement submitted by the Board of Deputies to the Colonial and Foreign Office equally unacceptable, it determined to adopt an independent line. All Selig Brodetsky's attempts to dissuade the AJA's president, Leonard Stein, from splitting the voice of the community vis-à-vis the government were unsuccessful. The memorandum which the AJA submitted to the British government in January 1945, while also calling for the revocation of the 1939 White Paper as a whole and especially its restriction of Jewish immigration, differed from that of the Board by implicitly rejecting Jewish statehood and proposing instead 'the further development of the Jewish National Home in an undivided Palestine' under conditions conducive to the attainment by Palestine of the status of a self-governing territory in close association with the British Commonwealth.³⁷

That Zionism had nevertheless made considerable inroads even in the Anglo-Jewish Association was evident when this memorandum was approved at a special general meeting in December 1944 by a majority of only 11: 24 for and 13 against. Moreover, those who voted against the memorandum insisted on submitting to the Colonial Secretary their minority opinion in which they called for the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state or commonwealth preferably within the framework of the British Commonwealth.³⁸ But this did not alter the fact that opposition to a Jewish state at that time commanded a majority in the Anglo-Jewish Association. The AJA submitted to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry (established in November 1945 by the British and the American governments) a memorandum which persisted in advocating the gradual development of a unitary Palestine with

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

autonomous self-governing institutions within the British Commonwealth.³⁹ In July 1946 it welcomed the recommendation of the Committee of Inquiry that Palestine should be neither an Arab nor a Jewish State, stating: 'In the firm conviction that the demand for a Jewish State is ill-advised and against the true interests of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, the Anglo-Jewish Association has consistently abstained from advancing it'.⁴⁰

An unofficial alliance had developed between the two major non-Zionist bodies in post-war western Jewry, the American Jewish Committee and the Anglo-Jewish Association. In February 1946 they convened a conference in London in a rather futile attempt to form an international bloc of representative Jewish organizations in various countries as counterweight to the World Jewish Congress. The Board of Deputies of British Jews was also invited to participate although it had previously entered into a tripartite agreement with the World Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Conference. Notwithstanding strong pressure from the latter bodies that the Board reject the invitation, its president, Selig Brodetsky, accepted out of conviction that the Board's presence would help 'in avoiding the rift which threatened to divide the leading Jewish bodies of various countries into irreconcilable blocs . . . [and] . . . avoiding conclusions fundamentally opposed to the point of view so widely shared by the large masses of the Jewish people on the question of Palestine'. Brodetsky was vindicated when the conference proved to be of little consequence; it took no decisions and passed no binding resolutions.⁴¹

Although the Anglo-Jewish Association's views were close to those of the American Jewish Committee, they differed in regard to specific proposals at various stages of the common search for an alternative solution to the constitution of Palestine wholly or partly as a Jewish state. The AJC's preference for international trusteeship, which it first proposed in February 1943 and to which it returned in testimony before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in 1946,⁴² was not shared by the AJA, which consistently preferred that Palestine remain within the British orbit.

Leonard Stein, for his part, was uneasy about the fact that the Association of which he was president found it impossible to follow the lead of the Board of Deputies in endorsing the policies of the World Zionist Organization — which, in 1946, meant acceptance of a partition solution. The Anglo-Jewish Association continued to advocate a unitary Palestine but Stein demonstrated his moderation and desire to minimize discord in the Jewish community in the following manner. In September 1946, the British government invited representatives of Arabs and of Jews to attend a conference in London. When the Jewish Agency declined to be represented unless certain conditions were satisfied, the Board of Deputies followed suit. This placed the

Anglo-Jewish Association in an awkward situation. In principle, it regarded the Agency's attitude as ill-advised and that of the Board of Deputies as an affront to its own government to boot. Yet Stein was unhappy at the prospect of the AJA being the only Jewish body to accept the invitation unconditionally. The policy he therefore adopted was to make representatives of the AJA available for consultation without actually taking part in the conference.⁴³

Two months later, in November 1946, Leonard Stein laid before his colleagues a policy proposal which argued that the course of events was making the Anglo-Jewish Association's stance obsolete: 'However much the fact may be deplored, the realities of the situation seem to me now to point towards some form of partition'. The main consideration involved was, he claimed, that there was no prospect of obtaining the support of any of the Arab states for a unitary regime with effective guarantee of facilities for large-scale Jewish immigration. He added: 'I desire to make it clear that it is with reluctance that I advocate partition . . . I should infinitely prefer the resumption of large-scale Jewish settlement and the continued development of the Jewish National Home in an undivided Palestine under the aegis of Great Britain'. But since a realistic appraisal of the situation now led him to the conclusion that this was no longer attainable, he thought one had best cut one's losses and work for partition as a second-best solution.⁴⁴

The Zionist caucus's capture of the Board of Deputies in 1943 and the resultant dissolution of the Joint Foreign Committee continued to rankle in the predominantly non-Zionist Anglo-Jewish Association. After all its efforts to reconstitute the former partnership on foreign policy had failed, the AJA finally decided in April 1947 to withdraw its representation from the Board of Deputies. That was an odd decision since the emerging consensus in favour of partition meant that there were no longer any substantive differences between the Palestine policies of the Association and of the Board.⁴⁵ Indeed, the AJA submitted to the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine in June 1947 a memorandum which did not greatly differ from official Zionist policy⁴⁶ and in September 1947 it welcomed that Special Committee's majority report favouring partition.

The Jewish Fellowship: the last stand of anti-Zionism in Anglo-Jewry

The Zionist capture of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, apart from provoking the response of the Anglo-Jewish Association discussed above, had spurred the formation of another and more extreme manifestation of opposition to Zionism — the Jewish Fellowship. Its main founders were Basil Henriques, the Liberal Rabbi Israel Mattuck, and Sir Brunel Cohen. The Fellowship was officially established on 7 November 1944 but the plan for such an association

had been germinating since 1942. Its official formation was repeatedly postponed owing to lack of consensus amongst the leading non-Zionist personalities. Some were satisfied that the Anglo-Jewish Association could adequately represent their views and were therefore reluctant to create a new organization which might weaken it. Moreover, the prospect of being associated with the fervently anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism — which was indeed seeking such an association — was not to the liking of the Anglo-Jewish non-Zionists whose disposition was more moderate.⁴⁷ Leonard Stein, who disapproved of the idea of the Fellowship, warned that it would be ‘associated in the public mind with the movement recently started in the USA [the American Council for Judaism] by Lessing Rosenwald’ — a movement which the AJA deprecated.⁴⁸ Neville Laski was also inclined to dissuade its promoters ‘from coming out into the open’ because he believed that ‘it would be stigmatised as a revival of the old League of British Jews of 1917’ and therefore ‘doomed to failure’.⁴⁹

Evidently, the Fellowship’s founders shared these apprehensions for they not only steered clear of any link with the American Council for Judaism but were also at pains to dismiss the charge that they were merely resuscitating the League of British Jews. They welcomed as members ‘any man or woman professing the Jewish religion and domiciled or permanently resident in the British Commonwealth and Empire’; and initially they claimed that the Fellowship was a non-political association whose goal was to foster ‘a religious revival’ amongst Jews. It aspired to bring together Jews of all religious groups — Orthodox, Reform, and Liberal — in a common resistance to excessive secularization and a common endeavour to enhance the contribution of Judaism to British society. In an address to the Fellowship’s first annual general meeting, Colonel Robert Henriques, a member of its council, emphasized what he termed its ‘purely affirmative aspect’, namely, ‘to uphold the principle that the Jews are a religious community and to strengthen the religious life of all sections of Jewry’ and furthermore, ‘to make a religious contribution to the life of the British nation’ in co-operation with the adherents of other faiths.⁵⁰

It was this positive religious emphasis which attracted personalities previously associated with Zionism such as Albert M. Hyamson⁵¹ and Joseph Leftwich. The latter served as secretary of the group which was planning to found the Jewish Fellowship and in that capacity he wrote in February 1944 to Chief Rabbi Hertz, urging him to sponsor the Fellowship and arguing that ‘there are many Zionists who stand staunchly by Jewish religion and do not believe that nationalism is a substitute for Judaism and that Jews are Jews only by blood’. Leftwich told Hertz that the Fellowship stood for ‘the fundamental principle that the Jews are a religious community and that the bond which unites them is their religion, supported by a common tradition and history’.

The aim was 'to strengthen and spread the influence of their religion among Jews, to promote Jewish unity and to supply a basis for co-operation among Jews of all schools of thought', and 'to make a religious contribution to the life of the British nation'. He added:⁵²

I do not need to tell you about the new paganism in Anglo-Jewry, the idea that Jews can be Jews without religion. You have inveighed against it often . . . We want this movement to be as large and unifying as possible and to include all sections of religious Jewry who are at home in this country. Having said this, I need hardly repeat my assurance that this is not an attempt to reorganise the League of British Jews.

Rabbi Hertz decisively rejected the invitation. After examining the Fellowship's draft aims, he replied: 'The tasks which you propose to undertake are, to a large extent, covered by existing machinery'. When approached by the Fellowship's chairman, Basil Henriques, Hertz commented: 'You seem to identify Jewish political nationalism with religious agnosticism. This is unjust . . . As to religion in its highest sense — idealism, loyalty, sacrifice — there is among Zionists as great a proportion of men and women who make real sacrifices for religion and higher ideals as there is among any other section of Anglo-Jewry'.⁵³ Hertz was quick to perceive the anti-Zionist potential, if not intention, of the Jewish Fellowship's programme, for the obverse side of the affirmation that 'the Jews were a religious community' was the Fellowship's assertion that the Jews were not 'a politico-national group'. Rabbi Israel Mattuck, a founding member of the Fellowship, stressed that the Jews of Britain were 'an integral part of the British nation; integral not only by the loyalty of citizenship, but also by the spirit of nationality'.⁵⁴

Although the Jewish Fellowship claimed that it did not engage in any political activities, it became in fact the most forceful opponent of the Zionist Organization in Britain. For that reason it must be described as anti-Zionist rather than non-Zionist. In respect of both its social composition and its ideological essence there can be no doubt that it was tantamount to a revival of the defunct League of British Jews, as that body had been in its initial anti-Zionist phase. The Fellowship's founders and council members were mainly the sons and relatives of the Anglo-Jewish notables who had established and supported the League. They included Sir Brunel Cohen (President), Basil L. Q. Henriques (Chairman), Robert Henriques, Ewen E. S. Montagu, Viscount Bearsted, Robert N. Carvalho, Lord Justice Cohen, Lord Swaythling, and Leonard G. Montefiore. Sir Robert Waley Cohen, who had refrained from joining the League, now agreed to become a member of the Fellowship, as did his son Bernard. As an organization the Fellowship was weaker even than its predecessor, although in 1946 it stated that it had 1700 members. (The Zionist Organization claimed an enrolment of 31,000 at that time.) The first issue of its monthly

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

organ, *The Jewish Outlook*, appeared in April 1946; but it too was a pale reflection of the old League's formidable newspaper organs and it existed for only some two years.

The Fellowship's object of bringing together Jews of all religious trends was attained to a very limited degree. Its moving spirits were almost all adherents of the Reform and Liberal congregations, notably the chairman, Basil L. Q. Henriques, and Louis Gluckstein (President of the Liberal Synagogue). However, its vice-chairman, Ewen E. S. Montagu, was also vice-president of the orthodox United Synagogue; and on the Fellowship's council the name of the Liberal Rabbi Israel Mattuck appeared next to that of the orthodox Emile Marmorstein.

Although the Fellowship followed the League's principal affirmation that the Jews were a religious entity and not a nation, there were differences in emphasis which reflected an erosion of confidence and a heightened defensiveness in consequence of the dominant role which Zionism had by now achieved in Anglo-Jewry. Thus, far less stress was placed on the charge that Zionism provoked antisemitism — notwithstanding the exacerbation of Zionist-British relations as a result of Jewish terrorist actions in Palestine. Indeed, the Fellowship upheld the emancipationist ideology in spite of the catastrophic fate of European Jewry. Describing itself as 'a body of Jews who have faith in God and humanity', it declared that it continued 'to uphold the principle of emancipation which had not failed because Nazism, which was equally directed against all liberal elements and movements, overran Europe by force of arms'. It adamantly rejected 'the idea that the Jews are a politico-national body, whose members are everywhere in political exile, waiting for repatriation'. It looked upon Palestine purely as 'the Holy Land, as a Jewish religious and cultural centre', and it desired only 'to help the Jews who need a place of refuge to settle there'; and that was why it opposed the immigration restrictions of the 1939 White Paper. It contended that whatever form of homeland Jews would ultimately establish in Palestine, it could not be the homeland of all Jews throughout the world, but only of those who would live there permanently and would be its citizens. The only bond which united all Jews throughout the world was religion.⁵⁵

The Jewish Fellowship was irrevocably opposed to the notion of a Jewish state under any circumstances. So much so that it told the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in January 1946 that even assuming 99 per cent of the inhabitants of Palestine were Jews, 'the Fellowship would still say that there is no ground for forming a Jewish state', since it would place the Diaspora Jew in 'an impossible position in relation to his fellow non-Jewish citizen . . . it would lay the ground for another outbreak of antisemitism'. The Fellowship's alternative for the alleviation of Jewish suffering and the problem of the displaced persons in Europe was for every country to admit 'a reasonable number

of victims of the Nazi persecution . . . for the purpose of developing them all into full and equal citizens'.⁵⁶

Anti-Zionism of this assimilationist ideological variety made its last stand in the form of the Jewish Fellowship. It was a last stand far weaker than that of its American counterpart, the American Council for Judaism. Its affirmation of Jewish religious identity and call for a united effort at a Jewish religious revival, cutting across the divisions between Orthodox, Reform, and Liberal groups, had only loosely held together the extreme anti-Zionism of a Liberal Jew such as Basil Henriques and what is best described as the non-Zionism of a nominally Orthodox Jew such as Sir Robert Waley Cohen. Once the State of Israel was in existence, the majority of the Fellowship's members inclined towards the non-Zionist pole and no longer saw any point in its continued existence since their views were adequately represented by the Anglo-Jewish Association. In November 1948, the Fourth Annual General Meeting of the Jewish Fellowship confirmed an earlier majority decision of its Council that 'the Fellowship now ceases to exist', an amendment having been defeated to the effect that the Fellowship should continue in existence but confine itself solely to religious work. The meeting endorsed a statement by the Anglo-Jewish Association which had affirmed 'that the allegiance and loyalty of British Jews are, and will remain, an undivided allegiance and loyalty to Britain' and went on to wish success to the newly created State of Israel. In a memorandum distributed to members of the Fellowship while they were considering whether to disband their organization, a statement was made which defined what may be regarded as the residual position of the non-Zionists of Anglo-Jewry:⁵⁷

The State of Israel does not become the homeland of those Jews who are citizens of the other countries of the world. To English Jews it is in one sense a foreign State, although in another sense it is a State in which Jews throughout the world have a peculiar and special interest. Because there is a religious relationship between Jews of all nationalities, it would obviously be the wish and the hope of the Jews of England that the State of Israel should prosper, and above all, that its religious and cultural life should be so intensified as to make a larger contribution to Jewish life in the whole world. On the other hand, for those Jews who are citizens of other countries there can be no dual loyalty. The country of which they are citizens must be the only one to which they give their complete and whole-hearted loyalty.

Concluding Observations

The historical record traced here and in the preceding article⁵⁸ reveals that in Britain, after 1917, the assimilationist genre of opposition to Zionism was rarely total and uncompromising. Although there were some phases of anti-Zionism (defined as organized

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

opposition to Zionism) for a few years after the League of British Jews came into existence in 1917 and again after 1944 when the Jewish Fellowship was founded, the opponents were for the most part non-Zionist rather than anti-Zionist. That is to say, they did not engage in forceful and active opposition and in fact showed a willingness to co-operate in certain practical and political spheres. Without doubt, Britain's assumption of the Palestine Mandate was the crucial factor in tempering anti-Zionism in Anglo-Jewry. Indeed, as citizens of the Mandatory power, the assimilationist Jews perceived support for the Jewish community in Palestine to be a patriotic British duty as well as a Jewish religious duty. In this respect, they shared common ground with the Zionists and co-operation was facilitated. The clash between them arose from their contrasting perceptions of Jewish identity in general and of the goals of the Jewish enterprise in Palestine in particular. It was essentially ideological in nature although it had serious practical implications.

The assimilationist ideology posited that in modern times the Jews had become purely a religious group and so should remain. Its platform was emancipation for Jews in all countries and integration into the national fabric of each country whilst preserving Jewish identity only in the sense of religious affiliation. The proponents of that policy themselves used the term 'assimilation' in this context; and the term, no less than its emancipationist cum integrationist intent, showed remarkable persistence. As late as 1940 one finds Anthony de Rothschild crossing ideological swords with Selig Brodetsky in much the same vein as in the debates of 1917. He accused Brodetsky of assuming that all Jews supported the notion 'that the Anglo-Jewish community should be regarded as some kind of national unit forming part of another nation', an idea which he declared 'most dangerous for the future of Jews in this country as well as of every other'. He contended that not 'nationality' but 'assimilation to English life' was 'the civic ideal' not only of himself and his 'Jewish friends' but also 'of the great body of English Jews'. By 'assimilation' he meant:⁵⁹

that the members of the Anglo-Jewish community should be in a similar relationship to their fellow nationals of different faiths as the members of other non-conformist churches, viz., that apart from the religious difference our ideal is to assimilate with the rest of the British nation taking our full part as Englishmen without reservation in all the secular activities of the nation. At the same time we should wish to see the Anglo-Jewish community maintain in full vigour its religious observances and its religious education.

We have seen that the evidence does not bear out the Zionist accusations, made in the heat of the debate, that the non-Zionists were motivated by personal desire for ingratiation with Gentile society and showed selfish disregard of the needs of displaced and distressed

Diaspora Jews. Some members of the Anglo-Jewish 'aristocracy' — Edwin Montagu for example⁶⁰ — may have feared that Zionism would endanger their personal status in politics or society, but that was neither a normative nor a dominant motivation among non-Zionists. There is abundant evidence that the proponents of the assimilationist ideology were ready to criticize Gentile pro-Zionism not only when it was voiced by antisemites but also when it emanated from respectable Gentile opinion.

Moreover, there is no solid evidence that the non-Zionists were mainly motivated by the desire to retain for themselves positions of prestige and power in the community. Certainly, such men as Osmond d'Avigdor Goldsmid, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, and Basil Henriques came close to regarding leadership of Anglo-Jewry by members of their social class as a natural prerogative. On the other hand, when Neville Laski resigned, the leading non-Zionists were in fact reluctant to stand for the presidency of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. Those willing to hold communal office did so not in the first instance for the sake of power or self-interest, but in the service of the best interests of the Jewish community, according to their lights. Their record reveals nothing of the ideological opportunism one might expect of men driven only by personal ambition. At some stage in their careers of communal leadership Waley Cohen and Neville Laski, for example, declined invitations to join the Zionists. Had they accepted these invitations, their leadership roles in Anglo-Jewry certainly would have been enhanced. The English Zionist Federation was only too eager to embrace members of the elite Anglo-Jewish families, when they showed some interest in Zionism. Lord Rothschild, for example, was unofficially co-opted to take part in the negotiations which culminated in the Balfour Declaration. Indeed, it was to him, rather than to Chaim Weizmann, that the famous Declaration was addressed in 1917. Similarly, Lord Melchett's interest in Zionism was enthusiastically welcomed and he was elected to the presidency of the English Zionist Federation in 1928.

In the final analysis, the motivation of the leading non-Zionists was their assimilatory ideology rather than personal ambition to be accepted by the Gentile elite of English society or to retain power over the Jewish community. At the core of that ideology lay the 'emancipation contract' theory that when the Jews of Britain were fully emancipated in the nineteenth century, they had morally undertaken in exchange to divest themselves of any residual national attribute. Long after the term 'emancipation contract' had fallen into disuse, the theory which it connoted continued to influence most of the members of the Anglo-Jewish 'aristocracy'. According to their lights, any affirmation of Jewish nationality was tantamount to a breach of contract and therefore personally dishonourable as well as gravely prejudicial to the fulfilment of Jewish emancipation.

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

Historical hindsight enables us to say that the conceptions and apprehensions of the assimilationists were unfounded. One inventive explanation for their misapprehension has been offered by Isaiah Friedman. He has argued that they mistakenly applied to Britain conceptions valid only for the situation of the Jews on the continent of Europe, particularly those enunciated by Napoleon's Great Sanhedrin of 1807 according to which the Jews were no longer a nation but only the professors of a religion. In Friedman's view, the assimilationists' fear that recognition of Zionism would cause Jews to be rejected by British Gentiles 'was misplaced' since 'such a practice was totally alien to English law'. Friedman therefore concluded that the Anglo-Jewish assimilationists showed 'an inept understanding of the British mind and of the British political and social make-up'.⁶¹

However, there is no reason to suppose that the conceptions of the non-Zionists in Britain were borrowed from the continental experience. As we have seen, the notion of an 'emancipation contract' was derived from the assimilationists' interpretation of the debate over emancipation in nineteenth-century Britain itself. Whatever references they made to such European precedents as the Sanhedrin summoned by Napoleon served only to confirm views derived directly from the British experience. The Anglo-Jewish adherents of the assimilationist ideology, who included a number of distinguished lawyers, could not have been in any doubt about the protection afforded them by English rule of law. Their apprehensions concerning Zionism were rooted not in an imperfect understanding of English law but rather in their belief that there would be a dangerous reaction from existing and potential antisemitic British circles. In that regard they cannot be said to have been unrealistic since it is a matter of record that there was indeed much antisemitism in British society throughout the first four decades of the twentieth century.⁶² The Zionist affirmation that Jews were a separate nation *did* add grist to the mill of antisemitic charges of Jewish unassimilability and some antisemitic groups *did* welcome Zionism as a way of being rid of the Jews.

The misapprehensions of the Anglo-Jewish leaders who opposed Zionism or withheld support from it were the result of their residual sense of insecurity in English society. That insecurity induced a great anxiety that Jews must prove themselves to be not only loyal British citizens but also impeccably worthy members of the English nation. If they showed 'an inept understanding of the British mind', it was in regard to that aspiration, for the term 'British' implied an overarching, inclusive identity into which one (like the Welsh or the Scots, for example) could contract. But this was not so in the case of an English or, for that matter, of a Jewish identity. As late as 1946 the humourist George Mikes discerningly noted: 'It is a shame and bad taste to be an alien, and it is no use pretending otherwise . . . He may become British;

he can never become English'.⁶³ With historical hindsight again, it may be said that the assimilationists failed to recognize that even the gentlemanly and liberal Englishman who deplored antisemitism, and indeed might have shown a liking for Jews of his acquaintance, did not necessarily consider them to be Englishmen, any more than a Jew who was friendly with Gentiles would regard them as Jews.

The Zionist ideologues, however, were more perceptive in this respect. The essence of their argument was that citizenship and nationality were not co-extensive: the Jews in England were British by 'citizenship' but Jews by 'nationality' — the term nationality being understood not in a political sense but as 'an ethnological and cultural conception'. They argued that it was self-delusion to think that Jews could truly be regarded as Englishmen in the ethnological-cultural sense.⁶⁴ As early as 1916, the Zionist Dr Moses Gaster (who was Neville Laski's father-in-law) had declared that 'the claim to be Englishmen of the Jewish persuasion — that is English by nationality and Jewish by faith — is an absolute self-delusion'.⁶⁵ As late as 1943 Leon Simon, in debate with one of the founders of the Jewish Fellowship, Major Louis H. Gluckstein, reiterated: 'It really is time we gave up this pretence, which deceives nobody, that we British Jews came over with the Conqueror, or earlier, and that we are exactly like Englishmen (or is it Welshmen or Scotsmen?) in every respect except that we go (or possibly don't go) to Synagogue and that they go (or possibly don't go) to Church'.⁶⁶

In abstract theory the assimilationist case was perhaps neater and more logically consistent; but in the reality of British society the untidier Zionist case has been vindicated. Neither the adherence of growing numbers of Anglo-Jews to Zionism nor even the public opposition which they expressed to the Palestine policies of various British governments undermined the emancipated civic status of the Jews in Britain.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on a broader research project on Zionism in Anglo-Jewry which has been made possible by research grants from the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and from the Hebrew University's Kelly, Ben Eli, and Sheinborn Funds.

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

NOTES

ABBREVIATIONS

AJA	Anglo-Jewish Archives, Mocatta Library, London
BD	Archives of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, London
CZA	Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem
<i>JC</i>	<i>The Jewish Chronicle</i> , London (weekly)
PRO	Public Record Office, Kew, London
YIVO, AJC	American Jewish Committee Records at YIVO, Institute for Jewish Research Archives, New York
<i>YZ</i>	<i>The Young Zionist</i> , London (monthly)
<i>ZR</i>	<i>The Zionist Review</i> , London (monthly, then weekly from 5 May 1938)

¹ See Gideon Shimoni, 'From Anti-Zionism to Non-Zionism in Anglo-Jewry, 1917-37'. *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 28, no. 1, June 1986, pp. 19-47.

² See the report of the Board of Deputies meeting, 20 May 1939 in *JC*, 26 May 1939, pp. 13-14.

³ See 'Note of Meeting held at New Court, St. Swithin's Lane on Tuesday September the 9th at 2.30 p.m.' (a document extracted from Ben-Gurion's luggage by the British censorship authorities) in PRO FO 371/27129. See also in M. J. Cohen, ed., *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*. Series A, vol. 20, Jerusalem, 1979, pp. 201, 204, 257-60.

⁴ See *The Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, 21st Annual Report, May 1919-April 1920*, p. 8; and *30th Annual Report, July 1928-January 1930*, p. 7.

⁵ On the Zionists during the 1930 Whitechapel by-election, see Norman Rose, *The Gentile Zionists*, London, 1973, pp. 37-39; and David Cesarani, 'The Zionist Federation and the White Paper Crisis of 1929-1931', in *Zionist Year Book*, London, 1984, pp. 25-28. *Poale Zion* Zionists, however, maintained their support of the Labour Party in that by-election. See Gideon Shimoni, 'Poale Zion: A Zionist Transplant in Britain, 1905-1945', in Peter Y. Medding, ed., *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, vol. 2, Bloomington, In., 1986, pp. 227-69.

⁶ See *Report of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation Submitted to the 19th Zionist Congress, August 1935*, p. 54; *Report of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation Submitted to the 21st Zionist Congress, August 1939*, p. 40; and *The Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, 39th Annual Report, April 1938-May 1939*, p. 13. It should be noted that shekel increases were not steadily incremental; examination of all the Reports shows considerable fluctuation: for example, sales dropped from 24,010 in 1936-37 to 19,353 in 1937-38.

⁷ The *JC* carried many letters to the editor attacking the Board's policy, written by Zionists. For example, Dr E. Hinden in the issue of 16 November 1934 declared that it was 'time that we stopped saying Mah yomru hagoyim [what will the Gentiles say] . . . and instead applied ourselves whole-heartedly to combat the menace of fascism while there is still time'. Hinden argued that the patrician communal leadership's complacency arose 'out of the exalted social and economic position which these gentlemen occupy'; but that 'the Jewish workman, and even the Jewish middle class doctor and lawyer who is not so situated, is much more aware of the danger. He will fight Fascism by the

only way in which it can be fought — by joining the local anti-Fascist council and working and demonstrating till Anti-Semitic Fascism is discredited'. See also the sharp criticism expressed by some Zionists at the Board of Deputies meeting on 9 April 1933 as reported in the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of 10 April 1933, BD Minute Book 26, p. 65.

⁸ The policy of the Board of Deputies under Neville Laski's presidency and the various manifestations of Jewish public reaction to that policy are discussed in Gisela C. Lebzelter, *Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939*, London, 1978, chap. 7, and, in more detail, in Nana Sagi, 'The Response of the Jewish Public in Britain to Persecution of the Jews in the Third Reich as Reflected in the Jewish Press in Britain, 1930-1939' (Hebrew), unpublished Ph.D. dissertation at the Hebrew University, 1983, especially pp. 131-54; 245-56; 369-75.

⁹ See *JC*, 10 November 1933, p. 26; also the report of the Association of Young Zionist Societies Annual Conference in *YZ*, July 1933, p. 10.

¹⁰ See Colonel F. H. Kisch's letter criticizing the 'transfer agreement' in *JC*, 25 October 1935, p. 27.

¹¹ The influence of these developments on the intensification and radicalization of Zionist commitment in Britain is discussed in Matthew Kalman, 'Young Zionism and Jewish Youth in London Between the Wars', dissertation as component of Cambridge University History Tripos, 1983.

¹² See Zionist Federation Executive Council Minutes, 11 January 1937, in CZA, A295/6.

¹³ See *YZ*, March 1937, p. 4 and April 1936, pp. 3, 4. For the ideological rivalry with the Communists see, for example, 'The Communist Challenge and a Zionist Reply', *ZR*, August/September, October, and November, 1935, and 'Fascism, Communism, Zionism' in *YZ*, February 1936, p. 8.

¹⁴ With much embarrassment, Laski managed to gain a vote of confidence of 69 against 14 at the Board meeting by expressing regret for inadvertently failing to inform the objecting deputies before personally apprising some other deputies of the matter in private letters. See the report on that meeting of the Board and the related correspondence in *JC*, 8 and 15 May 1936. However, in the light of Laski's record, it seems likely that his conduct, far from being inadvertent, was a calculated part of his determined effort to ensure that the Board reject participation in the World Jewish Congress.

¹⁵ The resolution welcomed the Colonial Secretary's statement in the House of Commons that after law and order would have been restored in Palestine a Royal Commission would be appointed to investigate the grievances of Jews and Arabs. Sir Robert Waley Cohen argued that this was merely platitudinous and that a different line of argument should be used which would emphasize the coincidence of the interests of the British Empire with the interests of Jewry in Palestine and which would call for a Round Table Conference on Palestine. See the report on the Board of Deputies meeting in *JC*, 24 July 1936.

¹⁶ *ZR*, July-August 1936, p. 80.

¹⁷ See L. Bakstansky to N. Laski, 17 March 1937 and N. Laski's reply, 18 March 1937 (marked 'not sent') in BD E1/111.

¹⁸ See *ZR*, January 1938, pp. 11, 12; also BD Minute Book 29, p. 198, and *JC*, 21 January 1938.

¹⁹ Neville Laski, *Jewish Rights and Jewish Wrongs*, London, 1939, pp. 149-50.

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

²⁰ See YZ, July–August 1939, p. 25.

²¹ See ZR, 23 November 1939, p. 8.

²² See Gideon Shimoni, 'Selig Brodetsky and the Ascendancy of Zionism in Anglo-Jewry, 1939–1945'. *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 22, no. 2, December 1980, pp. 125–61.

²³ *Statement on Post-War Policy for Submission to the Colonial and Foreign Offices*, published by the Board of Deputies of British Jews, November 1944.

²⁴ BD, Minute Book 32, meeting of 5 November 1944.

²⁵ These attitudes are discussed in Gideon Shimoni, 'Selig Brodetsky . . .', op. cit., pp. 140–43.

²⁶ For example, in a statement he made as president to a meeting of the Council on 30 August 1943, Stein said: 'As to my own position, I should like to make it clear that my Zionist views and sympathies remain unchanged'; AJA, 37/6/3/2.

²⁷ Leonard Stein to Anthony de Rothschild, 11 August 1943, AJA, 36/6/1b/3. An observer from the American Jewish Committee reported in 1944: '[Stein] definitely regards himself as a Zionist, and is an enrolled member of the British Zionist Federation . . . In fact [his Zionism] is not far from the non-Zionist position of many of us. In point of truth he is a Zionist only in the very broadest sense of the term and not in the narrow racialistic-nationalistic connotation that has been given to it by the Zionist Organisation during the past forty-seven years': Lt. E. A. Norman to M. Waldman, 21 January 1944, YIVO, AJC, RG 347, EXO 29, Box 16.

²⁸ Leonard Stein to the Foreign Office, 29 October 1943, and Foreign Office reply, 6 November 1943: PRO, FO 371/36741.

²⁹ 'Memorandum from Harold Beeley', PRO, *ibid.*

³⁰ Beeley pointed out that in the final analysis the Anglo-Jewish Association's position on the future of Palestine was not far removed from that of the World Zionist Organization. On the Anglo-Jewish Association's memorandum contradicting that of the Board of Deputies in 1944, he commented: 'The Zionists are expressing more indignation than would seem to be called for . . . True there is no mention of a Jewish state but what else could flow from "expediting" immigration and creating conditions conducive to "self-government"'? PRO, FO 371/40138. See also Gideon Shimoni, 'Selig Brodetsky . . .'. op. cit., pp. 150–53.

³¹ 'Memorandum Dictated by Neville Laski', enclosed with a letter from David J. Schweizer (AJC representative in London) to M. Waldman, 22 November 1943, YIVO, AJC, RG 347, EXO 29, Box 17.

³² Laski told Cyrus Adler, a prominent member of the American Jewish Committee: 'I need hardly say that I have not taken this step without long and anxious consideration and deep distress of mind . . . Nevertheless, I have no option in the matter. The holding of the office of President has reacted very disastrously upon my professional position, with a consequent diminution in earnings which has serious consequences for my family and myself. People have assumed, and the rumour has been spread with increasing vigour, that I am not in practice and/or that I do not want to work and/or that I am so busy with Jewish business that I have no time for work, and the results have been obvious': N. Laski to C. Adler, 20 November 1939, YIVO, AJC, RG 347, EXO 29, Box 24.

GIDEON SHIMONI

³³ 'Memorandum Dictated by Neville Laski', YIVO, *ibid.* In the same vein, a few years earlier Laski had confided to Morris Waldman, the Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee: 'You will remember in the old days I warned you that if I went from the Presidency of the Board, there would then go their last active worker against the absorption of the Community by the Zionists of 77 Great Russell Street. I think I was right and in fact I am certain that the facts have proved me right': N. Laski to M. Waldman, 14 May 1941, YIVO, AJC, RG 347, EXO 29, Box 24. Waldman had commiserated with Laski over his retirement from the Board at the end of 1939. He thought that Laski's 'wealthy and important friends' in Anglo-Jewry should have taken measures that would have made it unnecessary for him to retire on account of personal financial difficulties: M. Waldman to N. Laski, 2 January 1940, YIVO, *ibid.*

³⁴ Lt. E. A. Norman to M. Waldman, 21 January 1944, YIVO, AJC, RG 347, EXO 29, Box 16. Louis Lipsky was a journalist, author, and prominent Zionist leader in the United States. During the Second World War he was a key strategist in the Zionists' successful endeavour to mobilize American Jewry in support of the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

³⁵ See correspondence from David J. Schweizer to Morris Waldman, late 1943, in YIVO, AJC, RG 347, Gen. 12, Box 15, and from Lt. E. A. Norman to Waldman, in EXO 29, Box 16. The monthly reports to Waldman are in YIVO, AJC, Series FAD 1, Box 16.

³⁶ See Leonard Stein's retrospective explanation: 'The Anglo-Jewish Association and Israel: Speech by Leonard Stein', 11 June 1950, AJA, 95/69.

³⁷ *Anglo-Jewish Association Memorandum on Palestine, London 1944*, AJA, 95/69.

³⁸ *Policy in Palestine: Memo Submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies*, 14 March 1945, BD C14/28. This memo was signed by 33 members of the A.J.A.

³⁹ See *Anglo-Jewish Association Memorandum for Submission to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry* (approved by the A.J.A. Council on 22 January 1946).

⁴⁰ *Anglo-Jewish Association Statement by the President on the Course of Events in Palestine*, 3 July 1946, AJA, 37/6/1b/5.

⁴¹ See *Board of Deputies of British Jews, 75th Annual Report, 1946-1947*, pp. 71, 72.

⁴² See Menahem Kaufman, *Non-Zionists in America and the Struggle for Jewish Statehood, 1939-1948* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1984, pp. 81-82; 150, 151.

⁴³ See 'Statement by Leonard Stein', made at a meeting of the Council of the A.J.A. on 12 September 1946; AJA, 37/6/1b/5.

⁴⁴ See 'Note for Palestine Conference Committee by Leonard Stein', 15 November 1946; AJA, 37/6/1b/1.

⁴⁵ See S. Temkin to A. Brotman, 24 April 1947: BD C11/1/7.

⁴⁶ The memo stated: 'It is proposed by the Anglo-Jewish Association that, while the principle of partition should be accepted it should be applied in a form not necessarily involving the dissolution of all links between the several areas'. See *Memorandum to the United Nations Special Committee*, 24 June 1947, AJA, 37/6/1b/11.

⁴⁷ These views are reflected in Joseph Leftwich's secretarial correspondence in CZA, A330/19.

⁴⁸ See Leonard Stein to Basil Henriques, 14 September 1943, CZA, *ibid.*

⁴⁹ See 'Memorandum Dictated by Neville Laski', *op. cit.* (Note 31 above). Laski declined to join the Council of the Jewish Fellowship.

NON-ZIONISTS IN ANGLO-JEWRY

⁵⁰ See Robert Henriques, *Intention (The Substance of an Address Given at the First Annual General Meeting of the Jewish Fellowship, October 14, 1945)*, p. 1. See also *The Jewish Fellowship, 'Aims'* (printed pamphlet, n.d.), in CZA, A330/19; and *The Jewish Fellowship Constitution As Adopted At General Meeting, 14 October 1945* in Mocatta Library, Pamphlets BA 28.

⁵¹ Letter from Albert Hyamson (no addressee), 28 December 1942, CZA, A330/19.

⁵² See J. Leftwich to J. H. Hertz, 14 February 1944, and Hertz's reply on 31 March 1944; also Hertz to Henriques, 3 May 1944, CZA, *ibid.* To the radical Zionist Ivan Greenberg, Leftwich wrote: 'If we take possession, the Fellowship will be what we want it to be'.

⁵³ J. H. Hertz to B. Henriques, 3 May 1944, CZA, *ibid.*

⁵⁴ See the report on the address by Rabbi Dr Israel Mattuck to the B'nai B'rith First Lodge of England in *JC*, 12 January 1945. The report concludes with the sentence: 'A discussion followed in which nearly all who took part spoke against the Fellowship'.

⁵⁵ See 'What the Jewish Fellowship Stands For' (mimeographed, n.d.), CZA, A330/19.

⁵⁶ See 'Minutes of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, 30 January 1946' (mimeographed) in AJA 95/69; and see also the Jewish Fellowship's *Memorandum on The Jewish Problem*, n.d. (circa January 1948), in the library of the *JC*.

⁵⁷ See *The Jewish Fellowship, Private and Confidential Memorandum* (n.d.), and an undated, mimeographed letter also marked 'private and confidential' inviting members of the Jewish Fellowship to a special general meeting called for 7 November 1948: Mocatta Library, Pamphlets BA 28.

⁵⁸ See Shimoni, 'From Anti-Zionism . . .', *op. cit.*

⁵⁹ A. de Rothschild to S. Brodetsky, 16 December 1940 and 12 February 1941: AJA, Brodetsky Papers.

⁶⁰ Montagu was, by his own admission, troubled by the effect of Zionism on his personal political situation. In his view, since Zionism claimed that he as a Jew belonged to a nation other than the English nation, it morally undermined his status as Secretary of State for India. See the minutes of the War Cabinet, 4 October 1917: PRO, Cab. 23/4. See also Leonard Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, New York, 1961, pp. 499, 500.

⁶¹ See Isaiah Friedman, *The Question of Palestine, 1914-1918*, London, 1973, p. 242, and his 'Dissensions over Jewish Identity in West European Jewry' in Jacob Katz, ed., *The Role of Religion in Modern Jewish History*, Cambridge, Mass. 1975, pp. 127-40.

⁶² See especially Colin Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society 1876-1939*, London, 1979.

⁶³ George Mikes, *How to be an Alien*, London, 1946, preface.

⁶⁴ In the ideological debate with Lucien Wolf preceding the Balfour Declaration, the Zionists defined their 'ethnological and cultural conception' thus: 'To say that the Jews are a group claiming common descent and linked together by a common history and traditions and by the Hebrew language and literature, that is for Zionists to say that the Jews are a nation': 'Memorandum on Lucien Wolf's letter to Mr. James de Rothschild of 31 August 1916'. 11 October 1916, BD E3/204.

⁶⁵ Moses Gaster, 'Judaism: A National Religion', in Harry Sacher, ed., *Zionism and the Jewish Future*, London, 1916, pp. 92-94.

⁶⁶ Leon Simon, 'Let's Talk it Over', *ZR*, 26 March 1943.

ANNOUNCING

SUNY series in Israeli Studies

Edited by Russell Stone
State University of New York, Buffalo

The SUNY Press series in Israeli studies will publish studies on social, political, economic, and related topics within Israel and in relation to its position in the Middle East and beyond. The series will focus on modern-day Israel and its problems, and will include research monographs and collections of essays or papers dealing with current conditions and analyses from a social science perspective. The work of Israeli scholars as well as researchers from elsewhere will appear, and the series will include works in English from the Center for the Study and Documentation of Israel Society of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

All manuscripts, book proposals, and inquiries should be addressed to:

William D. Eastman
State University of New York Press
State University Plaza
Albany, NY 12246-0001
U.S.A.

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN EARLY VICTORIAN LONDON, 1840–1860

Steven Singer

THE nineteenth century was an age of political emancipation and reform in Western Europe; and these revolutionary changes had an impact on Diaspora Jews. Many basic religious institutions and observances, which had been regarded as sacrosanct throughout the ages, lost their hold on the masses.¹ It is the purpose of this paper to examine the degree of religious observance in the officially Orthodox Jewish community of London in 1840–60. At that period, Orthodox Jews constituted the overwhelming majority of Anglo-Jewry.

The early Victorian community was divided into a number of distinct factions with different standards of religious observance, linked in great measure to the divergent attitudes current in London about the desirability of making modifications to the ritual of the Orthodox synagogue — a question which agitated London Jewry throughout that period and split it into progressive and traditionalist parties.² The progressives, who wholeheartedly sought such liturgical changes, constituted one distinct group and attracted a large body of ordinary London Jews who did not wish to take part in the battles about synagogue reforms but who still identified sufficiently with Judaism to maintain many of the institutions of their faith.³ The traditionalists, on the other hand, were a small but strictly Orthodox section of the community. A third and not insignificant segment of London Jewry consisted of highly assimilated individuals, both rich and poor, who had virtually no interest in Judaism or in any of its religious requirements and little if any connection with the identifiable religious community. In fact, they probably did not think of themselves as Jews in a religious sense at all⁴ and can therefore be excluded from a discussion of religious practice in the early Victorian period.

The great majority of the committed Jewish community had an attitude towards religious practice which was in effect identical to that of the progressives. They did not openly reject the binding power of the halakha in their personal lives. Indeed, at an ideological level they remained quite loyal to the Orthodox tradition, as practised through the centuries. There were, however, two approaches to their thinking

which marked definite departures from normative Orthodox Judaism. One was to demand strict adherence to halakhic standards in all communal expressions of Judaism while at the same time not requiring such conformity in their own private lives. Most members of the London community saw no contradiction in insisting that strict Orthodoxy be followed by official Jewish bodies and their salaried officials while they themselves openly ignored it in their personal behaviour.⁵ They also tended to neglect some aspects of Orthodox ritual while maintaining loyalty to others.

Some *mitsvot* (commandments) seem to have had a broad, popular following in London while others, just as basic, were widely ignored. This pattern also often occurred about the same observance, some of whose details were neglected while its other requirements were carefully obeyed. Such a departure from Orthodox observance was not a flagrant rejection of halakha but rather a complex process by which changes were gradually and sometimes imperceptibly made in the life-style of many members of Anglo-Jewry.

There was undoubtedly an element of opportunism behind this lack of religious conformity. The upper-class progressives who found it so important to be accepted in Gentile society were not eager to observe those parts of the halakha which stood in the way of achieving their goal. While they were not totally ready to forsake the faith of their fathers, they ignored many of the burdensome and difficult restrictions of Judaism which emphasized their distinctiveness from other Englishmen.

The secularization of British society at large⁶ had had an impact on London Jewry; but just as English Gentiles did not totally abandon Christianity so did Jews not renounce Judaism. They simply became less observant. Unlike the case in some other European countries, there was no consistory in England, no Jewish corporate body authorized by the state to exert some control in religious matters. Jews in England were therefore free to be as much or as little observant as they pleased. Social ostracism by fellow Jews, which was an effective weapon in other countries, was not powerful in London where society was so open that a Jew subjected to such pressure could easily go over to the Gentile world.⁷

This leisurely attitude led to the glaring inconsistencies which characterized the religious practices of the majority of Anglo-Jewry. However, the strong respect of London Jews for tradition, which had been partly absorbed from their English environment, and which had restrained them from accepting Reform Judaism, led them to resist any open, revolutionary change in public religious observance.

On the other hand, early Victorian London Jewry was dominated by a curious neo-Karaite view of its faith. Accordingly, many individuals were willing to accept all the Biblical laws as divine and binding while

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

rejecting the entire interpretive body of rabbinic tradition embodied in the Talmud. Unlike the German Jewish Reformers, they did not deny the authority of the sacramental requirements detailed in the Bible but only attacked those elements of the ceremonial law which had little or no sanction in the written law.⁸ Thus, some Orthodox rituals which were thought to have clear Biblical roots were considered to be far more binding than others which lacked such authority. Perhaps Anglo-Jewry was also influenced by Bible-based Victorian evangelism. Many precepts might not have been neglected in the first instance because of their rabbinical origin, but neo-Karaitism served as a useful excuse for ignoring those *mitsvot* which were considered to be particularly irksome or harmful to good Jewish-Gentile relations. Indeed, the *Voice of Jacob* stated in 1848 that it was 'highly important that every rite should be divested of all that can possibly . . . expose it to ridicule' but added that 'where there is the evident finger of our Almighty Creator, there we may not think of alteration'.⁹

The traditionalists were one small but important group in London at that time which remained completely faithful to the halakhic obligations of Orthodox Judaism. Their religious devotion matched that of most other Orthodox European communities. Many of them were recent immigrants from Poland and Russia and they were imbued with the strong religious commitment of their native lands. For example, they regularly kept as a fast day the eve of the new moon when even in the less Westernized Jewish communities on the Continent this observance was followed only by members of extremely pious or kabbalistic circles.¹⁰

Sabbath observance

It was usual for most London Jews to absent themselves on the Sabbath from their places of work or commercial pursuits. A periodical noted in 1842 that 'Saturday in the Hebrew quarter is a day of devotion and rest . . . every shop is shut, every vocation suspended',¹¹ while another described how strictly the Jews 'keep their Sabbath — at least so far as regards refraining from trade'.¹² The old clothes market in Houndsditch, which was dominated by Jews, was completely shut down on Saturdays,¹³ as were the large clothing stores of Moses & Son and Hyams situated in a number of areas of the metropolis.¹⁴ The absence of Jews from the street markets in Petticoat Lane and Rosemary Lane on Saturdays was very noticeable,¹⁵ while wholesale jewellery auctions were never held in London on the Sabbath or on Jewish holy days since many Jews were active in that trade.¹⁶ The Jewish upper classes also kept away from their places of business on those days, leading a contemporary to note that there was a slackness of

trade at the Stock Exchange then because of the absence of Jewish brokers.¹⁷ The *Jewish Chronicle* reported that leading communal figures, such as the Rothschilds and Isaac L. Goldsmid, 'do not ever transact business on a Sabbath or festival'.¹⁸

There was, however, a minority of London Jews who did not join in this general abstention from trade on Saturdays. Henry Mayhew observed that the contemporary swagshops, the majority of which were owned by Jews, had their busiest hours on Saturday afternoons,¹⁹ while David Marks of the Reform congregation castigated 'the many hundreds of our Jewish brethren' who violated the Sabbath by going to work on that day.²⁰ However, much of the business conducted by Jews on Saturdays seems to have been transacted in a discreet manner in order to maintain an outward semblance of Orthodoxy. A contemporary writer observed that 'Jews will not transact any matters of business themselves but many of their number . . . have no scruples as to the lawfulness of allowing others to do it for them. Hence, many of their shops in the metropolis are to be seen open on their Sabbath-day'.²¹ Mayhew similarly noted that while 'the strict Jew does not trade himself on the Sabbath he may not object to employ either one of his tribe, or a Gentile, to do so for him'.²² The *Jewish Chronicle* referred to this situation when it commented on how wrong it was to give synagogue honours on the Sabbath to men who publicly kept their shops open on that day,²³ since there were detailed rabbinic prohibitions against benefiting from business transactions conducted on one's behalf by someone else on the Sabbath.²⁴

Most London Jews claimed that since the Bible defined the Sabbath as a day of rest, they should not labour or engage in commerce on that day, but that there was nothing objectionable in spending the Sabbath in various leisure activities not permitted by Orthodox Judaism. They accordingly went on Saturdays to places of amusement — such as the theatre and music halls — or to concerts and exhibitions. That was utterly alien to the traditional Jewish concept of rest on that day. A number of contemporary observers reported that many Jews could regularly be found in various London theatres on Friday evenings,²⁵ while a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* described how 'parents can be seen leading their children to common saloons in Whitechapel on Friday nights, and permitting their daughters to go by train on Shabbos to Highbury Barn . . . and other places of amusement'.²⁶ Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler was reported to be shocked, shortly after his arrival in London, to learn of the large number of working-class Jews who frequented public houses on the Sabbath,²⁷ while Mayhew described how the poor members of the community regularly gambled away for hours on Saturdays.²⁸ The well-to-do Jews were also rebuked for their attendance during 'the Sabbath hours at a race, or public breakfast, or afternoon concert'.²⁹

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

There was a good example of how the community accepted the general concept of Sabbath rest and abided by many of the rules, while ignoring some others, during the Great Exhibition of 1851 in London. When the organizers of that event announced that all those entering the fair-grounds would be required to sign their names, a number of prominent Jews protested that this would unfairly prevent Jews from attending on Saturdays. The authorities eventually allowed Jews to enter on the Sabbath by merely producing their tickets. The Jews were thus freed from having to write on that day but they still had to carry their tickets — which was a violation of strict Sabbath law. Yet no one involved in the controversy seems to have publicly raised this point.³⁰ Obviously, some Sabbath observances were widely observed while others were just as commonly ignored.³¹

The traditionalist minority, on the other hand, observed the Sabbath in all its Orthodox strictness. One contemporary writer noted that while the majority of Jews ignored many stringent Sabbath prohibitions, such as playing music or walking for more than a mile in the open countryside, others carefully observed them.³² Another noted that there were some London Jews 'who carry out with a Puritan severity the minute forms and laws with which the Rabbinical teachers have invested the Sabbath'.³³ A traditionalist denounced in 1856 attendance at concerts and picture galleries on Saturdays, even when tickets had been obtained in advance, as a clear desecration of the spirit of the Sabbath.³⁴

Contemporary observers noted that the synagogues were noticeably empty throughout the year, both on weekdays and on Sabbaths,³⁵ while a Gentile author advised those wishing to observe Jewish services to visit the synagogues only on the festivals when there would be more than a minuscule attendance.³⁶ Lack of a quorum for weekday services was a problem common to all London congregations, with some openly resorting to paid *minyán* men and others to less obvious methods of maintaining regular services.³⁷ Indeed, the Sephardi branch synagogue, which was established in the West End in 1853, did not even attempt to provide for daily services and was opened only on Monday and Thursday mornings during the week.³⁸ London Jews, in conformity with their interest in maintaining the community's public loyalty to Orthodoxy despite their own private lack of observance, saw nothing incongruous in paying for a daily *minyán* when they themselves were not willing to attend. There seems to have been no demands by any of the members of the Orthodox community for the abolition of daily services.³⁹ Indeed, the wealthy officers of the various synagogues firmly insisted that the members of the Jewish clergy attend each and every one of the daily services.⁴⁰

The scant attendance at weekday synagogue services was due at least in part to the long working day of most London Jews. That, however,

was not the case on Saturdays when, as noted, the overwhelming majority of the community did not labour. Yet attendance on Sabbaths, while larger than on weekdays, was generally very limited. A contemporary writer observed that there was an even smaller proportion of Jews in the synagogues on Saturdays than there was of Anglicans in the churches on Sundays,⁴¹ while another commented that 'the great majority' of the community were regularly absent from Sabbath services,⁴² The *Jewish Chronicle* in 1852 described synagogue attendance on Saturdays as 'miserable and scanty'⁴³ while in 1849 it had claimed that there was 'sometimes hardly a score to be seen' in any of the various congregations.⁴⁴

The clearest picture of Sabbath synagogue attendance is derived from the government census of worship taken on Saturday, 29 March 1851, which found 520 worshippers at the Great, 260 at Bevis Marks, 170 at the New, 70 at the Hambro, and 80 at the Maiden Lane synagogues — a very small fraction of the memberships.⁴⁵ By no stretch of the imagination could truly Orthodox Jews regularly absent themselves from the synagogue on the Sabbath. Yet the great majority of London Jews did so and still defined themselves as Orthodox and continued to insist that the community uphold Orthodoxy in all its public activities.

The census figures also give an idea of the size of the traditionalist faction, as it was obviously that group which constituted the overwhelming majority of those attending services on the Sabbath. It must be noted, however, that there were certainly more strict traditionalists in London than was indicated by that census since there were many very small synagogues or houses of prayer (*hevrot*) which were not covered by the survey. Previous historians have tended to underestimate the number and importance of these congregations.⁴⁶ It is generally known, for example, that there were two *minyanim* in Southwark⁴⁷ at that time and three *hevrot* in the concentrated Jewish neighbourhoods in the City and the East End. The latter congregations — the Rosemary Lane, Cutler Street, and Gun Square *hevrot* — were all old institutions which had been in existence for more than half a century in London.⁴⁸

The Cutler Street and Gun Square *hevrot* were known as Polish synagogues and they, together with the Rosemary Lane *hevrah*, clearly catered primarily to the traditionalist immigrants who were coming to England in the middle of the nineteenth century.⁴⁹ But there were many other such groups active in the City and the East End at that time. There are references to at least four other *minyanim* and it is likely that a number of other conventicles met regularly without publicizing their presence,⁵⁰ since there was much opposition to the establishment of *hevrot* by the officers of the large City synagogues.⁵¹

In the context of Sabbath attendance, it must be noted that most of London's wealthy Jews had moved to the West End, where there was

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

no synagogue within easy walking distance until 1853, when the Sephardi branch congregation was opened in Wigmore Street.⁵² Moreover, poor Jews claimed that they were made to feel very uncomfortable in the larger synagogues because of their shabby appearance and consequently they had no desire to become regular worshippers there.⁵³ Contemporary sources confirm this state of affairs.⁵⁴ V. D. Lipman, commenting on the results of the 1851 census of worship, stated that the synagogue attendance figures were those 'of a community at least partially assimilated'.⁵⁵

Jewish festivals

Jewish festivals were observed generally more strictly than was the Sabbath. (A cynic might say that that was because they did not recur every week, as Saturdays did.) *Chamber's Journal of Popular Literature* reported in 1865 that many Jews took great liberties with the Sabbath laws but that the New Year was 'observed with greater strictness, or it would be more correct to say, more generally', while the Day of Atonement was kept 'with remarkable strictness'.⁵⁶ The huge synagogue attendance on those occasions reflects the emotional impact of these festivals on the general community. So many Jews wished to participate in high holy day prayers that all the London synagogues could not contain them and every year numerous overflow services had to be arranged.⁵⁷ The numbers at these latter gatherings were enormous: one such service held at the Jews' Free School drew 2,500 persons in 1841⁵⁸ and 3,000 in 1846,⁵⁹ in 1853,⁶⁰ and in 1855.⁶¹ In addition to the overflow services sponsored by the communal organizations, many private entrepreneurs opened temporary prayer rooms in rented quarters for these festivals and advertised them boldly in the Jewish press.⁶²

Contemporary observers noted that attendance on such occasions was much higher than it was on the Sabbath and that even those who neglected many *mitsvot* would be found among the worshippers on festival days.⁶³ This, however, did not mean that the majority of London Jewry observed all the rituals of the various holy days. A pattern of outward conformity and private neglect, coupled with a tendency to ignore some halakhic obligations while following others, was as true of the community's festival observances as it was of its Sabbath practices.

Every year with the approach of Passover, the Jewish newspapers were filled with advertisements for specially prepared foods for the festival.⁶⁴ A contemporary journal described in 1849 how the Jews of London could be seen thoroughly cleaning their houses and purifying their eating utensils⁶⁵ while the *Voice of Jacob* and the *Jewish Chronicle* reported on the vast amount of *matsot* baked in London.⁶⁶ Such a

pattern of observance, however, was not evident in the rituals connected with the Feast of the Tabernacles. Contemporary writers observed that the halakhic requirement that all meals during that period be eaten exclusively in a *sukkah* was widely ignored in London.⁶⁷ They ascribed this lack of observance to the cold and rainy English climate and to the difficulty of finding open spaces in London to build the booths.⁶⁸ However, cramped housing conditions and the cold and the rain did not stop pious Jews in other parts of northern Europe from building *sukkot* and adhering to all the obligations of that festival.⁶⁹ London Jews publicly supported the Sukkot ritual: many of those who did not take all their meals in a booth made a point of partaking of *kiddush* and of a token repast in a communal *sukkah* following services on the initial festival days.⁷⁰ In this manner they maintained some link with this colourful observance without inconveniencing themselves to any great degree.

The strict traditionalists, of course, followed all the attendant rituals. A contemporary article reported that while most Jews did not dwell, or eat their meals, in booths during that festival, there were some among them who were 'capable of braving cold or wet for five nights in succession, in order to fulfill the rules in all their strictness'.⁷¹ Private *sukkot* existed in small but noticeable numbers in London⁷² and advertisements for the booths and for decorations to be placed in them appeared in the Jewish press.⁷³ Although the majority of London Jews apparently did not buy the citrons and palm branches ritually required for this festival,⁷⁴ many traditionalists did acquire them.

Kashrut

All religiously committed Jews, including members of the Reform Movement, nominally supported observance of the dietary laws.⁷⁵ Allegiance to *kashrut* seems to have been more common in the community than was the observance of almost any other religious obligation. However, much of that conformity was in reality only superficial or, at best, highly selective: some forms of *kashrut* were adhered to while others were totally ignored. According to contemporary observers, the great majority of London's Jews avoided pork, bought meat from *kasher* butchers, and did not mix flesh and dairy products. Apparently, Jews would go hungry rather than eat non-*kasher* meat and Jewish pedlars travelling in the English countryside never touched Christian meat.⁷⁶ It was also commonly believed that the average London Jew would never use the same implements for both meat and dairy meals, no matter how irreligious he might otherwise be.⁷⁷

These reports, however, do not reflect the total picture. London Jewry's observance of *kashrut* was quite similar to its observance of other *mitzvot*. Most members of the community made an attempt to

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

follow the broad outlines of the dietary laws but they were willing to ignore, or compromise with, some of the requirements when they thought it expedient to do so. There is clear evidence that while the metropolitan Jewish population was increasing, the number of kasher-slaughtered animals was decreasing, prompting the Board for Shechita to complain of 'the laxity of observance in our Nation in respect to Casher meat'.⁷⁸

A good deal of the community's kashrut observance was in the public sphere and directed towards the outside world, for the benefit of Gentile observers.⁷⁹ All Jewish public functions were kasher⁸⁰ and at the annual fund-raising dinners for the London Hospital, the large numbers of Jews were always provided with a kasher table.⁸¹ At the banquet held by friends of David Salomons in 1844 to celebrate his election as alderman of the City of London, when there were certainly few (if any) Jewish traditionalists present, there was a kasher caterer for the Jewish guests.⁸²

But even public observance of kashrut was not strictly in accordance with all the requirements of the halakha. When David Salomons was elected Lord Mayor in 1855, he gave orders that the Mansion House be supplied with meat from a kasher butcher. But the fact that that meat was apparently to be cooked in non-kasher pots and pans and eaten on non-kasher crockery with non-kasher cutlery seems to have been totally overlooked — even by the *Jewish Chronicle* which greatly applauded the new Lord Mayor's instructions.⁸³ A contemporary work noted that a Jew invited to a Christian home could not be expected to eat the meat but had to 'content himself with fish, puddings, pies, cheese, bread, or other articles'.⁸⁴

London Jews constantly asked for kasher meat that was unsalted and unporged; they were not concerned about consuming such ritually prohibited substances as blood and some forms of fat.⁸⁵ There were also many who were similarly unconcerned about the clear rabbinic ruling that calves bled at the throat before slaughter were rendered non-kasher; and they insisted that this procedure be followed by the kasher butchers so that the veal would be appropriately light pink in colour.⁸⁶

Such infringements of kashrut did not constitute a reasoned attack on the dietary laws; it was simply that the secularized community was unwilling to inconvenience itself to any great extent in order to conform to all the religious rulings. Most London Jews apparently had an emotional need to adhere at least nominally to kashrut, which constituted such a large part of their religious heritage, and they were content with the acceptance of only the general outline of the dietary laws. This attitude was in sharp contrast to that of the traditionalists who were meticulous observers of all the requirements of kashrut and who also insisted on regular supplies of kasher cheese. It was produced for them in England⁸⁷ and they were greatly concerned about the

kashrut of bread and of butter since it was stated that these items on sale in some shops contained lard.⁸⁸ The traditionalists also were careful about what they drank outside their homes for it must have been to them that a coffee house in Duke's Place addressed its advertisements in the *Jewish Chronicle*, stating that kosher wine was available for its patrons throughout the entire year.⁸⁹

Other observances

Most London Jews were apparently not consistent in their observance of the Orthodox requirements for burial and mourning. Contemporary sources reported that such basic ceremonies as *shivah* were observed by the bereaved as a matter of course;⁹⁰ and the Chief Rabbi had large numbers of ritual questions about the matter put to him, indicating that the members of the community were concerned about specific obligations.⁹¹ However, they did not all willingly follow the ritual procedures; there were recurrent requests to modify the ruling that the mourners who were close kin of the deceased must remain at home for the entire *shivah* period⁹² and to discontinue the reciting of prayers three times a day at the house of mourning.⁹³ The laws ordering that a body be buried within twenty-four hours of death and prohibiting shaving by the bereaved were rarely followed. Indeed, neglect of early burial was so widespread that a Christian writer was led to report that the 'burial of a Jew must not take place sooner than twenty-four hours after his death, but almost all Jews are interred within forty-eight hours of their death'.⁹⁴ Some of this lack of observance may have been due to a neo-Karaite unwillingness to accept restrictions which were all of rabbinic origin; but basically it was the behaviour pattern of a community which had not openly rejected Orthodoxy but merely subordinated it to other concerns regarded as more important.

When we come to the halakhic requirement of ritual monthly immersion by married women, we find yet another example of the tendency of London Jews to support publicly the observance of *mitsvo*t while neglecting them at a personal and private level. The major metropolitan synagogues, including such progressively oriented ones as the New, consistently approved appropriations for the support of the local *mikvaot* (ritual pools) throughout 1840–60,⁹⁵ even though their use seems to have been widely neglected by Jewish women. It is very difficult, especially in view of Victorian reserve in such intimate matters, to be precise but scattered indications reveal that the ritual pools were rarely frequented in London. In 1846, Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler received a letter concerning the 'non-observance of *tevila* [ritual immersion] among the poor women';⁹⁶ and in 1853 Adler wrote to Moses Rintel, who had been sent from London to minister to the Jews

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

of Melbourne, complaining that a *mikvah* had not yet been built in Melbourne and pointedly commenting: 'as you are married, you must necessarily feel the need of it acutely'.⁹⁷ Apparently, even a Jewish clergyman bred in London could be quite unconcerned about this basic observance of Orthodox Judaism. It is also hard to believe that the majority of London Jews who neglected so many other traditional practices would have remained loyal to the obligations of ritual immersion, which they would have probably considered to be an antiquated medieval relic. The traditionalists, on the other hand, seem to have faithfully followed the practice and they patronized the many London *mikvaot* which were advertised in the Jewish press.⁹⁸

The Orthodox prohibition about shaving on the intermediate days of festivals, while not as important as the requirement for ritual immersion, also provides a good example of the community's attitude to religious observance. Here again, the overwhelming majority of London Jews, who did not personally follow this precept, gave it their official loyalty and demanded that their religious representatives obey it in its full rigour.⁹⁹ This was true even of the most progressive circles. For example, on the last day of Passover 1846, when the Western Synagogue's Torah reader appeared to perform his task with a cleanly shaven face, he was forcibly ejected from the reading desk by the congregation's officers for this infraction.¹⁰⁰ There was some agitation at the time for the repeal of the shaving prohibition,¹⁰¹ but it seems that London Jews saw no contradiction in demanding that strict Orthodoxy be followed by their communal bodies and functionaries while openly flouting it themselves.¹⁰² Again, it must be noted here that at least some of the small group of traditionalists remained faithful to that requirement, as they did to the other dictates of halakhic Orthodoxy.¹⁰³

Conclusion

There was no wholesale abandonment of traditional religious practice by London Jews in the early Victorian period. They remained nominally Orthodox and insisted on faithful adherence to halakhic ritual in their synagogues, but the majority exhibited in their private lives an unorganized neglect of some requirements of the old Orthodox life-style combined with a strong loyalty to other tenets.

In such emotionally highly-charged matters as religious belief and practice, one should not expect always to find logic or consistency of behaviour. The pattern exhibited by the majority of London Jews in the first decades of the Victorian period might well have been very similar to that which obtained in some other Western metropolitan Jewish communities at that time — as further research may show.

STEVEN SINGER

NOTES

ABBREVIATIONS

ASPS	Archives of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue
AUS	Archives of the United Synagogue
HO	<i>Hebrew Observer</i>
JC	<i>Jewish Chronicle</i>
ROCR	Records of the Office of the Chief Rabbi
TJHSE	Transactions of the <i>Jewish Historical Society of England</i>
VJ	<i>Voice of Jacob</i>

¹ See Howard Morley Sachar, *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, New York, 1958, pp. 158–59, for a general description of the falling away from religious observance during this period. See also Steven Lowenstein, 'The Pacc of the Modernization of German Jewry', *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, vol. 21, 1976, pp. 41–54.

² There is a full description of the struggle between the progressives and the traditionalists about synagogue practices in Steven Singer, *Orthodox Judaism in Early Victorian London* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1981), pp. 48–93 and pp. 128–67.

³ Although religion played some role in the lives of these Jews, it was not a factor of sufficient importance to involve them actively in the religious battles of the period. Two contemporary works referred to this group in the community. One noted the existence of a large element among the Jews who 'retain of Judaism little or nothing but the name of Jew . . . mingle with the world and adopt any profession without religious scruple' but yet, 'join occasionally in the solemnities of their faith' in *A Few Words to the Jews*, London, 1853, p. 16. (The book was published anonymously and was later revealed to be the work of Charlotte Montefiore). The other noted that within the community 'the mass are only moderately religious. They love the dependence which yokes them to God, and revere the traditions', but they find 'much which' they 'cannot respect' in Orthodox Judaism: Moses Angel, *The Law of Sinai*, London, 1858, p. 308.

⁴ It was this group that John Mills referred to in his contemporary survey of the community and its religious life, when he stated that there were numerous Jews 'to whom . . . many of the facts recorded in the following pages are as strange as to the Christian reader': John Mills, *The British Jews*, London, 1853, p. vi. For a discussion of the various types of Jews who fit into this group and an estimate of its size, see Vivian David Lipman, 'A Survey of Anglo-Jewry in 1851', *TJHSE*, vol. 17, 1953, p. 178.

⁵ This situation was reflected by the *VJ* of 10 October 1845 which noted that in England 'everything bears upon its surface a strictly Jewish colour . . ., and no cost is spared to maintain this appearance', but yet 'how different is the scene, the moment you shift it from public to private life! How very few religious rites are there observed!'

⁶ A work which gives a good description of this trend and its causes in the Gentile world is Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1975.

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

⁷ The causes of London Jewry's lack of religious conformity and the community's resulting pattern of religious observance were already visible by the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. See Todd M. Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*, Philadelphia, 1979, pp. 138-49.

⁸ Good examples of this way of thinking can be found in works of the period. For example, Grace Aguilar, a popular contemporary Anglo-Jewish writer, continually attacked Orthodoxy and argued for a return to 'scriptural Judaism': Grace Aguilar, *The Women of Israel*, 2 vols, New York, 1854, vol. 2, p. 262. Another well-known author stated that he wanted to 'preserve only principles and scriptural ceremonies . . . because they alone are eternal': Angel, op. cit., p. 311. The existence of such a unique neo-Karaite ideology in London is noted in passing by Jakob J. Petuchowski, *Prayerbook Reform in Europe*, New York, 1968, p. 66 and by Robert Liberles, 'The Origins of the Jewish Reform Movement in England', *Association for Jewish Studies Review*, vol. 1, 1976, pp. 135-37. There is a full discussion of this ideology and all its ramifications and causes in Singer, op. cit., pp. 48-93.

⁹ *VJ*, 23 June 1848.

¹⁰ The *Voice of Jacob* of 11 November 1842 observed in its report of Chief Rabbi Solomon Hirschell's funeral that since the day was the eve of the new moon 'it was kept as a fast by a larger number of persons than are accustomed to the observance'. The background of this ritual is described in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s.v. 'Yom Kippur Katan'.

¹¹ See 'The World of London — Foreigners in London', *Blackwood's Magazine*, January 1842, p. 31.

¹² See 'Jews in England', *Once A Week*, 7 August 1862. David Bartlett, in *What I Saw in London*, New York, 1862, p. 186, similarly noted that in one part of the City, 'although it was Saturday, the streets were silent, solemn, and still. They were "Jew-streets", and they keep their Sabbath with the greatest show of decorum'.

¹³ According to *Lights and Shadows of London Life*, 2 vols, London, 1842, vol. 1, p. 125, this market was closed because 'the Jews, by whom it is chiefly frequented, hold their Sabbath that day'. (This work was published anonymously and I have not succeeded in tracing its author.) Henry Mayhew made a similar comment in *London Labour and the London Poor*, 4 vols, London, 1861-62, vol. 2, p. 27.

¹⁴ See John Weale, *Pictorial Handbook of London*, London, 1851, pp. 533-34.

¹⁵ Mayhew, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 45-46, stated that trade went on every day in Petticoat Lane 'the Jewish Sabbath excepted, when there is no market at all', while at Rosemary Lane, 'the greater part of the shops are then closed' as 'the Jews do not participate in the commerce until after sunset'.

¹⁶ The *JC* of 23 February 1855 stated that 'most of the auctioneers possessed the Jewish almanacs, in order that the sales might not be announced for such periods'.

¹⁷ See Weale, op. cit., p. 533.

¹⁸ *JC*, 23 March 1849.

¹⁹ Mayhew, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 333. The swagshops bought articles cheaply from craftsmen in order to sell them to the public at inflated prices.

²⁰ David W. Marks, *Sermons*, 3 vols, London, 1851-85, vol. 1, p. 184.

²¹ *Lights and Shadows* . . . , op. cit., vol. 2, p. 269.

²² Mayhew, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 121.

²³ See *JC*, 30 April 1847 and 23 September 1853.

²⁴ It should be noted that some Jews in London personally engaged in trade on the Sabbath. Mayhew (op. cit., vol. 1, p. 5) noted, for example, that 'a large number of Jews' came regularly to buy at the wholesale strawberry market held on Saturday mornings. Most of them were, however, probably alienated from the religious community and belonged to that segment of London Jewry which had almost no contact with Judaism as a religious way of life.

²⁵ According to the *JC* of 5 April 1850, a visitor to 'the City, Standard or Pavilion theatres on Friday evenings . . . will find there numbers of Jews composing the greater part of the audience', while Moses Margoliouth in *The History of the Jews in Great Britain* (3 vols, London, 1851, vol. 3, p. 159) noted that 'on a Friday night the Standard Theatre is above half-filled with old-clothesmen'. The *JC* of 28 December 1849 had reported that London Jews 'flock in numbers, to kill the long dreary Friday evenings of the winter, to the City and Standard theatres, to the ill-reputed saloons of Whitechapel and Mile End, to the low public-houses and coffee rooms'.

²⁶ *JC*, 10 July 1857.

²⁷ *JC*, 19 March 1847.

²⁸ Mayhew, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 120.

²⁹ Grace Aguilar, *The Spirit of Judaism*, Philadelphia, 1842, p. 129.

³⁰ See the *JC* of 25 April and 9 May 1851. There is no reference to any involvement in this matter by the Chief Rabbi or any other member of the clergy. It seems to have been a layman's compromise.

³¹ Writing, although not expressly prohibited in the Bible, seems to have been regarded, at least by the upper-class Jews involved in this issue, as a serious violation of the Sabbath. Anthony Rothschild's daughter Constance recalled, for example, that in her parents' home 'we kept the Sabbath day in practice, as well as in spirit . . . we never wrote nor did any lessons on Saturday, nor did we drive or ride': Constance Battersea, *Reminiscences*, London, 1923, p. 21.

³² Mills, op. cit., p. 145.

³³ Montefiore, op. cit., p. 98.

³⁴ Miriam Mendes Belisario, in *Sabbath Evenings at Home*, London, 1856, p. 208, noted that there were many 'who do not disapprove of the practice, but I must own that I cannot think it consonant with the spirit of the Sabbath'.

³⁵ According to the *JC* of 9 July 1852, these services were 'generally and shamefully neglected'. A pamphlet of the time similarly noted the problem of 'the Synagogue being so scantily filled throughout the year': *Ahavat Emet — A Few Words Addressed to the Committee for the Election of a Chief Rabbi of England by a Friend of Truth*, London, 1844, p. 9.

³⁶ *Lights and Shadows*, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 284.

³⁷ According to Albert M. Hyamson, *The Sephardim of England*, 1951, p. 316, the Bevis Marks congregation had a paid daily *minyán* during the years 1840 to 1860. The New Synagogue had already adopted this method of maintaining daily services by the end of the eighteenth century, while the Hambro operated under a system devised in 1829 whereby poor Jews who received charity from the congregation were required to attend the daily *minyán* on a rotation basis:

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

Endelman, *op. cit.*, pp. 133–34. The Great Synagogue does not seem to have had any officially approved plan to secure a daily quorum, but it is significant that complaints were made during these years about 'the irregular manner in which the service . . . is performed on the weekly days' and steps were demanded to 'ensure the due attendance' on those occasions: Great Synagogue Minutes of Vestry Meetings, 1825–51, entry for 8 May 1844, AUS. Nathan Adler himself suggested to the Maiden Lane Congregation in 1851 that *minyan* men be secured to attend its weekday services, while calling on the officers of the Great Synagogue in 1855 'to make such arrangements as to ensure the attendance minyan . . . every day of the week' at the West End branch synagogue: Nathan Adler to the Officers of the Maiden Lane Synagogue, London, 5 September 1851, Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi, vol. 2, ROCR and Nathan Adler to the Officers of the Great Synagogue, London, circa February 1855, Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi, vol. 3, ROCR.

³⁸ But even on those days it was not always possible to secure a *minyan*. Joseph Piperno, *hazzan* (cantor) of that synagogue, when called before the Mahamad in 1857 to explain why 'the Synagogue was not regularly opened for prayers on Mondays and Thursdays . . . pleaded the absence of Minyan as a reason', but was told that the building must be opened on those days, even if there was not a quorum: Minutes of the Mahamad, 1857–74, entry for 18 June 1857, ASPSP.

³⁹ It is noteworthy in this connection that the London Reform Congregation had, from its very beginning, declared its opposition to daily services: Marks, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 36.

⁴⁰ For example, the cantor de Sola was severely reprimanded by the Mahamad in 1845 for not attending daily services regularly, while David Meldola was similarly rebuked a year later: Minutes of the Mahamad, 1844–57, entries for 31 July 1845 and 23 June 1846, ASPSP.

⁴¹ See Mayhew, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 126. The Church of England at that time attracted extremely small congregations on a regular basis. For example, there were at mid-century only 140,000 church seats in London for an Anglican population of 1,380,000 Londoners: Edward R. Norman, *Church and Society in England 1770–1970*, Oxford, 1976, pp. 124–25.

⁴² Mills, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

⁴³ *JC*, 9 April 1852.

⁴⁴ *JC*, 9 November 1849. The situation was so bad that the Sephardi congregation threatened to withhold charity from the poor who did not attend services regularly on the Sabbath: Minutes of the Mahamad, 1833–44, entry for 13 September 1842, ASPSP.

⁴⁵ The census results are listed in Vivian David Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England 1850–1950*, 1954, p. 185. There was apparently no report from the Western Synagogue, while the Reform congregation had 140 worshippers. According to Lipman, there were at that time about 2,800 individuals connected with the Great, 3,000 with Bevis Marks, 2,000 with the New, 1,000 with the Hambro, 1,000 with the Western, and 500 with the Maiden Lane synagogues.

⁴⁶ For example, Lipman, *ibid.*, pp. 71–75, claims that there were relatively few actively functioning *hevrot* in London before 1870. Lloyd P. Gartner, in *The Jewish Immigrant in England 1870–1914*, London, 1960, p. 199, mentions some of these *hevrot*, but gives an incomplete list.

⁴⁷ One of the Southwark congregations originated as a private *minyán* founded by Nathan Henry in 1799. In 1823 some members seceded and formed the Borough New Minyan, which absorbed the remnants of Henry's group in 1853. The number of individuals involved in these two groups was tiny. Henry's synagogue did not even have seats for one hundred worshippers and was eventually forced to close when it proved impossible to obtain a quorum on Sabbaths. See Moses Rosenbaum, *The History of the Borough Synagogue*, London, 1917, pp. 5–8.

⁴⁸ For a description of these *hevrot* see Cecil Roth, 'The London Synagogues of the Eighteenth Century', *TJHSE*, Miscellanies, 3, 1937, pp. 4–6, and Lipman, *Social History . . .*, op. cit., p. 71.

⁴⁹ These groups were characterized by an attitude towards Judaism more typical of eastern Europe than of London or of most other Westernized areas of the Continent. Roth, for example, points out (*ibid.*) that the Cutler Street *hevrah* was commonly known as 'the Chevra Shass'. Similarly, the *JC* of 1 May 1846 described how Moses Katzenellenbogen, a visiting rabbi from Russia, had delivered a lecture to the Gun Square congregation and two talmudical discourses at the Cutler Street synagogue during the Passover. It concluded by reporting that 'the audience, which consisted chiefly of Poles, appeared to enjoy the Rev. Lecturer's discourses which were quite in the ancient style of former Maggidim'.

⁵⁰ Morris Joseph, 'The Synagogue Fifty Years Ago', in the *JC* of 13 November 1891, refers to 'the Polish shools in Gun Square, Cock and Hoop Yard and Cutler Street and the English Chevrans in Rosemary Lane and Garden Court, Petticoat Lane', as all existing by 1850. Mills, op. cit., p. 260, mentions a Carter Street *hevrah* in his list of minor synagogues of London, in addition to those already known. Lipman, in 'A Survey of Anglo-Jewry in 1851' (op. cit., p. 276) notes that the census returns of 1851 include a citation for the synagogue attached to Joel Emanuel's almshouse in Wellclose Square, characterizing Sabbath attendance there as 'the same as usual, say about forty'. In addition, regular services were conducted in the London Beth Hamedrash. As immigration increased after 1850, three more *hevrot* are known to have been founded: the Sandys Row in 1853, the German Synagogue in 1858, and the Fashion Street in 1858. Cecil Roth in *The Federation of Synagogues 1912–1937* (London, 1937, p. 38) lists these synagogues and their founding dates without any elaboration. I became aware of another *hevrah* from a pamphlet, *Rules of the German Synagogue, Chevra Vicor Chaulim*, London, 1880, the title-page of which bears the statement 'gegrundet 1861'. While this may have been the prayer house listed by Roth as having been founded in 1858, it is also possible that it was another *hevrah* started by German immigrants in 1861.

⁵¹ Mills, op. cit., p. 129, describes how anyone attending a private *minyán* or allowing his premises to be used by one was liable to be fined by the synagogal authorities. This was also the case in contemporary Paris where despite the strict prohibition by the communal authorities, many private *minyanim* were quietly held in the homes of Orthodox immigrants to the city: see Phyllis Cohen Albert, *The Modernization of French Jewry*, Hanover, N.H., 1977, pp. 200–10.

⁵² A letter to the *JC* of 24 March 1848 commented that 'a great number of the Jewish community . . . have removed westward: consequently the Synagogues

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

are very thinly attended'. But even after the two West End branch synagogues were opened, there were not many worshippers since the individual Jewish families were scattered over the area with few living within easy walking distance of the new congregations. Nathan Adler, indeed, stated that this was his reason for allowing the split service in the West End branch: Nathan Adler to the Honorary Officers of the Great Synagogue, London, circa February 1855, Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi, vol. 3, ROCR.

⁵³ A correspondent to the *JC* of 4 January 1850 stated that the poor did not attend services because 'our poverty is thrown in our face at the Synagogue . . . we are heaped together in a cluster at the bottom of the Synagogue in a corner, whilst at the top the benches are empty'.

⁵⁴ The *JC* of 9 November 1849 referred to the poor synagogue attendance by the wealthy, noting that 'the official benches are either entirely deserted, or one of the officers sits in a solitary corner' and commented on 11 September 1855 on 'the habitual absence of the higher classes from worship'. Mayhew (op. cit., vol. 2, p. 126) reported on how almost none of the poor Jews in London attended Sabbath services. It is significant in this connection that the traditionalists were basically a middle-class group. It should be noted, however, that these statements refer to the larger synagogues and not to the *hevrot*. Many of the immigrant Jews who frequented these *hevrot* were regular synagogue worshippers despite their poverty.

⁵⁵ See Lipman, *Social History* . . ., op. cit., p. 36.

⁵⁶ See 'The Jewish Community in England' in *Chamber's Journal of Popular Literature*, 26 August 1865, p. 534.

⁵⁷ Mills (op. cit., p. 174) noted that on these holy days 'every Jew who has the least feeling of Judaism, attends the Synagogue' and since 'the synagogues are too small to contain the worshippers' extra services had to be held.

⁵⁸ *VJ*, 15 October 1841.

⁵⁹ *JC*, 16 October 1846.

⁶⁰ *HO*, 21 October 1853.

⁶¹ *JC*, 23 September 1855.

⁶² For example, the *JC* of 23 August 1850 contains an advertisement by a 'Mr. Ritterman (late Chief Reader in Posen)' for such a service, while the issue of 2 September 1853 has a similar advertisement by 'Mr. M. Spertner of Vienna, pupil of the Eminent Professor Sulzer, reader of the Synagogue at Vienna'.

⁶³ Angel, op. cit., p. 264, stated that 'on the Sabbath, only the pious and the observer of ceremonies unite: but on the festival, even the rationalist and scoffer . . . enter the sacred precincts'; and in another passage he noted that 'while the Sabbath . . . claims but a small proportion of worshippers, crowds assemble to celebrate the Passover' (p. 363). Constance Battersea, Anthony Rothschild's daughter, similarly recalled that while the women of her family never went to Sabbath services, 'on most of the Jewish holy days we were to be found in our seats in the gallery of the Orthodox Synagogue': Battersea, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

⁶⁴ For example, see *VJ*, 18 March 1842 and 15 March 1844 and *JC*, 6 March 1846, 2 April 1848, 8 March 1850, and 28 March 1856.

⁶⁵ See 'The Jewish Passover and its Sanitary Tendencies', *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal*, 5 May 1849, pp. 285-87.

⁶⁶ In 1842, 650 sacks (each containing 280 pounds of flour) were used to bake matsot in London: *VJ*, 23 December 1842. In 1857, the Great Synagogue alone baked 200,000 pounds of matsot for Passover: *JC*, 24 April 1857.

⁶⁷ Mills, in *The British Jews*, op. cit., p. 175, commented that 'these rules are never strictly observed', while Belisario (op. cit., p. 310) stated that 'there are but few who dwell in a Tabernacle even in the day time'. The latter author first urged full observance of this precept but, in an apparent concession to the community's lack of interest, concluded by calling for at least one meal a day to be eaten in a *sukkah*.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* See also 'The Jewish Community in England' in *Chamber's Journal* . . ., op. cit., p. 534, which observed: 'In as much as in towns it is not often that a family can erect a shed in the open air . . . this portion of the ceremony is usually omitted'.

⁶⁹ One drawing of the eighteenth-century Jewish quarter of Amsterdam shows a profusion of *sukkot* along the crowded streets in that city while another contrasts the opulent *sukkah* of a rich family in Amsterdam with the simpler structure of a poorer one. They are reproduced in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s.v. 'Sukkah'.

⁷⁰ The *JC* of 16 October 1857 described how *kiddush* was made over wine at the Bevis Marks synagogue *sukkah* and some bread and olives were then distributed to those present. *Lights and Shadows* . . ., op. cit., vol. 2, p. 297, similarly reported that following services on *Sukkot*, 'a feast of sweets and fruits' was eaten in the tabernacle of an unidentified synagogue.

⁷¹ 'The Jewish Community in England' in *Chamber's Journal of Popular Literature*, op. cit., p. 534.

⁷² According to *Lights and Shadows* . . ., op. cit., vol. 2, p. 298, 'many of the Jews erect tabernacles of their own, either on the tops of their houses or in some adjoining yard'. The *JC* of 16 October 1857 similarly observed that 'a more than usual proportion' of *sukkot* had been built in the City neighbourhoods during the past festival.

⁷³ For example, the *JC* of 18 September 1857 advertised 'a convenient large *sukkah*', while the *JC* of 26 September 1851 had offered for sale a chart of prayers in gold and silver letters to be hung in a *sukkah*.

⁷⁴ According to *Chamber's Journal of Popular Literature*, op. cit., p. 534, in the synagogue the *hazzan* 'followed by certain members of the congregation', waved these articles during prayer, rather than every congregant as required by strict Jewish law. Belisario (op. cit., p. 316) similarly stated that these objects were carried in a procession during services by 'the ministers, rabbis, and wardens', without mentioning the worshippers. Examples of the advertisements for *etrogim* and *lulabim* can be found in *JC*, 18 September 1846, 6 September 1850, and 24 September 1852.

⁷⁵ Immediately upon its formation in 1840, the Reform congregation established its own poultry butcher, for whom the synagogue's sexton served as *shohet*: Albert M. Hyamson, *The London Board for Shechita 1804-1954*, London, 1954, p. 24. This does not necessarily mean that the Reformers strictly observed the rules of *kashrut*, but it is quite significant in view of the open opposition by much of the contemporary German Reform movement to these laws. See *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s.v. 'Dietary Laws'.

⁷⁶ See *Lights and Shadows* . . ., op. cit., vol. 2, p. 259, and Mayhew, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 122-23. Mayhew was told by a Jewish street urchin that though he

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

never went to synagogue, he had never eaten pork. 'I don't know why it shouldn't be eaten', the boy said, 'only that it's wrong to eat it'.

⁷⁷ See Mayhew, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 120 and Margoliouth, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, pp. 160–61. Margoliouth stated that this was true 'whether the party is a strict Jew or "Meshumet" [convert to Christianity]'.

⁷⁸ For the half year 1841–42, the profits of the Board for Shechita were down by one quarter of the total of some years past. See Hyamson, *The London Board . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁷⁹ An anonymous letter to the *JC* of 25 June 1858 stated that 'hundreds . . . no longer hesitate enjoying prohibited food' while a correspondent to the *HO* of 7 April 1854 had noted that the Jewish housewives of Marylebone and Paddington 'cannot spare time to go four miles to a butcher' in the City and therefore bought non-kasher meat.

⁸⁰ For example, *The Times* of 7 and 24 May 1848 reported this fact about the dinners of the Jews' Orphan Asylum and the Jews' Hospital respectively.

⁸¹ See *VJ*, 15 April 1842.

⁸² See *JC*, 1 November 1844.

⁸³ *JC*, 16 November 1855.

⁸⁴ See *Lights and Shadows . . .*, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 263. The anonymous author of this work concluded that Jews could not be invited comfortably for dinner, but 'you may ask them, without any inconvenience either to yourself or them, to breakfast or tea'.

⁸⁵ Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler was involved throughout his career in efforts to stop the kasher butchers from selling unsalted and unpurged meat to Jewish customers who vociferously demanded such cuts: see Steven Singer, *Chief Rabbi Nathan M. Adler: Major Problems in His Career* (M.A. Dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1974), pp. 82–86. Bernard Homa, in *A Fortress in Anglo-Jewry*, London, 1953, pp. 29–52, describes how this issue, which had its roots in the early Victorian period, continued to agitate London Jewry into the twentieth century.

⁸⁶ Adler observed that on his arrival in London he had found 'this evil custom established in this country', and although he personally avoided eating such veal, he was unable to prohibit the bleeding 'because the butchers all agree that they could not sell the meat without this practice': Nathan M. Adler, *Papers and Letters*, circa Spring 1856, *Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi*, vol. 4, ROCR.

⁸⁷ Nathan Adler regularly appointed *shomerim* to oversee the manufacture of cheese made from rabbinically supervised milk. Indeed, in one letter he strongly protested about the fact that such a *shomer* had 'left London without having seen me to give him instructions for the kosher cheese': Nathan M. Adler, *Papers and Letters*, circa Spring 1856, *Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi*, vol. 4, ROCR. It is unclear whether this cheese was made with kasher rennet or without any rennet at all.

⁸⁸ There were a number of letters in the *VJ* of 2 February and 22 March 1844 dealing with the question of lard in butter. Mills, *op. cit.*, p. 51, noted that many London Jews bought bread from bakeries having 'Jewish watchers . . . appointed to overlook the baking'. Since a good portion of London Jewry bought unsupervised bread — as indicated by a letter in the *JC* of 23 September 1853, calling on the community to avoid certain breads baked with lard — Mills was here clearly referring to the traditionalists.

⁸⁹ See *JC*, 4 May 1849 and 28 May 1852.

⁹⁰ For example, see *Chamber's Journal of Popular Literature*, op. cit., p. 533 and *Once A Week*, 9 August 1852. The *VJ* of 2 June 1848 similarly stated that it was well known that 'the poor man is for one whole week prevented from attending to his business . . . moreover, he must purchase *minyán*'.

⁹¹ Close to half of the halakhic queries answered in Adler's letterbooks in 1840–60 dealt with death and mourning.

⁹² *VJ*, 2 June 1848.

⁹³ The *JC* of 15 December 1848 urged that this be done. Both the progressively oriented New and Western Synagogues requested permission to end such services but were refused by the Chief Rabbi: New Synagogue, Minutes of the Committee Meetings, 1831–50, entry for 20 December 1848, AUS; and Nathan M. Adler to Nathan Defries, London, circa Spring 1855, Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi, vol. 3, ROCR.

⁹⁴ See *Lights and Shadows*, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 279. Mills, op. cit., p. 45, after referring to the prohibition of shaving by mourners, noted that 'they seldom adhere' to this law in London.

⁹⁵ For example, in 1846 when Nathan Adler asked the three City synagogues to help defray the cost of the *mikvaot*, he received the consent of each congregation as a matter of course: see Great Synagogue, Minutes of the Committee Meetings, 1841–61, entry for 24 August 1846; Hambro Synagogue, Minutes of the General Meetings, 1845–63, entry for 24 August 1846; and New Synagogue, Minutes of the Committee Meetings, 1831–50, entry for 21 October 1846, AUS.

⁹⁶ See Mrs. Marx to Nathan M. Adler, London, 29 July 1846, Index, vol. 83, ROCR.

⁹⁷ See Nathan M. Adler to Moses Rintel, London, circa Autumn 1853, Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi, vol. 2, ROCR.

⁹⁸ For example, the *JC* of 5 May 1854 had advertisements from two competing private *mikvaot* on the same page. The *Hebrew Observer* of 8 December 1854 had an advertisement for a third such pool, while the *JC* of 31 October 1856 had one for a fourth.

⁹⁹ The *JC* of 6 April 1849 observed that this prohibition was followed only 'by a few individuals, mostly officers of the community', and that 'the congregational officers say "we are paid servants, and cannot therefore enjoy our holidays as we might have done were we independent"'.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ See the *JC* of 1 May 1846.

¹⁰¹ For example, the *JC* of 15 May 1846 strongly attacked this observance which, it claimed, had been 'annulled by the Rabbis of every civilised congregation in Europe'.

¹⁰² A correspondent to the *JC* of 6 April 1849 noted that only congregational officers followed this practice and concluded that, if the law required it, 'one must feel surprised that there should be so few . . . who observe the law'.

¹⁰³ A correspondent to the *JC* of 6 April 1845, while attacking this prohibition, stated that he was aware that 'many pious of our nation' did observe this law. Nathan Adler also took a strong stand in upholding the practice, stating that its neglect was 'deeply to be regretted' and that 'it is the duty of every teacher in Israel to uphold this ritual': Nathan M. Adler, Papers and Letters, circa October 1852, Letterbooks of the Chief Rabbi, vol. 2, ROCR. The Chief Rabbi

JEWISH RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN LONDON

was almost never willing to back a religious position which had no popular support within the community: see Singer, *Orthodox Judaism . . .*, op. cit., pp. 143-65. It therefore seems to be a fair assumption that there was a noticeable group of Jews in London who refrained from shaving on specified festival days.

new **community**

Journal of the Commission for Racial Equality

Dealing with all aspects of ethnic and race relations and migration in Britain and internationally

Editor: Sheila Patterson

**Volume XIII, No. 1, Spring-Summer 1986
contains two special sections entitled:**

IDEOLOGIES AND ATTITUDES

Paul Rich on *The Impact of South African Segregationist and Apartheid Ideology on British Racial Thought: 1939-1960*

Michael Banton on *Pluralist Ignorance as a Factor in Racial Attitudes*

PARENTS, TEACHERS, PUPILS, SCHOOLING

Margaret Gibson/Parminder Bhachu on *Community Forces and School Performance: Punjabi Sikhs in Rural California and Urban Britain*

Peter M. E. Figueroa/L. Thomas Swart on *Teachers' and Pupils' Racist and Ethnocentric Frames of Reference: A Case Study*

Other contributors include: **Howard Aldrich et al.** on Asian residential concentration and business development; **Adrian Furnham** on some explanations for immigration to, and emigration from, Britain; **Michael P. Hornsby-Smith** on the immigrant background of Roman Catholics in England and Wales and **Bernard Ineichen** on the 1959 Mental Health Act and experience of ethnic minorities.

Annual Subscription:

Institutions - £16 (US\$32); Individuals - £12 (US\$24)

Back Numbers - £5 (US\$10); Single copy current issue - £4 (US\$8)



New Community Subscriptions
Elliot House
10/12 Allington Street
London SW1E 5EH
Telephone: 01-828 7022

W. E. B. DUBOIS ON BLACK NATIONALISM AND ZIONISM

Benyamin Neuberger

IN 1919, William Edward Burghardt DuBois wrote: 'The African Movement means to us what the Zionist Movement must mean to the Jews'.¹ He was born in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, in 1868; his ancestors were black slaves who had been brought to the West Indies and to the United States but he also had French Huguenot and Dutch forebears.

It was when he went to Fisk College in Nashville, Tennessee that he encountered the ugly brutality of White racism. Shortly after his arrival, there occurred an incident which changed his life: while walking in the street, he accidentally brushed against a white woman and begged her pardon whereupon she spat at him and shouted, 'How dare you speak to me, you impudent nigger?'² After brilliantly completing his studies at Fisk, he went to Harvard, where he obtained his Ph.D. in 1895. There he found that he was excluded from Harvard clubs, a form of prejudice which was not as ugly or violent as in the South but which was nevertheless racism.

His first major book, *The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade in the United States of America 1638-1870*, was published in 1896. His thesis was that slavery and abolitionism were not a function of brutality and morality, respectively, but resulted from the market forces of supply and demand, utility and profits. The following year, he was appointed professor of economics and history at Atlanta University; he resigned in 1910 but returned in 1934 to become the head of that University's Department of Sociology, a post he held until 1944.

DuBois was one of the leaders of the first Pan-African Conference in London in 1900, which was the precursor of four Pan-African Congresses. At the fifth Congress, in 1945, he and Kwame Nkrumah were co-chairmen and issued a call for the independence of the countries in Black Africa. Within the United States, DuBois was one of the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). He claimed that the problem of the twentieth century was 'the problem of the color line'³ and bitterly commented that cheap cotton was 'built upon cheap niggers'.⁴ He steadfastly fought for full social and political equality of Blacks in

America and in Africa but always opposed violence and the use of force. Decades before 'Black is beautiful' became a rallying cry, he wrote about the 'beauty' of the genius of the Negro race 'and the sweetness of its soul'.⁵ He urged Blacks to be proud of Black achievements and his *Souls of Black Folk* as early as 1903 had all the ingredients of African cultural nationalism. He had been quick to realize that the ideology of White supremacy could be fought only by proving that Africa had a heritage worth preserving. He strenuously argued that African peoples did have a history, that they had founded kingdoms and empires, and that they had not lived in a 'dark continent' now ruled by the 'civilized' world. The Africans had a rich cultural past which Black historians must reconstruct; and DuBois accepted the invitation of Kwame Nkrumah to head the Encyclopedia Africana project and devoted his last years to that task. He died in Accra, Ghana, in 1963, at the age of 95.

DuBois was pleased to discover in the Old Testament a liberal and tolerant attitude towards Africans. In *The World and Africa*, first published in 1947, he stated that the history of the Hebrew nation 'touched Ethiopia at many points and Jews showed the Blacks the highest respect'.⁶ He added that 'Jewish writers pictured Ethiopia as one of the most powerful countries of their day, equal in strength to Egypt, Persia, Assyria and Babylon',⁷ and that it was Jewish historians who had ensured that Ethiopia's past greatness was recorded. He reminded his readers that Moses had married an Ethiopian woman and that when Miriam had voiced opposition to that union, God had punished her;⁸ and he often quoted Amos who relates that God said, 'Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel?'⁹

Supporters of slavery had often quoted a passage from Genesis about the curse laid on Canaan that he would be 'a servant of servants'¹⁰ unto his brethren. But DuBois rejected the view that Canaanites were Negroes and their brethren White.¹¹ Instead, he pointed out that in Biblical times 'repeatedly the Jews made alliance with the Ethiopians'¹² and cited as evidence the case of Tirhakah, King of Ethiopia, who joined the Jews in their battle against Sennacherib¹³ and the rescue of the prophet Jeremiah by Ebedmelech the Ethiopian.¹⁴ The story of the African Queen of Sheba's visit to King Solomon was a further illustration of the closeness of Jewish-African relations.

In the United States, Jews had chosen to be active in support of the NAACP and he was grateful to them. He admired the Jews for the 'magnificent clearness of their intellect' and their 'fineness of family life'.¹⁵ He noted that education was the Jewish road to success: 'Only the Jews among us, as a class, carefully select and support the talent and genius of the young'.¹⁶ Jewish success in business was the result of living within one's means and abstaining from wasteful expenditure and antisemitism was simply 'jealousy of the gifted Jew'.¹⁷

BLACK NATIONALISM AND ZIONISM

Martin Luther King later showed the same attitude to Jews when he wrote:¹⁸

Negroes nurture a persisting myth that the Jews of America attained social mobility and status solely because they had money. It is unwise to ignore the error for many reasons. In a negative sense it encourages anti-Semitism and overestimates money as a value. In a positive sense the full truth reveals a useful lesson.

Jews progressed because they possessed a tradition of education combined with social and political action. The Jewish family enthroned education and sacrificed to get it. The result was far more than abstract learning. Uniting social action with educational competence, Jews became enormously effective in political life . . .

Nor was it only the rich who were involved in social and political action. Millions of Jews for half a century remained relatively poor, but they were far from passive in social and political areas . . . Very few Jews sank into despair and escapism even when discrimination assailed the spirit and corroded initiative . . .

Without overlooking the towering differences between the Negro and Jewish experiences, the lesson of Jewish mass involvement in social and political action and education is worthy of emulation.

DuBois noted that Jews and Blacks had endured persecution throughout the centuries and that the German Nazis believed that they both were members of an 'inferior race'.¹⁹ He also compared the segregation and lynchings in the American South with the ghettos and pogroms in Tsarist Russia. He was the editor of *The Crisis*, the official organ of the NAACP, from 1910 to 1934 and he said in the October 1933 issue of that Journal: 'If Hitler were to lecture at White Southern colleges his race nonsense would fit beautifully'. In the December 1938 issue, he stated:

It is doubtful if any section or race has sympathised more wholeheartedly and keenly with the Jews than Negro Americans, for they have known the same type of persecution ever since the beginning of America . . . In their hearts, the Negroes' feelings go out to the Jews. They know what Hitler means because they have known slave overseers, plantation riding bosses, high sheriffs . . .

In 1941, DuBois commented about the recent press despatches from Berlin that they 'read like a discussion of "Jim Crow" methods in Mississippi'.²⁰ In the December 1938 issue of *The Crisis*, he had stated that the only difference between the treatment of the Jews in Germany and that of the Negroes in the United States was that in America 'the central government does not use its machinery against Negroes; it proceeds just as effectively by remaining indifferent to the plight of the Negroes and using its machinery for White people'. He also later drew a parallel with conditions in South Africa: 'The life of a non-European is very cheap in South Africa, as cheap as the life of a Jew in Nazi Germany'.²¹

DuBois praised Jewish resistance to the Nazis and especially the Warsaw Ghetto uprising in an article entitled 'The Negro and the Warsaw Ghetto' after he had seen the devastated quarter:²²

The result . . . particularly of my view of the Warsaw Ghetto was not so much a clearer understanding of the Jewish problem in the world as it was a real and more complete understanding of the Negro problem. In the first place, the problem of slavery, emancipation, and caste in the United States was no longer in my mind a separate and unique thing as I had so long conceived it. It was not even solely a matter of color and physical and racial characteristics . . . It was not merely a matter of religion. No, the race problem . . . was a matter of cultural patterns, perverted teaching and human hate and prejudice, which reached all sorts of people and caused endless evil to all men. So that the ghetto of Warsaw helped me to emerge from a certain social provincialism into a broader conception of what the fight against race segregation, religious discrimination and the oppression by wealth had to become if civilization was going to triumph and broaden in this world.

DuBois had come to realize that racism was not necessarily linked to colour and that just as Blacks cannot cross over to the White world, so 'Jews cannot avoid antisemitism by changing their names or refusing to cooperate with Jews for common objects'.²³ He wholeheartedly supported the Zionist demand for a Jewish Homeland where the Jews would be a self-governing people and not a tolerated minority, especially since after the Holocaust the 'theoretical demand for a Zion now became a necessity for more than a million displaced and homeless Jews. There was actually no other place on earth for them to go'.²⁴ However, for DuBois Zionism was essentially a return to human dignity and equality rather than a return to a territory; and unlike Marcus Garvey he did not advocate 'Black Zionism' as a return to Africa by the Black diaspora. Zionism's rejection of assimilation, its return to the national roots, and its crystallization of a new Jewish identity pointed the way for Black nationalism: 'The African Movement means to us what the Zionist Movement must mean to the Jews, the centralization of race effort and the recognition of the racial fount'.²⁵

DuBois never doubted that the Jewish people had a moral, historic, and legal right to establish a Jewish state in the Land of Israel. Zionism meant that the Jews would simply 'go back to Zion and *re*found a state which they had *lost*' and he rejected the Arab contention that Jews were 'European colonialists' usurping part of the 'Arab Homeland': 'Every child knows that ancient Jewish civilization and religion centered in Palestine'. The dispersed Jewish survivors of the Holocaust had a human right to go to the Jewish Homeland 'where there is room for them, where there is work for them to do, where what Jews have already done is for the advantage, not simply of the Jews, but of the Arabs'.

BLACK NATIONALISM AND ZIONISM

DuBois could not understand Arab opposition to Jewish immigration: 'Palestine is a land largely of plateaus, mountains and deserts, sparsely inhabited, and could easily maintain millions more than the two millions it has today'²⁶ He blamed the Arab landowners for many of the armed attacks to which the Jews of Palestine were subjected and he accused Ernest Bevin, the British Minister for Foreign Affairs, of 'building on some half-hidden dislike of the Jews' when he refused to implement the British promise of establishing a Jewish National Home in Palestine enshrined in the Balfour Declaration and instead 'used British troops against the Jews, trained Arab troops for use in the future against them and used the Navy for keeping displaced persons from immigrating to Zion'.²⁷

After the establishment of the State of Israel in May 1948, DuBois continued to support Zionist aspirations until his death in 1963. It is therefore well to remember the stand taken by that great leader of American Blacks and of Pan-Africanism in view of the considerable African support for the 1975 United Nations Resolution which equated Zionism with racism and of the tensions between Jews and Blacks in the United States in recent years.

NOTES

¹ *The Crisis*, February 1919, p. 166.

² See J. B. Moore, *W. E. B. DuBois*, Boston, 1981, p. 22.

³ W. E. B. DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*, Chicago, 1903, p. 13.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁶ *The World and Africa* (first published in 1947), Millwood, NY, 1976, p. 131.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁸ Numbers, 12:1.

⁹ Amos, 9:7.

¹⁰ Genesis, 9:25-27.

¹¹ W. E. B. DuBois, *Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil* (first published in 1920), New York, 1969, p. 113.

¹² *The World and Africa*, op. cit., p. 133.

¹³ Isaiah, 37:9.

¹⁴ Jeremiah, 38:7-13.

¹⁵ W. E. B. DuBois, 'The Case for the Jews', in *Chicago Star*, 8 May 1948.

¹⁶ *The World and Africa*, op. cit., p. 182.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Martin Luther King, Jr, 'Where Do We Go From Here?', in Peter I. Rose, ed., *Americans From Africa: Old Memories, New Moods*, New York, 1970, pp. 318-19.

¹⁹ W. E. B. DuBois, *Worlds of Colour*, New York, 1961, p. 23.

²⁰ W. E. B. DuBois, 'The Jews', in *Phylon*, vol. 2, no. 4, 1941, p. 393.

²¹ *The World and Africa*, op. cit., p. 40.

BENYAMIN NEUBERGER

²² W. E. B. DuBois, 'The Negro and the Warsaw Ghetto', in *Jewish Life*, April 1952, pp. 14-15.

²³ *Chicago Star*, op. cit.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ *The Crisis*, February 1919, p. 166.

²⁶ *Chicago Star*, op. cit.

²⁷ Ibid.

IDEOLOGY AND THE HOLOCAUST

(Review Article)

Robert Benewick

CHRISTOPHER BROWNING, *Fateful Months. Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution*, ix + 111 pp., Holmes & Meier, New York and London, 1985, \$24.95.

SIMON TAYLOR, *Prelude to Genocide. Nazi Ideology and the Struggle for Power*, xii + 288 pp., Duckworth, London, 1985, £19.50.

ROBERT WISTRICH, *Hitler's Apocalypse. Jews and the Nazi Legacy*, viii + 309 pp., Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1985, £18.95.

IT is clear that the Holocaust cannot be regarded simply as an historical phenomenon. Indeed, Simon Taylor begins his study of Nazi ideology with a reference to the German dramatist, Ernst Toller. As he watched the Nazis in 1933 burn his books, he asked, 'What has mankind learned from sacrifice, from catastrophe and despair . . .?'. Fifty-two years later Taylor replies, 'the answer today, as then, is nothing'. This finds an echo in Robert Wistrich who argues that the war on the Jews begun by the Nazis has not stopped; and he devotes a major portion of his book to a survey of its contemporary manifestations. The debate on how it happened is unsettled despite the many studies of the Holocaust; but it remains no less relevant both within and beyond the realm of academic enquiry.

Taylor and Wistrich focus on the role of ideology and on antisemitism as the essence of Hitler's Weltanschauung while Christopher Browning examines the decisions and initiatives at different levels of the Nazi regime that led to the Final Solution. This is done through a series of excellent micro-studies of the events of Autumn 1941 and Spring 1942. In recognising that an atmosphere pervaded by antisemitism was required, he acknowledges the force of ideology.

Browning's point of departure is Tim Mason's classification of interpretations of National Socialism into two schools: intentionalists and functionalists. The former identify a consistent ideology implemented through a totalitarian dictatorship while the latter

emphasize the improvisation and radicalization of the decision-making process. The debate is unresolved because of the disagreement on what constitutes a decision for the Final Solution and because of the lack of documentation.

Browning describes his position as a 'moderate functionalist' rejecting the view that the Final Solution had been decided upon before the Second World War and was to be implemented at the appropriate time. Such a view does not accord with the practice before 1941 and cannot explain either the emigration policy or the long delay. Hitler's antisemitic obsession was the motive for an ever increasing radical solution rather than providing the logic and blueprint for mass extermination. The Final Solution was the consequence of the conjuncture of Hitler's antisemitism, the anarchical and pluralist nature of the State, the vulnerability of European Jewry, and the advent of the Second World War. This stands in stark contrast to Wistrich's position that there would have been no World War had it not been for Hitler's radical antisemitism and the political repercussions; and it conflicts with Taylor who deduces both a logic and a conscious plan for extermination.

Browning warns against a Hitlerocentric interpretation. It is also necessary to take into account that the Final Solution could not have been carried out without the complicity of others ranging from active participation, willing co-operation, to passive acquiescence. His study of the interaction between the lower and middle echelons and the central decision makers is an important contribution. In order to understand how this complicity existed in the first place, however, the primacy of ideology must be established.

This complex process is unravelled by Simon Taylor. He begins by tracing the development of Nazi ideology and the struggles within the party to determine its direction. This is followed by studies of the aggregation of support and a sound analysis of the disjuncture between the appeals to the *Mittelstand* and the policies and practices of the Nazi State. Of particular interest are his use of propaganda posters, pamphlets, and election leaflets to illustrate the development of ideology during the *Kampfzeit* and of political ritual and celebration as a means of ideological control. His thesis is based on the interaction of ideology, economic crises, and the breakdown of social consciousness.

He too warns against an exclusive concentration on Hitler's ideological role. For Taylor, the fundamental defect in this approach is that ideology is treated in an historical vacuum which fails to identify a dialectic in the rise of National Socialism. Totalitarian theories of ideology also perpetuate an 'idealistic' view of National Socialism while Soviet historiography's emphasis on material conditions is equally guilty of a monocausal interpretation. Taylor identifies the political dimensions of Hitler's antisemitism and the way in which beliefs were

IDEOLOGY AND THE HOLOCAUST

manipulated according to the political circumstances during the Kampfzeit and the early years of the Nazi State. It was essentially because the Jewish Question was determined by political considerations in the first place rather than by racial beliefs that the genocide of the Jews was planned before the seizure of power. Antisemitism provided a comprehensive explanation and a final solution.

Robert Wistrich in the first half of his book seeks to demonstrate the consistency of Hitler's ideological obsession with Jewry. In contrast to Browning and Taylor, this approach involves the centrality of Hitler and of the Jewish Question. Wistrich criticizes historians for underestimating Hitler's purposiveness and rejects the notion of the Final Solution as an incremental process. He sees the Holocaust as both the consummation of Hitler's and National Socialism's Weltanschauung and the 'logical culmination of Hitler's messianic self-conception'.

Wistrich's vigorous style, which carries over to the second half of the book, can be misleading in so far as it glosses over a more considered position. He is well aware of the structural realities that made the Holocaust possible and of the problems and tensions of Israeli society. It is his contention, however, that the depersonalized behaviour of Nazi bureaucrats and what Browning describes as careerism were the result of a long process of ideological indoctrination that provides a cutting edge to his analysis of anti-Zionism. As if to underscore the continuum of the war against the Jews, the book is not divided into two parts. Hitler, as never before, used antisemitism as a weapon of political mobilization with great skill and effectiveness and a totalistic world view was created. The resulting cataclysm has made it necessary for post-war antisemitism to disguise its intentions. The mask is a fashionable anti-Zionism. Wistrich's position is clear for since Israel is central to Jewish life, anti-Zionism is indistinguishable from antisemitism.

He undertakes the enormous and difficult task of surveying the different expressions of anti-Zionism: militant Islam, Arab nationalism, Soviet antisemitism, neo-Nazi historical revisionism, and the radical left's anti-imperialist ideology. It is an approach that is flawed by an inevitable need to be selective, yet Wistrich displays an impressive grasp of a wide range of disparate and unpleasant material. He can also be a skilled interpreter, as when dealing with the radical left in a chapter aptly titled, 'Inversions of History'. In its opposition to fascism and racism and its identification with the Third World, Israel is ascribed the role of colonial oppressor. My reservation is at the level of analysis for in this instance at least, the tragedy of the radical left (and Israel) is that equipped with a powerful framework for analysis they choose to crudely exploit symptoms rather than uncovering causes.

If Wistrich's case is political, it is no less important for the social scientist. Where Nazi ideology promoted the Holocaust, the Holocaust is now used by Neo-Nazis to promote their ideology. The

ROBERT BENEWICK

understanding of the *processes* of belief and also of disbelief remain rudimentary. The present studies are concerned with beliefs but there is a growing literature on disbelief of which Deborah Lipstadt's *The American Press and The Coming of the Holocaust* is just one recent example. There is a need to understand how antisemitism persists and the recognition of the power of ideology is a start. One of the lessons from these studies is that what begins as posturing may develop into a world view which provides acceptability of the unacceptable and encourages its transformation into practice.

BOOK REVIEWS

SAUL BERNSTEIN, *The Renaissance of the Torah Jew*, xiv + 412 pp., Ktav, New York, 1985, \$20.00.

One of the most remarkable phenomena of the post-war years in world Jewry is the growth of Orthodox Judaism, especially in the United States, when so many had prophesied its speedy demise. Rabbi Bernstein, who served for thirty years as administrator of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and as editor of *Jewish Life* magazine, surveys in this book this renaissance of the Torah Jew, a term he prefers because of the sometimes perjorative connotations of the word 'Orthodox', meaning hidebound, resistant to change, and reactionary.

Bernstein's survey is more comprehensive than those which have been available so far but it falls short of anything like a sound sociological analysis. A book of this kind cries out for full documentation but, unfortunately, Bernstein handicaps himself by his methodology. He writes (p. 394): 'It is to be understood that throughout this work, assessments of events, experiences, ideas, and the role of individual figures are as seen independently by the author. In various instances, such assessments and the interpretation of historical developments differ — sometimes radically — from those conveyed by works listed or other sources. Consistent with the character of this work, the measure of validity for what is presented therein is not in conformity with other formulations, however prevalent, but with understanding of modern-day Jewish experience as perceived in the light of the Torah. The validity of what is set forth in *The Renaissance of the Torah Jew* must therefore be gauged by the extent to which its governing criterion has been fulfilled'. This comes close to an admission that we are being given not an objective study but a highly personalistic, not to say partisan, account.

The introductory chapter gives a brief survey of the history of Orthodoxy in the modern world. It is followed by chapters entitled: 'In the Path of Epochal Change'; 'Era of Response'; 'Building Blocks of the American Torah Community'; 'Epics of Group Rebirth'; 'The Educational Key'; 'New Growth, New Questions'; 'The Contemporary Presence of the Torah Jew'; and 'In Summary Vein'. Each chapter has a number of subdivisions.

The book is marred by a number of errors. On one page (p. 206), the name of the founder of the Volozhin Yeshivah is correctly given as Rabbi Hayyim of Volozhin but on another page (p. 308) he becomes

BOOK REVIEWS

Rabbi Hayyim Soloveitchik, confusing him with his descendant, R. Hayyim of Brisk. R. Hayyim of Volozhin probably did not have a family name. If he did, it was certainly not Soloveitchik. In the discussion on Anglo-Jewry, Bernstein states: 'Sections of London and Manchester thickly populated by Jews had been pinpointed in air raids and shattered to blood-soaked rubble'. If this means that the Blitz was aimed at destroying the Jewish population of the two cities, it is incorrect. Hitler had other diabolical ways of achieving the 'final solution'. The Nazi bombers wished to paralyse communications and the commercial centres of London and Manchester. He observes that Manchester Yeshivah remained at the primary and secondary levels until advancing in recent years. I wonder where he got this tit-bit of information about my *alma mater*. He states (p. 200) that separate seating of men and women in the synagogue is 'a characteristic of the synagogue always, it is traceable to the Holy Temple of Jerusalem and is believed to go beyond that to the Sanctuary in the days of wandering in the wilderness of Sinai'. Not a hint here of the famous essay by the Israeli scholar, Shmuel Safrai, in which he adduces archaeological and other evidence to show that there was no separate seating in the ancient synagogue.

The emergence of a vibrant Orthodoxy is a great and fascinating development. The book under review raises several interesting points but sadly does not provide an adequate portrayal or analysis of that development.

LOUIS JACOBS

CALVIN GOLDSCHIEDER, *Jewish Continuity and Change: Emerging Patterns in America* (Jewish Political and Social Studies of the Center for Modern Jewish Studies of Brandeis University, Daniel J. Elazar and Steven M. Cohen, eds), xvii + 195 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1986, \$24.95.

The statistical studies of Boston Jewry conducted in 1975 by the Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston were so extensive that they have provided the basis for two important books, both of which extrapolate the Boston findings onto American Jewry at large. The first was Steven M. Cohen's *American Modernity and Jewish Identity*, mainly an attitudinal and cultural study published in 1983. The second is the present book by the prominent demographer Calvin Goldscheider. It is a meticulous and penetrating study of the social, economic, and demographic realities of the Jews of the United States, drawn from data assembled in the 1975 survey with occasional reference to an earlier Boston survey of 1965.

Goldscheider argues that social processes among the Jews illuminate those taking place among other ethnic groups generally; and he rejects

BOOK REVIEWS

the view that ethnic identity is merely affective and socially regressive. He specifies three sets of issues which preoccupy him in this book: Jewish cohesion among marginal Jews; the generational and demographic aspects of group continuity; and group 'quality', meaning the educational level and the transmission of social and economic status. He pays particular attention to the marginal Jews: those who have intermarried; young people living alone; and Jews who have migrated within the United States. The data about the marginals show that these persons are not as estranged from Judaism as has been previously believed. Thus, the intermarried are not outside Jewish life although they are less involved with it than is the average Jew in the survey. They still have many Jewish friends, take some small part in religious activities, and are accepted in many spheres of the Jewish community. Adjustment to the fact of extensive intermarriage during the past two decades seems to be one of the pronounced but informal features of American Jewish life.

Goldscheider's report on the Jewish family pours cold water on some rather overheated preoccupations. The vast majority of American Jewish men and women do marry, although ages at first marriage and at the birth of the first child are somewhat higher than is the case for the Gentile average. Moreover, the divorce rate and the percentage of single-parent households are far lower among Jews. The author scrutinizes marital cohorts (groups of couples who married during the same period) and, after a very careful analysis of the data about the number of children which respondents said they expected to have, he concludes that these 'expected' births would probably be numerous enough to maintain the American Jewish population at its existing level. The ultra-Orthodox are under-represented in the survey group; and since their birth rates are known to be high, the estimate of the Jewish population may be somewhat higher than the survey statistics reveal. One notable fact may be peculiar to Boston, namely that the great majority of those within the 18-29 years age-group live apart from their families; Boston has a plethora of important universities and a large population of graduate students.

Goldscheider's analysis shows that, contrary to popular belief in recent years, the strength and stability of the Jewish nuclear family appear to have been maintained in the United States. But one is not surprised that the social and economic data reveal that Jews value higher education and are attracted by independent commercial enterprises; this is demonstrated by the high proportion of those who are managers, proprietors, or engaged in a professional occupation. The upward mobility of successive generations seems to be a perennial in the American Jewish historical scene.

If so thoroughly analytic a work may be said to possess a theme, then that theme is the stability and basic continuity of American Jewish life.

BOOK REVIEWS

Beneath a sometimes turbulent surface, Jewish affiliation continues to be high, even among the marginals. Professor Goldscheider steers a course which is independent of passing fashions, although the emphasis on stability and continuity may perhaps reflect the mood of the conservative 1980s. Every serious reader of the sociology and demography of American Jewry will benefit from his carefully reasoned and scholarly study.

LLOYD P. GARTNER

NANCY L. GREEN, *The Pletzl of Paris. Jewish Immigrant Workers in the Belle Epoque*, ix + 270 pp., Holmes and Meier, New York and London, 1986, £31.50.

Recent years have seen the publication of a number of major works in English on modern French Jewish history. Among them are Michael Marrus, *The Politics of Assimilation* (Oxford, 1971), dealing with the established community at the time of the Dreyfus Affair; David H. Weinberg, *A Community on Trial: The Jews of Paris in the 1930s* (Chicago, 1977) and Paula Hyman, *From Dreyfus to Vichy: The Remaking of French Jewry, 1906-1939* (New York, 1979). Both of the latter books cover the Russo-Jewish immigration, at least from 1906. The work under review deals specifically with this subject, extending the coverage back to 1881 but with a special emphasis — four chapters out of seven — on their economic life, labour relations, and radical politics.

The Pletzl (Yiddish for 'little square') of the title was the name for the Jewish immigrant area of first settlement in the Marais (which happened to include the medieval Rue des Juifs) in the third and fourth arrondissements, centred on the Rue des Rosiers and the Rue Pavée, near the Place des Vosges. But the eastern European Jewish immigrants formed quarters also on the Left Bank in and near the Latin Quarter as well as in Montmartre. The total number of these newcomers, including Rumanians, was about 35,000 by 1914: small, compared with the immigrant Jewish community of New York or even of London. But it developed its own varied social and cultural life. The historic revolutionary and republican tradition of France tended to draw more specifically political exiles, whose ultimate aim was not to integrate but to return after a successful revolution to Russia. One is struck, however, by the parallels with British and American Jewish immigrant communities of the same period: there was the same ambivalent relationship with the established Jewish community, the same types of religious and welfare institutions (even an *asile* which more or less resembled London's Jews' Temporary Shelter), and the same tensions with the wider host society.

The author argues that in addition to the 'push' of emigration from eastern Europe there was a complementary 'pull' of immigrants (not

BOOK REVIEWS

only Jews) to Paris, notably the need for cheap labour for Parisian light industry, particularly the garment trades and the manufacture of cheap ready-to-wear clothing. The argument that French industry deliberately set out to attract eastern European immigrants seems part of an ideologically based thesis that western capitalism intentionally sucked in poor immigrants and then exploited them. The first leader in the Yiddish paper, *Der Idisher Arbeyter*, in 1911 spoke of 'Jewish workers in Paris . . . men and women who have been torn from their homes, and who are exploited in Parisian workshops . . .' (p. 184). But not even the author, the Russian communist Lozovsky, could have believed that the pressures which drove those Jewish workers from their homes in Russia were deployed by their present employers in the Paris workshops, or even by those who controlled the French clothing industry for which they worked. It is no doubt arguable that 'if there had been no jobs, the immigrants would not have come in such large numbers' (p. 41); but it is more probable that, having arrived in Paris, they naturally turned to those trades which offered the best — sometimes the only — chance of employment. France then had little statutory or administrative restriction on immigration; it was traditionally hospitable to political exiles, and it was on one of the routes to America, the ultimate aim of so many of the eastern European immigrants; these factors are sufficient to explain why out of the nearly two million Jews who left the Russian Empire between 1880 and 1914, 35,000 should have settled in Paris.

Discussion of the religious life of the immigrants is limited to seven pages but gives the impression that the relationship between them and the established community was not unlike that prevailing in Britain at the time but perhaps there was more estrangement because of the adoption by the established synagogues of the *Consistoire* of certain non-Orthodox features such as the organ. French Jews could be occasionally hostile, labelling the new arrivals as backward and obscurantist, but they were more often supportive. Until the separation of church and state in France in 1905, the *Consistoires* were state-recognized and subsidized and their approval was needed for all Jewish places of worship. This was given for what the author terms the 'oratories' of the immigrants, and there was also financial support. The newcomers took the initiative in forming a federation of minor synagogues and also in opening in 1913 a large synagogue in the Rue Pavée.

There is a full account of the range of economic occupations of Parisian immigrant Jews. Precise statistics are impossible to achieve but the evidence suggests that a third of the total gainfully employed were in the clothing industry (Speiser's *Kalendar* on p. 213), including footwear, furs, and hats. The capmakers were a notable element (about 1,500 in a total population of 35,000). Much attention is devoted to the formation of trade unions. These often began as mutual aid societies or grew into permanent associations from *ad hoc* organization during

BOOK REVIEWS

strikes. Their ultimate form was often as Yiddish-speaking sections of larger French unions. The author notes a more intense politicization after the immigration wave of 1905, which was precipitated as much by the failure of the 1905 Russian revolution as by pogroms. But even a strong union like that of the capmakers enrolled only half the Jewish workers in the trade and less than half of these paid their union dues (p. 163).

The numbers involved in strikes, which were numerous, was also small — from four to 200 (p. 147). There is discussion on whether the strikes were an inevitable reaction to bad conditions of employment or due to an initiative showing 'working-class consciousness' (p. 149): both factors were involved. There was also the 'community factor' — the close proximity of workers in a tight-knit community in an alien environment — which facilitated the organization of strikes (p. 190). The immigrants included Bundists, anarchists, and Russian social democrats, who were primarily concerned with return to Russia after revolution there, and with few exceptions had only a passing interest in Franco-Jewish politics. An outstanding exception was Lozovsky, who came to Paris in 1909, took over the leadership of the capmakers' union and the running of the *Idisher Arbeyter*, and returned to Russia in 1917, where he became head of the Communist Trade Union International and then vice-minister of Foreign Affairs; he was purged by Stalin in 1949 and sent to a labour camp where he died.

There were inevitable conflicts between the Bundists, who emphasized the national Jewish aspects of their socialism, and the Jewish sections of French trade unions; and between the anarcho-syndicalists and the reformist socialists. Relations with the broader French trade union movement were ambivalent: there was xenophobic fear of competition and undercutting by the immigrants but also efforts to enrol them in the French working-class movement.

The book is based on archival material (including Alliance Israélite Universelle, Consistoire, French Foreign Office, and Prefecture of Police files) as well as on the French and Yiddish contemporary press. While one need not accept all the ideological premises, the analysis of the factors favouring immigration and emigration is illuminating and the book provides — especially in the economic sphere — a welcome basis for comparison with other Jewish immigrant settlements at that period in the western world.

V. D. LIPMAN

ABRAHAM HALKIN and DAVID HARTMAN, *Crisis and Leadership: Epistles of Maimonides*, x + 292 pp., The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1985, \$15.95.

The three famous Epistles of Maimonides — On Martyrdom; To the Yemen; and On Resurrection — are here translated from the Arabic

BOOK REVIEWS

with learned notes by Abraham Halkin. David Hartman provides a general Introduction and, after each Epistle, a theological and philosophical analysis.

In the first half of the twelfth century, the Muslim sect, the Almohads, had seized power in North Africa, compelling all peoples under their rule to make a formal declaration in which they had to accept Islam as the true religion and Mohammed as the prophet of God. Those refusing to make the declaration were sentenced to death. Many members of the Moroccan Jewish community, fearing the consequences of a refusal, did make the formal confession of faith but they continued to practise Judaism in the privacy of their homes since, provided it was not obtrusive, that was allowed. A rabbi (we are not told who he was) had taught that since these people had not opted for martyrdom they were no better than idolaters so that their Jewish observances were not only futile but were positively sinful. Seeking to encourage these secret Jews, Maimonides compiled his Epistle on Martyrdom in which he advises those who can escape to free lands to do so but, while stating that those who were prepared to suffer martyrdom were great heroes and holy men, he ruled that martyrdom is not demanded in such circumstances. To profess Islam is not to adopt an idolatrous faith, argues Maimonides, and as for the Talmudic rule that in times of religious persecution martyrdom is required, even where idolatry is not the issue, he argues that this persecution is different from all others because the rulers are fully aware that the profession of Islam is only a formal requirement, the Jews continuing to practise their own religion in secret.

The Epistle to Yemen seeks to afford comfort to the Jews of that distant land who had begun to question whether their lowly estate under Islamic rule would ever come to an end. They feared that they were in danger either of acknowledging that Islam had really superseded Judaism in the divine economy or of clutching in desperation at the straw of Messianic pretension, that this or that claimant to the role of Messiah was the true Messiah, sent by God to bring their troubles to a close in glorious vindication.

The third Epistle, the Essay on Resurrection, was written towards the end of Maimonides's life in order to defend himself against the charge that, by his comparative silence on the question, he did not believe in the physical resurrection of the dead, substituting for it a belief in the immortality of the soul. Maimonides states categorically that he does believe in the resurrection of the body, since to deny a traditional belief so widely held would be heretical; but he adds that resurrection will not be for ever. The resurrected bodies will eventually return to dust, the soul alone enjoying the presence of God for all eternity.

The tone and content of these Epistles has long been a puzzle to commentators. The Epistle on Martyrdom seems to be in flat

BOOK REVIEWS

contradiction to the Halakhah, including Maimonides's own Halakhic rulings. The Epistle to Yemen seems to stress the miraculous elements in Messianism which, in his other works, Maimonides seeks to play down. His Essay on Resurrection seems to adopt the kind of crude eschatology he had been at pains to contradict all his life. Worried by the contradictions, J. L. Teicher went so far as to declare that the Essay on Resurrection is not Maimonides's work at all but a forgery, and H. Soloveitchik suggests that the Epistle on Martyrdom substitutes rhetoric for sober Halakhic assessment.

Hartman's solution is similar to that offered by some scholars on the contradictions between Maimonides's Code and his Guide for the Perplexed: they were addressed to different audiences. Hartman, very skilfully and with much learning, advances the thesis that in these three Epistles, Maimonides was writing not as a philosopher in his ivory tower but as a statesman concerned with the situation of more or less simple Jews in a real predicament. As Hartman puts it (p. 6): 'Here is no erudite intellectual expounding complex philosophical arguments for the sake of "a single virtuous man" but a committed leader who enters the marketplace of the community and is prepared to suffer personal hardships for the sake of the welfare of the whole. Also in the *Epistle on Martyrdom* and the *Essay on Resurrection*, we do not meet the teacher of the few, but rather the compassionate and concerned leader of the many. Both aspects of Maimonides — his intellectualism and his statesmanship — are in truth integral components of the rich personality of this philosopher-halakhist'. This interpretation of the Epistles explains the title of the book: *Crisis and Leadership*.

Hartman is convincing but occasionally overplays his hand. For instance, on the Epistle on Martyrdom, he argues (pp. 10; 51–52; 86) that Maimonides's willingness to tolerate compromise was in many respects an application of the rabbinic principle: 'The Torah spoke only with respect to the *yetzer ha-ra*'. This principle is stated in the Talmud (*Kiddushin* 21b) in connection with the captive woman (Deuteronomy 21:10–14) — that is, that the Torah permits the soldier to take a captive woman as his wife since, in his passion, he would take her in any event so that it is better for it to be permitted. Maimonides does not, in fact, quote this and for very good reason. How can one draw the conclusion from the interpretation of a particular law as a concession to human weakness that (in Hartman's words, p. 10): 'Torah is not a law for ideal people living in idyllic conditions, but rather a normative system that guides people in imperfect situations and through personal crises of the will and spirit'? If that were the case, why is the principle only mentioned in this one case? In fact, it is not a legal principle at all but a homily on the law of the captive woman. The implication appears to be that, on the contrary, since in this one case, where the *yetzer ha-ra* (the passions) would gain control in any event, the

BOOK REVIEWS

Torah permits it, then it follows that all the other laws of the Torah brook no concessions and the *yetzer ha-ra* must be controlled. Maimonides was undoubtedly influenced by extra-legal motivations but what he tried to do was to interpret the Halakhah creatively so that it was in accord with the other values he sought to foster. This is, in fact, what Hartman seems to be saying but the example he chose is not helpful to his case.

In another context Hartman, discussing whether a Jew can legitimately be said to have observed a *mitzvah* if he does not believe in God, remarks (p. 61): 'The answer to this question is not a foregone conclusion, especially if one seriously considers the midrashic statement: "Would that they (Israel) had forsaken Me (God) but kept my Torah"'. This midrashic statement is often quoted by people opposed to the notion that Judaism has a theology and they understand it in the way Hartman does, namely, that God is, as it were, willing to tolerate unbelief in His existence as long as His people keep the Torah. 'If one seriously considers' the midrashic statement, however, it becomes clear that what the rabbis of the Midrash mean is that even if one has an ulterior motive, carrying out religious observances not for God but out of self-interest, this is still acceptable to God since, as the Rabbis say, out of the impure motivation will come the pure. The Rabbis of the Talmud and Midrash never discuss theoretical atheism and could not possibly have made God say that He does not mind if a person is an atheist as long as he keeps the Torah. There may have been a school which taught: 'Believe what you like as long as you keep the *mitzvot*' but such an opinion would have been intolerable, indeed, unintelligible, to the ancient rabbis and, most certainly, to Maimonides.

Perhaps when all is said and done and when Halkin, Hartman, and other scholars have published their illuminating comments, it should be recognised that even a genius of systematization like Maimonides can sometimes succumb to inconsistency. The lines of Walt Whitman may not be entirely inapt when put into the mouth of Maimonides:

Do I contradict myself?
Very well then I contradict myself.
(I am large, I contain multitudes.)

LOUIS JACOBS

JEHUDA REINHARZ, *Chaim Weizmann: The Making of a Zionist Leader*, xiii + 566 pp., Oxford University Press, 1985, New York and Oxford, \$29.95 or £29.50.

'The literature on Weizmann is quite enormous', as Professor Abramsky, who knows it all, wrote in 1975; and much more has been written in the last ten years. Yet Professor Reinhartz can claim with some justification that his study of the first forty years of Weizmann's

BOOK REVIEWS

life — from Motol to Manchester — is the first scholarly biography. He is in the biographical succession to Richard Crossman, who was able to publish only a fragment from the material he had prepared, and of the next official biographer, Professor Laqueur, whose collaborator he became. A biographer now has the advantage of being able to draw on the completed twenty-three-volume edition of Weizmann's *Letters and Papers*, one of the volumes of which was edited by Professor Reinharz; in addition, the book is based on much other archival material, including the protocols of the Zionist congresses, two dossiers of legal documents which reveal the story of Weizmann's commercial research in 1910–12, and University of Manchester papers which throw light on his academic fortunes there.

The narrative is very readable and it moves from milieu to milieu — Motol (where Chaim Weizmann was born in 1874), Pinsk, Darmstadt, Berlin, Geneva, Manchester: the author sets the scene, as he does also for major controversies like Uganda. But it is not merely narrative. Professor Reinharz tries to provide an assessment of Weizmann's character and how this developed. Weizmann's upbringing was that of enlightened orthodoxy; his father was a *maskil* (an enlightened Jew) who became mayor of his village, an unusual distinction for a Jew in that time and country, and he saw to it that ten of his twelve children became university graduates. The family name was Fialker and Chaim's father probably changed it to Weizmann because he was adopted by a childless couple of that name who could claim for him exemption from military service. Chaim Weizmann was sent to the Real Gymnasium in Pinsk, where the only outstanding teacher was the chemistry instructor, Kornienko; and Weizmann later credited him with having inspired in his pupil an attraction to chemistry. If so, on this chance happening depended much of later success for both Weizmann personally and for world Jewry.

The book traces Weizmann's westward odyssey in search of secular education to Germany and Switzerland and his early involvement in Zionist politics for almost a decade before he moved to Manchester in 1904. Weizmann dropped by about the age of 20 the traditional Jewish orthodox practices of his home upbringing; but he never lost the ability to communicate, especially in Yiddish, with even the simplest Jews from Eastern Europe. Professor Reinharz describes him as 'essentially an élitist who was attuned to the voices of the masses and the currents of his movement but at the same time preferred to carry out its ideas by his own methods and at his own pace' (p. 101). At the end of his period in Switzerland, Weizmann described himself as 'ein anstaendiger Mittel Europaer — a decent Central European'. This was during the Russo-Japanese War and he thus distanced himself from both Russia and the ghetto. The book describes how in the next ten years Weizmann at first felt far less at home in grim, bourgeois Manchester than in the more

BOOK REVIEWS

bohemian student atmosphere of Geneva; but he soon began to develop that identification with England which was to give him enthusiasms very different from those of a 'decent Central European'.

This adaptability of Weizmann, his upward social and personal mobility, is illustrated also by his relationships with the people he worked with, whether in Zionist affairs or in academic circles. At first his life was dominated by a series of patrons, whose disciple or protégé he became, although some at least of them he grew out of, as it were, or even quarrelled with: Motzkin, Ussishkin, Ahad Ha'Am, and Moses Gaster in Zionism; William Henry Perkin and Sir Arthur Schuster in academic life. Then he began to acquire friends of his own generation, of whom Berthold Feiwel and Martin Buber were the first. Finally, at the end of the book, he is beginning to gather round him his own disciples, such as Norman Bentwich and the 'Manchester School' — Sieff, Marks, and Sacher.

In dealing with Weizmann's decade in Manchester before 1914, Professor Reinhartz breaks new ground. He discusses Weizmann's relationship with his professor, Perkin, and their joint involvement in the commercial application of scientific research. He recounts Weizmann's frustrated hopes of succeeding to Perkin's professorship and discusses the allegation that Weizmann did not obtain that promotion because of the conflicts over the commercial exploitation of research. Professor Reinhartz's conclusions are that antisemitism did not play a part in Weizmann's failure to get the professorship and that in the commercial research conflicts all parties, including Weizmann, were 'guilty of greed and vanity'.

The book deals also with even more personal aspects of Weizmann's life: apart from his relationship with his wife, the previous affair with Sophia Getzova and the effect of the breaking of that engagement on his relations with other Zionists, notably Motzkin; and Weizmann's strange infatuation in 1912-13 with Caroline (later, Lady) Schuster and her daughter Norah. It is remarkable how intimate are the details revealed by the surviving correspondence. The letters also show how pressed Weizmann was for money during his earlier years in Manchester, probably owing to his wife's spending habits, and the straits to which he was reduced, such as borrowing from Gaster and Ahad Ha'Am. His involvement in commercial research and the foolish attempt to extract more money from Perkin, under threats of disclosure of research secrets, were no doubt prompted by the ever-pressing need for more funds to meet the expenses of his household.

The book is sub-titled 'The Making of a Zionist Leader'. The author never loses sight, in recounting the history of the Democratic Faction, of the Uganda controversy, or the rise of Synthetic Zionism, of his aim of showing how Weizmann developed from a student leader into, by 1904, 'one of the most successful propagandists in the Zionist

BOOK REVIEWS

movement', and then by 1914 into a widely recognized leader. Nothing better illustrates Weizmann's capacity to learn political techniques than the comparison between his earlier failure to achieve anything for a Jewish University — a cause very dear to him on general and personal grounds — and his successes in the same cause in 1913 and 1914. He had to canvass support from, among others, Baron Edmond de Rothschild. The Baron was initially opposed to a university, though prepared to fund a Jewish research institute. Weizmann, conscious of the overall importance for the Zionists of securing the Baron's cooperation with the World Zionist Organization in a major project, accepted the research institute but subtly led the Baron to agree that the institute should be the first stage of a university — until the Baron was so convinced that he criticized Weizmann's time-scale for the university as too long!

Weizmann's negotiations with the Baron prefigure his diplomatic triumph three years later in obtaining the Balfour Declaration. This remarkable book makes credible how the boy from Motol could develop in a few decades into an international statesman, while retaining the ability to understand the constituency from which he came. One awaits with confident expectation the successor volume — the only doubt being whether the author can carry out his declared intention of covering the whole of the remainder of Weizmann's life from 1914 to 1952 in a single volume.

V. D. LIPMAN

CHRONICLE

The Statistical and Demographic Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews published last July *British Jewry in the Eighties* by Stanley Waterman and Barry Kosmin. There are four sections: demography; geographic distribution; religion and education; and economy and social services.

The estimate given for the Anglo-Jewish population in the early 1980s is 330,000. (There are no official British census data for religious affiliation.) The authors state that there was 'a rapid increase in the Jewish population of the U.K. from 1881 until the outbreak of the Great War, and again in the decade prior to the Second World War. The zenith . . . was reached in the early 1950s, when the figure was estimated at 430,000, although later research suggests that this estimate was too high. Either way, the population has been in decline since then . . .'.

The total number of synagogue marriages has also been declining in recent years: 1,180 in 1983, 1,153 in 1984, and 1,144 in 1985. On the other hand, the 1985 total is higher than that for 1982, when there were only 1,110 reported synagogue weddings, but lower than the average for the five-year period 1980-84: 1,169. Just under four-fifths of all these marriages were solemnized in Orthodox and Sephardi synagogues while the Reform and Liberal synagogues accounted for 21 to 22 per cent of the total. There has been a marked increase in the number of Sephardi weddings in recent years: 30 in 1982, 45 in 1983, 49 in 1984, and 54 in 1985; these weddings accounted for 2.7 per cent of all synagogue marriages in 1982 but by 1985 the proportion had risen to 4.7 per cent.

Israeli census data show increasing numbers of British-born Jews: 2,790 in 1961, 5,558 in 1972, and 13,352 in 1983. Australia, Canada, and South Africa give data on religion in their censuses. In Australia, there were 5,193 British-born Jews in 1961, 5,663 in 1971, and 5,006 in 1981. In Canada, 6,539 British-born Jews were enumerated in 1961, 8,005 in 1971, and 12,140 in 1981. In South Africa, there were 5,109 British-born Jews in 1970.

The authors note that little is known about the number of Jewish immigrants who settled in the United Kingdom in recent years. 'The only statistics which can be assumed to relate to Jews are those on Israeli-born persons resident in the United Kingdom at the time of the 1971 and 1981 censuses. Even these statistics are suspect because they do not refer to all Israelis, only to those persons born in Israel.' In 1971, 5,170 Israeli-born persons were enumerated in the United Kingdom; and in 1981, 7,106 — an increase of 37.5 per cent. Censuses of the United States give data for mother-tongues and in 1970 there were 19,457 British-born persons who gave Yiddish as their mother-tongue.

The majority of Jews in the United Kingdom live in Greater London. That area 'accounts for 66 per cent of the burials, 68 per cent of synagogue

CHRONICLE

membership and 72 per cent of synagogue weddings', according to communal returns. The authors note that 'although large residential concentrations are evident, . . . in no political unit in Greater London or anywhere in the United Kingdom are Jews in a numerical majority. The vast majority of their neighbours are thus non-Jewish'.

The section on synagogue membership states that in 1983 there were 328 congregations with a total male membership of 78,899 and an independent female membership of 30,527. Provincial synagogues have an average of 154 male members while London synagogues have more than double that average: 329 male members. About 90 per cent of independent female members are affiliated to Central Orthodox synagogues; these women are mainly widows.

As for Jewish education, there was in 1982 a total of 30,328 schoolchildren attending pre-school (1,158), day schools (14,188), and supplementary schools (14,982). Schools under Orthodox auspices account for 81 per cent of the pupils while the Progressive sector (Reform and Liberal) provides a Jewish education for the remaining 19 per cent. The authors add, however, that 'it must be remembered that there are many children from Progressive and unaffiliated homes on the rolls of Jewish day schools, all of which, bar one, are nominally affiliated to Orthodox institutions.' They also note that in the United Kingdom, as is common in Diaspora communities, 'there is a greater proportion of pupils enrolled in all types of Jewish schools at the primary level than there is at the secondary or post-Barmitzvah level'.

In the section on occupations, the authors have to rely on local surveys carried out since the 1960s. These have shown that there are 'a few professions where, nationally, Jews are found in excess of their expected numbers. Among these are medical practitioners, accountants and university teachers. . . . one of the most popular Jewish occupations is that of the London taxi driver. It is estimated that perhaps a third of London cabbies are Jews.' In addition, there are other occupations which have above average Jewish representation: law, dentistry, pharmacy, clothing, and estate agency and property generally. There is a very marked tendency towards self-employment: 55 per cent of Jewish males in Edgware in 1963, 21 per cent in Hackney in 1971, and 44 per cent in Sheffield in 1978 were self-employed.

Finally, the section on social services states that in the London area in 1984 there were 23 Jewish homes for the elderly with 1,218 long-stay and 58 short-stay residents; 6 homes for the mentally handicapped with 270 long-stay and 45 short-stay residents; 14 day centres for the elderly catering for 3,295 individuals; and the provision each week of 4,650 kosher meals on wheels. More than 2,000 paid employees were assisted by some 4,000 volunteers and the authors point out that if we added 'to the 4,000 volunteers in social services, several thousands more who give of their services to youth organizations and religious bodies, we would have the picture of the vast amount of individual personal involvement that the organized Jewish community both requires and achieves and the very high proportion of adults who are involved in a volunteer capacity'.

*

The Kibbutz Research Institute of Haifa University carried out a survey covering 87 kibbutzim of the United Kibbutz Movement and 50 of Kibbutz

CHRONICLE

Artzi. The researchers traced 739 mixed couples with 1,200 children. The intermarriages were between members of the kibbutzim and non-Jewish volunteers. The very great majority had married in civil ceremonies only; 65 per cent of the Gentile partners were women. Two thirds of the mixed couples had continued living in the kibbutz; 7 per cent settled elsewhere in Israel; and the remainder had emigrated, mainly to the volunteers' countries of origin.

*

The North American Jewish Data Bank was inaugurated last June in New York. According to the Data Bank's first *Occasional Paper*, published by the Council of Jewish Federations (730 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003, U.S.A.), some of the most important functions of the Data Bank will be to 'collect and store the reports, code books and tapes from local Jewish population studies in a permanent archive so that they will not be lost to Jewish history and scholarship'; 'collate the existing studies so that they can, even now, be made more comparable and useful'; and the Data Bank 'will be the source of continuing dialogue between the scholars and the practitioners interested in the North American Jewish community. Out of this dialogue will come guidelines so that future studies can be mounted in a more consistent way. Thus, waste and duplication can be avoided and local studies can be more useful to their communities and to the Jewish community at large'.

The Data Bank's 'primary partners' are the Council of Jewish Federations and the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York while the co-operating institutions are the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Brandeis University in the United States. The Vice-President of the Council of Jewish Federations stated: 'We welcome also as equal partners in this enterprise every Federation leader, every campaigner and planner and every academician interested in the Jewish community. . . . Without understanding our Jewish community, how can we serve it?'

*

The Spring 1986 issue of *News from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem* includes a report of a Conference on 'Ethiopian Jewry Under Changing Conditions' held last January. The Conference was sponsored by the University's Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace, the Israel Anthropological Association, and the Ben-Zvi Institute for the Study of Jewish Communities in the East.

In a session on education, an official from the Ministry of Education and Culture said that there were more than 6,000 Ethiopian pupils up to the age of 17 years in Israeli religious schools; two thousand of these were within the framework of Youth Aliyah. A further 700 students beyond school age were enrolled in a variety of institutions with the financial support of the Absorption Ministry's Student Authority.

A representative of the Absorption Ministry 'said that thus far there are 800 Ethiopian families now living in permanent housing. Another 1,000 housing units have been acquired by the government and are being prepared for absorption of more immigrants, and a further 6,000 units will be purchased within two years. The ministry's purpose is to find suitable permanent housing for all of the Ethiopian immigrants. He added that nearly all the Ethiopian

CHRONICLE

immigrants have been moved out of hotels and into the absorption centres or permanent housing. The policy of the ministry in housing is to settle the Ethiopians in communities around Israel in small family groupings so that they will not feel isolated, but not in such concentrations that they will fail to be integrated into the larger population . . .'. The ministry was 'making efforts to find employment for Ethiopians, while providing them at the same time with opportunities to improve their work skills'.

*

Scopus, a publication of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, reports in its Spring 1986 issue that the University's Centre for Jewish Art 'has for the last eight years been recording and documenting in a systematic way the amazing diversity of synagogue art, both in Israel and abroad, just as it is on the verge of becoming extinct. . . . The separate traditions of different communities are being erased'.

With the help of student volunteers from the University's Department of Art History, 150 synagogues have been surveyed; these include those founded by Yemenite, Persian, Iraqi, and Kurdish Jews in Israel. In a Jerusalem synagogue, whose congregation originated from Yannina in north-western Greece, they discovered more than 200 silver dedication plaques which were not openly exhibited. 'The plaques, which cover a 300-year period, bear the names of the donors and the reasons for their dedication (e.g., recovering from ill health, against the evil eye). In some cases the Ten Commandments are also engraved. During the Second World War the plaques were collected from the four synagogues in Yannina and hidden in a cellar. After the war only a few members of the community remained; 15 years ago they sent the collection with someone to Israel with the request that it be delivered to the Yannina community. However, the treasure was just hidden away as the custom of using them to hang around the curtains of the Ark was no longer in practice. Today, thanks to the survey's work, half the collection is in the Israel Museum and was exhibited there recently.'

*

A square in the Greek city of Salonika was renamed last September 'Square of the Jewish Martyrs' in memory of the 56,000 Greek Jews who were killed by the Nazis during the Second World War. The mayor of Salonika conducted the ceremony. On one side of the square there is a school built in memory of the 12,000 Greek Jewish children who perished.

*

The Summer 1986 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* reports the results of a survey conducted by the University's Centre for Strategic Studies last January. A representative sample of 1,172 Jewish residents of Israel were questioned about matters of national security. These respondents did not include any members of kibbutzim. 'The survey showed enormous confidence in the face of outside threats. When asked whether Israel could successfully confront a combined attack by all the Arab states, 75 per cent said yes. War against Syria? 94 per cent said yes. An intensified terror campaign? 92 per cent said yes. Weakening of support by the United States? 69 per cent said yes.'

CHRONICLE

The respondents were asked to identify the 'guardian of Israel' in the Biblical quotation, 'The guardian of Israel slumbers not, nor sleeps'. They were given a list of six choices and 57 per cent said that the guardian was the army of Israel; 17 per cent said that it was God; 13 per cent selected the State of Israel; 10 per cent, the people of Israel; two per cent, the United States; and two per cent said that it was 'every man for himself'.

More than half the respondents (55 per cent) stated that the burden of military service was equitably shared while 78 per cent 'had no quarrel with the length of military service'. The majority (60 per cent) wanted the defence budget to be maintained at current levels, 31 per cent said that that budget should be increased, and the remaining nine per cent stated that it should be cut. On the other hand, when asked whether Israel could best avoid war with the Arabs by pursuing the peace process or by strengthening the army, about two thirds (64 per cent) were in favour of the peace process.

*

The rectors of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid have signed an agreement for academic, scientific, and cultural co-operation between the two institutions. The agreement provides for an exchange of staff, an exchange of publications, joint research, co-operation in supervising research projects by doctoral candidates, and co-operation between the libraries and archives of the two universities.

*

The Executive Committee of the Council of Christians and Jews (CCJ) issued last March in London a statement stating that it was 'a matter of concern to the Council that Jews, and particularly Jewish students, seem to have been singled out as targets for conversion by the missionary activities of certain Christian groups. . . . There are . . . groups who actively seek to convert Jews and who use methods which appear to be insensitive or even deceptive. Although neither the CCJ nor any Church organization has power to prevent such groups working in the way they do, the CCJ deplures any form of deception in evangelization and targeting of Jews for special missionary activity'.

*

The March 1986 issue of *Jewish Affairs*, a publication of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, reports that the Council of Natal Jewry 'has appointed a special committee to make arrangements for the provision of social welfare and/or educational assistance to the Black community. The intention is to endeavour to involve young people in this project'.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Abram, I. B. H., *Jewish Tradition as Permanent Education*, v + 284 pp., translated from the Dutch by Christine E. Thirlway, SVO (PO Box 19050, The Hague, Holland), 1986, 35 Dutch florins.
- Agnon, S. Y., *A Simple Story*, translated and with an Afterword by Hillel Halkin, 246 pp., Schocken Books, New York, 1985, distributed in the United Kingdom and Western Europe by Clio Distribution Services (55 St Thomas Street, Oxford, OX1 1JG), £13.10.
- Aigen, Ronald S. and Gershon D. Hundert, eds., *Community and the Individual Jew: Essays in Honor of Lavy M. Becker*, viii + 195 pp., Reconstructionist Rabbinical College Press, Philadelphia, 1986, \$12.00 (hardback, \$20.00).
- Ata, Ibrahim Wade, *The West Bank Palestinian Family*, xiv + 166 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1986, £25.00.
- Curtis, Michael, ed., *Antisemitism in the Contemporary World*, xi + 333 pp., Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, and London, 1986, distributed in the United Kingdom by Wildwood Distribution Services (Unit 3, Lower Farnham Road, Aldershot, Hants GU12 4DY), £34.00.
- Fatu, Mihai and Mircea Musat, eds., *Horthyist-Fascist Terror in Northwestern Romania, September 1940–October 1944*, xlv + 328 pp., Meridiane Publishing House, Bucharest, 1986, n.p.
- Hasan-Rokem, Galit and Alan Dundes, *The Wandering Jew: Essays in the Interpretation of a Christian Legend*, ix + 278 pp., Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1986, \$27.50.
- Hunter, James Davison and Stephen C. Ainlay, eds., *Making Sense of Modern Times: Peter L. Berger and the Vision of Interpretive Sociology*, ix + 259 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1986, £7.95 (paperback).
- Mannheim, Karl, *Conservatism. A Contribution to the Sociology of Knowledge*, edited and introduced by David Kettler, Volker Meja, and Nico Stehr; and translated by David Kettler and Volker Meja from a first draft by Elizabeth R. King, vii + 256 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and New York, 1986, £25.00.
- Meijers, Daniel, *Hasidic Groups and Other Religious Collectivities in Orthodox Judaism*, 34 pp., Free University Press, Amsterdam, 1986, 12.50 Dutch florins.
- Michman, Jozeph and Tirtsah Levie, eds., *Dutch Jewish History: Proceedings of the Symposium on the History of the Jews in the Netherlands, November 28–December 3, 1982, Tel-Aviv–Jerusalem*, published by Tel-Aviv University, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and the Institute for Research on Dutch Jewry, Jerusalem, 1984, n.p.
- Sandberg, Neil C., *Jewish Life in Los Angeles. A Window to Tomorrow*, xii + 210 pp., University Press of America, Lanham, New York, and London, 1986, n.p.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Sandler, Shmuel and Hillel Frisch, *Israel, the Palestinians, and the West Bank. A Study in Intercommunal Conflict*, xvi + 190 pp., Lexington Books, Lexington, Ma., and Toronto, 1984 (second printing, 1985), distributed outside America by Gower Publishing Co. (Croft Road, Aldershot, Hampshire, England), £21.00.
- Schmelz, Usiel O. and Gad Nathan, *Studies in the Population of Israel in Honor of Roberto Bachi*, xiv + 444 pp., Magnes Press, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1986, n.p.
- Shenker, Barry, *Intentional Communities. Ideology and Alienation in Communal Societies*, ix + 283 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1986, £20.00.
- Waterman, Stanley and Barry Kosmin, *British Jewry in the Eighties. A Statistical and Geographical Study*, 56 pp., Board of Deputies of British Jews (Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place, London, WC1H 0EP), 1986, £4.00.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

- BENEWICK, Robert**; Ph.D. Reader in Politics, University of Sussex. Chief publications: *The Fascist Movement in Britain*, 1972; and co-editor of *Direct Action and Democratic Politics*, 1972, *Knowledge and Belief in Politics*, 1973, *The Crowd in Contemporary Britain*, forthcoming, and *Reforming the Revolution: China in the 1980s*, forthcoming.
- NEUBERGER, Benyamin**; Ph.D. Senior Lecturer in African Studies at Tel Aviv University and Senior Lecturer in Political Science at Everyman's University (Israel's Open University). Chief publications: *Involvement, Invasion and Withdrawal: Qadhafi's Lybia and Chad 1969-1981*, 1982; 'On Dealing with Multi-ethnicity in Europe and Africa' in *Plural Societies*, vol. 15, no. 3, October 1984; 'Early African Nationalism, Judaism and Zionism — Edward Wilmot Blyden' in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 47, no. 2, Spring 1985; *Modern Democracy: Intellectual Roots and Basic Concepts*, 1985; and *National Self-Determination in Postcolonial Africa*, 1986.
- SHIMONI, Gideon**; Ph.D. Senior Lecturer and incumbent of the Shlomo Argov Chair in Israel-Diaspora Relations at the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Chief publications: *Gandhi, Satyagraha and the Jews*, 1977; *Jews and Zionism: The South African Experience 1910-1967*, 1980; 'Ideological Perspectives' in Moshe Davis, ed., *Zionism in Transition*, 1980; 'Selig Brodetsky and the Ascendancy of Zionism in Anglo-Jewry (1939-1945)' in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 22, no. 2, 1980; and 'Poale Zion: A Zionist Transplant in Britain' in Peter Y. Medding, ed., *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, vol. 2, 1986.
- SINGER, Steven**; Ph.D. Rabbi, Congregation Beth Sholom, Providence, Rhode Island. Chief publications: 'The Anglo-Jewish Ministry in Early Victorian London' in *Modern Judaism*, vol. 5, no. 3, October 1985 and 'Orthodox Judaism and the Smaller American Community' in *Tradition*, vol. 22, no. 1, Spring 1986.

THE
JEWISH JOURNAL
OF
SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR Judith Freedman

VOLUME TWENTY-EIGHT 1986

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

CONTENTS

Books Received	81, 166	Early Victorian London, 1840-1860 by <i>Steven Singer</i>	117
Books Reviewed	3, 87	Non-Zionists in Anglo-Jewry, 1937-1948, by <i>Gideon Shimoni</i>	89
Chronicle	75, 161	Notes on Contributors	83, 168
Edah and 'Ethnic Group' in Israel by <i>Ernest Krausz</i>	5	Recent Trends in Anglo-Jewish Marriages by <i>Barry A. Kosmin and Stanley Waterman</i>	49
From Anti-Zionism to Non-Zionism in Anglo-Jewry 1917-1937 by <i>Gideon Shimoni</i>	19	W. E. B. DuBois on Black Nationalism and Zionism by <i>Benjamin Neuberger</i>	139
Ideology and the Holocaust by <i>Robert Benewick</i>	145		
Jewish Religious Observance in			

BOOKS REVIEWED

Bernstein, S., <i>The Renaissance of the Torah Jew</i>	149	Halkin, A. and D. Hartman, <i>Crisis and Leadership: Epistles of Maimonides</i>	154
Browning, C., <i>Fateful Months. Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution</i>	145	Krausz, E. and D. Glanz, eds., <i>Politics and Society in Israel</i>	64
Endelman, J. E., <i>The Jewish Community of Indianapolis</i>	59	Reinharz, J., <i>Chaim Weizmann: The Making of a Zionist Leader</i>	157
Feldman, L. G., <i>The Special Relationship Between West Germany and Israel</i>	61	Rotenstreich, N., <i>Jews and German Philosophy</i>	67
Goldscheider, C., <i>Jewish Continuity and Change: Emerging Patterns in America</i>	150	Taylor, S., <i>Prelude to Genocide. Nazi Ideology and the Struggle for Power</i>	145
Goldscheider, C. and A. S. Zuckerman, <i>The Transformation of the Jews</i>	63	Wigoder, G., ed., <i>Contemporary Jewish Studies in Honor of Moshe Davis</i>	68
Green, N. L., <i>The Pletzl of Paris. Jewish Immigrant Workers in the Belle Epoque</i>	152	Wistrich, R., <i>Hitler's Apocalypse. Jews and the Nazi Legacy</i>	145
		Zeitlin, I. M., <i>Ancient Judaism. Biblical Criticism From Max Weber to the Present</i>	70

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

Benewick, R.	145	Shimoni, G.	19, 89
Kosmin, B. A.	49	Singer, S.	117
Krausz, E.	5	Waterman, S.	49
Neuberger, B.	139		

AUTHORS OF BOOKS REVIEWS

Benewick, R.	145	Jacobs, L.	149, 154
Capitanchik, D.	64	Lipman, V. D.	59, 152, 157
Carlebach, J.	61, 67	Sacks, J.	70
Gartner, L. P.	63, 150	Wistrich, R.	68

SOVIET JEWISH AFFAIRS

A Journal on Jewish
Problems in the USSR
and Eastern Europe

Volume 16 Number 2 Summer 1986 Published three times yearly

ARTICLES

LUKASZ HIRSZOWICZ

The Twenty-Seventh Congress of the CPSU

JOSHUA ROTHENBERG

The Przytyk Pogrom

JOHN P. FOX

Confronting the Holocaust

REVIEWS include

MARK A. EPSTEIN on **Portrait of a Hero—Shcharansky:**
Hero of Our Time by Martin Gilbert

JOSEPHINE WOLL on **Jews and Jewish Themes Portrayed in**
Soviet Literature—*The Image of the Jew in Soviet Literature*
in the Post-Stalin Period by Jakub Blum and Vera Rich

BOOKS RECEIVED

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

1 November 1985-28 February 1986

Published by the INSTITUTE OF JEWISH AFFAIRS

11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX

Annual subscription: individuals: £12.00 (\$20.00);
institutions: £16.00 (\$25.00); single issue: £4.50 (\$7.50)