THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XXXI : NUMBER 2 : DECEMBER 1989

CONTENTS

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 XXXI : Number 2 : December 1989

CONTENTS

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

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

BOOKS REVIEWED

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

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

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.

ANGLO-JEWRY AND THE 1944 EDUCATION ACT

Bernard Steinberg

THE new era in Jewish education inaugurated at the end of the Second World War has been characterized in Diaspora communities by corresponding innovations, expansion of amenities, and the implementation of new policies. In particular, the gradual general acceptance of the day-school as a crucial agency for perpetuating group survival has throughout the Diaspora become the central related issue. As is now well-documented, it took a number of years before this acceptance became an integral part of communal policy.[1]

For Anglo-Jewry this new era began even before the war was over, with the passing by Parliament of the 1944 Education Act, in itself a momentous landmark in modern British social history. Since 1870, public education in England and Wales had been organized within the two sectors of the so-called 'dual system': the council schools, which were non-denominational, and the voluntary schools, under the aegis of Christian denominations (with the exception, since 1938, of several Jewish day-schools) which functioned by means of financial grants from the public sector. Among the important reforms and innovations of the 1944 Act were a number of clauses concerned with religious education.[2] These fell under two main headings. First, there were those clauses relating to the provision of religious instruction in the state-maintained non-denominational council schools. Second, there was a new policy for state financial aid to schools maintained by the various religious denominations, including the small number of Jewish day-schools. Both these areas of concern had clear implications for the Jewish community, the first with regard to Jewish pupils attending council schools, and the second with regard to the future of pre-war voluntary Jewish day-schools.

Until the Education Act of 1944, the state-maintained school system of England and Wales had been highly decentralized, in keeping with principles laid down by the Acts of 1870 and 1902. Local authorities were responsible for the establishment and supervision of the state schools: council schools, county schools, and provided schools. The schools established by religious denominations, as opposed to local

authorities, were known as voluntary schools, church schools, or non-provided schools; the 1870 Act and subsequent legislation secured their continued existence by ensuring financial assistance. One important provision of the 1944 Act was to restructure the state-maintained system to comprise two distinct stages of education: 1) primary schools for pupils up to the age of eleven years and 2) various types of secondary schools — such as grammar schools for pupils deemed to be academically very able, and secondary modern schools or technical schools for others. Later, in the 1950s, comprehensive schools (originally known as multilateral schools, accommodating pupils of all types of ability and aptitude) began to replace the original tripartite secondary school structure in most local authorities.

In Great Britain, supplementary schools, which had been the predominant Jewish educational agencies, functioned exclusively within local Jewish communal administrative frameworks. The emergence of denominational day-schools, not only in the United Kingdom but elsewhere in the Diaspora, raised new issues within the general ambit of Church-State relations. In some countries, notably the United States, there has been until comparatively recently no significant assistance from public funds to denominational schools, while elsewhere by contrast, notably in the Netherlands, schools of the various denominations have traditionally received state recognition as well as generous support from public funds.[3]

This paper considers the developments in the provision of Jewish education in Britain before and during the immediate post-war era in the following three related areas: changes in communal policy regarding Jewish education; the politics of negotiation within the Jewish community, and between it and the public authorities; and the emergence of new spheres of interest and allegiance in post-war Anglo-Jewry. It also considers the well-established 'middle of the road' orthodoxy which characterized Anglo-Jewry during that period, when it co-existed with Reform and Liberal Jewry as well as with an emergent ultra-orthodox sector. Finally, it reaches the conclusion that by comparison with other religious denominations in Britain — especially the Roman Catholics — the Anglo-Jewish communal establishment generally showed a lack of cohesion and purpose, as a result of which it was slow to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the Education Act of 1944.

Prelude to Post-war Reconstruction

The two great administrative defects of pre-war Jewish education in Britain were the unnecessary multiplicity of organizations concerned and the ever-present financial problems of institutions largely dependent upon charity. At the outbreak of war, the Joint Emergency

Committee for Jewish Religious Education had been set up to deal with the disruption resulting from the mass evacuation of school-children from London and other large cities. Paradoxically, this body succeeded in placing the entire system on a firm footing, as the result of applying the principles of centralization and communal taxation.[4] It became evident that a return to the pre-1939 situation was unthinkable. Amongst other considerations which dictated a totally new policy was the fact that the residential distribution of the larger Jewish communities had drastically changed, mainly as a result of the wartime air raids. This was particularly the case of London's East End, hitherto accommodating the largest concentration of Jews in the country, while similar dispersions took place in Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, and Glasgow.

As a result of this, part-time schooling provision in former densely-populated Jewish areas now became largely impracticable. Already towards the end of the war, after the return from the countryside to the urban areas of many Jewish children, there were under two hundred pupils on the rolls of the eight Talmud Torahs in the East End of London. This figure contrasted with some 3,000 pupils at the outbreak of the war, while in new areas of Jewish population there was no corresponding increase in Jewish educational centres or pupil enrolment.[5] The pre-war day-schools returned to London and other provincial centres with their numbers greatly depleted. The largest of these, The Jews' Free School, had been bombed and as a result had ceased to function. In all, of the seven state-aided Jewish day-schools which had existed in London in 1939, only two were still functioning at the end of the war.[6] The day-schools in Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham, although they had survived the war, were also faced with falling enrolments brought about by the dispersion of the local Jewish communities.

Against this background, the legislative provisions of the 1944 Act impinged directly upon any plans, existent or projected, for the future of Jewish education in England and Wales. In June 1941, the Board of Education (the forerunner of the Ministry of Education) prepared a memorandum entitled *Education After the War* which put forward proposals and suggestions for reform of the educational system, with a Foreword stating that the memorandum was to 'serve as a basis for discussion'. It was sent to concerned organizations and individuals, with a covering letter stressing its 'confidential character', and contained a chapter entitled 'The Dual System and Allied Problems'. Copies of the memorandum were sent to the Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations and to the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. In July 1943, the White Paper on *Educational Reconstruction* was published; it contained details of post-war planning.[7] As in the case of other religious denominations, formal and informal contacts had

been made between government representatives and various Jewish communal leaders and organizations, with the intention of clarifying the prevailing viewpoints over the various projected clauses of the impending Education Act.

Before the publication of the 1943 White Paper, there had been several meetings between the Chief Rabbi, Dr J. H. Hertz, and Mr R. A. Butler, the government minister who was to draw up the 1944 Act.[8] In the course of subsequent correspondence, the Chief Rabbi requested that Jewish teachers be granted a right of entry into state-maintained schools, in order to give religious instruction to Jewish pupils. He further requested (in disagreement with the views of the Joint Emergency Committee) that the religious affiliations of all pupils be registered at the beginning of their school careers. This particular point of disagreement epitomized the lack of unity of approach within the community. Although the Joint Emergency Committee (JEC) was by far the largest educational authority in Anglo-Jewry, it did not represent all sectors, and moreover it had been set up only for the duration of the war. As the result of an earlier confrontation with the JEC, over the question of collaboration with Reform and Liberal congregations, the Chief Rabbi had in 1941 set up a National Council of Jewish Religious Education and had given these congregations the choice of accepting his authority or 'contracting out', thus rendering further discussion pointless.[9] Nevertheless, representatives of the Liberal and Reform congregations and of the Joint Emergency Committee did have further meetings over some form of liaison. Thus, from the very outset in the negotiations that preceded the 1944 Act, Anglo-Jewry had no unified representation of its interests. Although there were also indications of a lack of general concern within the Jewish community itself about the Act and its implications, the JEC planned to inaugurate an appeal for £500,000 for educational reconstruction; but the appeal was never launched.[10]

After the first reading in Parliament of the Bill preceding the Act, the JEC arranged a meeting with the governors of six Jewish voluntary day-schools in order to consider the likely reactions within the community to the reopening of these schools and others under the provisions of the Act. There was naturally a reluctance to establish schools without the certainty of an adequate intake of Jewish pupils. Accordingly, methods were considered of testing viewpoints within Anglo-Jewry, and for this purpose plans were made for a consultation with representatives of the rabbinate, for a public meeting, and for the publication of an appropiate booklet. The Board of Deputies of British Jews, as the overall representative body of the entire community, became involved in all these developments by reconvening its Education Committee in 1944, and by establishing a special liaison committee for contact with other bodies.[11] In the course of subsequent

developments, however, neither of these committees was to play a significant part.

The New Plans for the Voluntary Schools

Since supplementary part-time Jewish education was in no way affected by the impending new legislation, it was the future of the existing Jewish day-schools and the plans for establishing new day-schools that were now at issue. In addition to this, the position of Jewish pupils in state-maintained primary and secondary schools was now directly affected by those clauses which dealt with religious instruction in such schools. When Mr Butler addressed a special meeting of the Board of Deputies early in 1944, shortly before the Act was promulgated, the President of the Board stated: 'We Jews consider his educational proposals to be a spur and stimulus to us and to every other denomination in the country. Jewish religious education must rise to the level prescribed for the general education of the country'.[12] However, the Jewish community failed to display the active interest shown by the Christian denominations during the consultations which took place before the drafting of the Act. Nor was it involved at a national level in the controversies which arose over those sections concerning the voluntary schools and religious instruction in the county schools. The Anglicans, who constituted the largest of the Christian denominations, were divided over policies relating to their voluntary schools. A steadily increasing number of these schools had been closing down since 1918, while an agreed syllabus for religious instruction in state institutions had reduced the need for such schools. The Nonconformists, of whom the Methodists were the most important constituent, were, by contrast, resolutely opposed to the preservation of the dual system. They preferred to rely instead on their strong network of Sunday Schools.[13]

In general, the official Anglo-Jewish view was vaguely in line with that of the Roman Catholics and of an active section among the Anglicans — that is, in favour of retaining the denominational schools, but on a basis of equality within the state system, while preserving their independence and still enjoying the material advantages of aid from public funds. However, concern was expressed over a proposed 'agreed syllabus' for Scripture, with the implied abrogation of the right of children to be exempted from such religious instruction in county schools. Unlike its import for Christian denominations, an agreed syllabus would have been totally unacceptable to Jews, since its common denominator remained the New Testament. For their own particular reasons, the Roman Catholics and many Anglicans also opposed the principle of an agreed syllabus.

Apart from this, the rather muted Jewish expressions of concern during the period in which the legislation was being prepared

contrasted strongly with the more assertive attitudes of the Catholics. In theory, both communities should have had the same two basic goals in view: the preservation of the voluntary system with more generous government grants, and more favourable facilities in the state schools for denominational religious instruction on the premises during school hours. By means of an arrangement subsequently to be known as 'withdrawal classes', pupils were to be given separate religious instruction in accordance with parental wishes. In reality, however, the Catholics sought to establish day-schools for as many children in their community as possible, whereas the Jews were more concerned that their own children attending state schools should not be subjected to Christian doctrines. Unlike the Catholics, therefore, the Jews were not primarily concerned with augmenting their own depleted system of day-schools. There is, for example, no statement of Jewish policy which could compare with that enunciated in 1944 in an Advent pastoral letter by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle: 'I therefore lay down this Catholic principle. We shall stand by it and we shall not surrender — we shall have our Catholic schools where our Catholic children shall be educated in a Catholic atmosphere by Catholic teachers approved by a Catholic authority. We cannot, and will not, surrender our schools'.[14] Neither was there in Anglo-Jewry any pronouncement of policy comparable with that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, as appeared in the Catholic press:[15]

> We maintain that in this England of ours which takes pride in its religious freedom, the State should provide schools to which Anglicans and Free Churchmen, Catholics and Jews may send their children with good conscience, always supposing there are a sufficient number of such children in a given area to warrant the establishment of a school.

The comparative reticence of the Jews can perhaps be attributed to the absence of a centralized authoritative leadership comparable with that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, as well as to the prevailing lack of unanimity of attitudes over the question of the day-schools. Whilst there certainly was agreement about the need for providing Jewish education in one form or another, there was also strong opposition to establishing or re-establishing such schools.[16] When the 1944 Act was implemented and when government grants were available for exisiting and new schools, the Catholics and to a lesser extent the Anglicans were thus able to benefit. By contrast, the Jews concentrated first on the religious education of their children in state schools by arranging visiting teachers and withdrawal classes, and second on supplementary schooling financed by their own community. At that stage in the history of Anglo-Jewry, the prevailing ethos was against the principle of separate Jewish day-schools. During the opening decades of the present century, these schools had served successfully as agencies of integration

and acculturation for the children of immigrants.[17] Their success perhaps inevitably prompted the new generation, born and educated in England, to send its children to non-denominational state schools.

A closer examination of the relevant clauses of the 1944 Education Act reveals what Jewry stood to gain from it. Two options were available for existing and for proposed new denominational schools. They could qualify for voluntary aided status, under which governors or managers of such schools needed to provide half the cost for necessary improvements and alterations to bring the school buildings up to required standards. Thereafter, the governing body was responsible for half the cost of repairs and maintenance to school buildings. In return for these obligations, the local education authority was to shoulder all other financial responsibilities, including the salaries of the established teaching staff. The school governing body retained full control over provision of religious instruction in accordance with the original trust deed of the school. The other alternative was that of voluntary controlled status.[18] In such cases the school remained under the control of the local education authority which was responsible for all the expenses of maintaining the school and which had the right to appoint two-thirds of the governing body. Denominational instruction was to be limited to two periods a week, whilst remaining religious instruction was to be based upon an agreed syllabus.[19] Additional clauses within the Act made provision for what was called 'transferred' and 'substituted' status. These clauses concerned schools in existence before the war which had been closed or had been destroyed by air raids and which were now to be reopened in new sites.[20] They were of special interest for the pre-war Jewish voluntary schools which had been situated in former areas of Jewish settlement and which could now be established in districts to which large numbers of Jewish households had moved.

Since the vast majority of Jewish children attended county primary and secondary schools, the provisions in the Act concerning denominational religious instruction in these schools were at the time of more pressing importance. The new proposals for withdrawal classes carried much further the equivalent provisions within the preceding 1936 Act. Denominational religious instruction could now be given at any time of the school-day at the discretion of the head teacher, instead of the beginning or the end of the day as hitherto. Where no alternative accommodation was available for withdrawal classes for secondary school pupils, the local education authority would have to provide facilities on school premises for this purpose.[21] In this connection, the proposed raising of the school-leaving age to fifteen years meant that by means of the new legislation, Jewish education would now be available to a larger number of children.

However, the day-schools remained the key issue in matters relating to post-war reconstruction. By opting for voluntary aided status, the

existing Jewish schools could have continued or resumed their existence in comparative security, free from constant financial problems, provided that they were prepared to spend the sums required to bring their buildings up to standard. The advantages of 'transferred' and 'substituted' status would have facilitated the opening of such schools in new areas of Jewish settlement. The only real problems envisaged were, first, organization and staffing, and second, the fact that there was little reliable information about parental attitudes to Jewish day-schools. Anglo-Jewry's nearest equivalent to an official policy statement on the voluntary schools took the form of a Report by a special committee set up in preparation for a Conference on Educational Reconstruction to be held in London in November 1945.[22] The Report — to be discussed presently in more detail — noted that the decline of the pre-war Jewish non-provided schools in London was the result of a decreasing number of potential pupils; these schools had prospered in the early decades of the present century because of the influx of Jewish immigrants.

Three factors were now responsible for the decline — the shift of Jewish population, the unwillingness of parents to send their children to distant schools, and the decline in the birth-rate. The Report favoured the continuing existence of Jewish primary day-schools, and also recommended the establishment of one centrally-situated multilateral secondary school in London. Furthermore, future decisions concerning the existing schools should be taken jointly by the governing bodies together with a central authority to be set up as successor to the Joint Emergency Committee. The ever-present preoccupation of planners continued to be their uncertainty about the attitudes of Jewish parents. Once new day-schools were established, would sufficient numbers of parents be willing to enrol their children, or would they consider such schools as centres of self-imposed segregation? Despite all the benefits to be derived from the new dispensation, such considerations led to cautious policies, with the result that no firm decisions or plans were made.

By contrast, there were others, not within the mainstream of the Anglo-Jewish leadership, who were anxious to go ahead with day-school development, notwithstanding the uncertain consequences. Of these, Rabbi Dr Solomon Schonfeld (1912–84) was the most prominent. He maintained that current communal policies, with their stress on voluntary part-time schooling, would fail to take advantage of impending post-war opportunities, with sad consequences for the future of Anglo-Jewry.[23] Solomon Schonfeld had succeeded his father, Rabbi Dr Victor Schonfeld, as spiritual leader of the North London Beth Hamedrash (subsequently known as the Adath Yisroel Congregation) and as principal of the Jewish Secondary School which he had established shortly before he died. Both the congregation and the

day-school represented a stricter form of orthodoxy than that typified by the mainstream United Synagogue congregations. By 1939 the school, which was not state-aided, had a combined enrolment of some 550 pupils in its junior and senior departments. It placed more emphasis on religious studies than did other existing Jewish day-schools. Both the congregation and the school drew their support largely from Orthodox refugees from Europe, many of whom had been allowed to enter Britain largely as a result of Solomon Schonfeld's intercession with the appropriate government authorities. During the war the school was evacuated to Shefford in Bedfordshire, with a high proportion of refugee children among its pupils. At the end of the war, Solomon Schonfeld led a team of relief workers to liberated Europe. He was instrumental in bringing a large number of orphaned Jewish child survivors to Britain; many of them became pupils of his original school and of subsequent schools which he established.[24] As early as November 1943, he wrote with characteristic forthrightness about the existing state of Anglo-Jewish education:[25]

> It is admitted that parents will need a great deal of reorientation before they fall in with the training of their children. But in a matter which so intimately affects the Jewish future, the effort is surely worthwhile. Anglo-Jewry needs fifty Jewish day schools and Empire Jewry probably requires a similar number
>
> British Jewry! What are you going to do about it? You have resources for elaborate houses, private and communal, for tombstones, furs, diamonds and pleasures. What about the well-being of your children, and the future of your people?

The Conference on Educational Reconstruction

As early as 1943, there were concerted efforts — by the Jewish press, by the Joint Emergency Committee, and by means of special publications, meetings and conferences in London and the provinces — to combat the general apathy. The *Jewish Chronicle* lamented:[26]

> ... on the subject of Jewish education British Jewry as a whole is obstinately apathetic, however valiantly a minority strive to awaken it from its torpor ... it is for nothing less than a spiritual revolution that our educational authorities have got to labour, a revolution to bring us back to Judaism, by saving our children from the horrors of Jewish ignorance.

Apart from the lack of motivation, there was also communal disunity. The Joint Emergency Committee was by no means representative of Anglo-Jewry as a whole. As the result of the Chief Rabbi's veto, the Liberal and Reform Congregations were excluded from direct participation in any overall scheme relating to post-war development. In addition, except for a few months during 1944, the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations (which had been established several years

earlier under the leadership of Rabbi Solomon Schonfeld and whose members consisted predominantly of recent arrivals from Europe) remained aloof from the mainstream Joint Emergency Committee, preferring to administer its own separate system.[27] This absence of overall representation was to set the tone for post-war intra-communal relations between mainstream Orthodox Jewry and the so-called 'left-wing' and 'right-wing' elements.

While the Education Bill was already before the House of Commons, preparations were made for a Conference on Educational Reconstruction within Anglo-Jewry. Plans for that Conference had been considered as early as December 1943 at an executive committee meeting of the JEC.[28] At that meeting, a sub-committee had reported that in an interview with the Chief Rabbi, it had failed to establish the principle of unified communal co-ordination and collaboration. Nevertheless, the executive committee discussed arrangements for a conference at the earliest convenient date, at which all sections of the community were to be represented. Three further sub-committees were delegated to examine each of the questions of organization, finance, and education, and to present their reports to the Conference. The matter was urgent, since a most important government policy statement, the White Paper entitled *Educational Reconstruction*, had been published some months earlier, in July 1943.[29] While all other religious communities had defined their attitudes, Anglo-Jewry had not yet made any official pronouncement. The executive committee finally decided that the Communal Conference should take place before May 1944; but in fact it was only in November 1945 that it was held.

Dr Nathan Morris, Education Officer of the Joint Emergency Committee, had presented in 1943 a blueprint for post-war reconstruction.[30] Some of his more important proposals included the setting up of two administrative bodies, one for London and one for the provinces. He advocated the 'reconstruction in the material as well as in the educational sense, of the Jewish day school', and he estimated that London would require four schools, two of which should comprise composite infant, primary, and secondary units.[31] He also strongly recommended the establishment of seven Jewish Higher Education Centres, two in London and the others in the larger provincial communities. He estimated that one quarter of the Jewish school population would attend all these institutions and this was believed to be in accord with the realities of the situation.

One of the public meetings was held in January 1944; it was organized by the United Synagogue in its capacity as the main synagogal body in London, and by far the largest in Britain. The Chief Rabbi, who was indisposed, sent a message stressing the need for 'unity in our ranks, and the removal of uncertainty as to the content and spirit of the religious knowledge to be imparted'. The meeting passed several

resolutions, recognizing the importance of the proposals contained in the Education Bill, and expressing the hope 'that Anglo Jewry will use the great opportunity presented by the reconstruction of education to enable the Jewish community to continue to make its full contribution to the spiritual life of the nation'.[32]

The Conference, which was held in London on 25–26 November 1945, was officially designated as 'The Communal Conference on the Reconstruction of Jewish Education in Great Britain'; it was attended by more than 200 delegates, the majority representing official organizations, but some having been invited in a personal capacity.[33] It was overshadowed by the absence of the Chief Rabbi, who was still ill. There were three main sessions — on organization, finance, and education — dealing with the reports of each of the three sub-committees set up in December 1943. There was also a session concerned with Jewish Education and Jewish Youth, in addition to a well-attended public meeting. The report of the organization sub-committee was presented at the first session. Its essence was a draft scheme for the establishment of two bodies to replace those organizations that had existed before 1939. The two new bodies, a Central Council for Jewish Religious Education for the country as a whole, and a specific Board for London, were to be representative of the entire Orthodox community. The new London Board was to replace three pre-war organizations — the Jewish Religious Education Board, the Union of Hebrew and Religion Classes, and the Talmud Torah Trust. There was now no opposition to the idea of rationalization, largely because of the success of the Joint Emergency Committee. When the resolution for the adoption of the report was put to the Conference, it was carried with acclamation.

At the same session, the report of the committee set up to look into the future of the pre-war state-aided voluntary day-schools was cautious; it recommended that 'all decisions regarding the future of each school and/or the utilization of its assets should be taken jointly and in conjunction with the Central Authority for Jewish Religious Education in the Metropolis which is shortly to be set up as successor to the Joint Emergency Committee'.[34] Although the committee was concerned only with the pre-war schools in London, it was clear that its findings and conclusions would also be of interest to the provincial communities and its report was also enthusiastically received. It pointed out that whereas in 1939 the community had had fourteen day-schools with a combined total enrolment of 4,900 children, there were now only seven schools with under a thousand pupils.[35]

The second session of the Conference was concerned with finance and was presented with a scheme for communal taxation. The pre-war system, based largely on charitable donations, had long caused dissatisfaction, being undignified and unreliable. The report of the

finance sub-committee pointed out that since synagogues were the central institutions of the community, the only way of ensuring adequate funding was by means of a tax upon synagogue membership contributions. Every constituent congregation had already agreed to a contributions increase of 33⅓ per cent for this purpose. In general, the report was very favourably received by the delegates, many of whom advocated the abolition of fees for schooling. A delegate from Leeds mentioned that in his community an additional 50 per cent had been proposed for synagogue seat rentals, which would provide an expenditure of £3 per pupil per annum.[36] The session ended with the unanimous acceptance of the report and its proposals.

At the third session, Dr Morris presented the report of the education sub-committee, which had consisted of himself and the Chief Rabbi. That report included a series of syllabuses which were in effect the first comprehensive effort in this field to provide for all age-groups within the system.[37] Because of the failing health of the Chief Rabbi, some of his functions on the two-man sub-committee had been delegated to Dayan Dr Grunfeld of the London Beth Din. In content, the syllabuses presented nothing revolutionary, since the compilers were motivated by the need to preserve age-old traditions. It was more with method that the report took issue:[38]

> What we need is not the return to the Heder, but rather an effort to recapture something of the Grand Idea which formed the heart of historic Jewish education: 'The Unity of Education with Life'. It can be made to serve as a flexible and fertile rule of method and may be applied to the whole scale of our educational work. Let us not alone teach the children about the synagogue, but create opportunities which would enable them to share in its life and work. Let us not only recount to the children the praises of Judaism, but seize every chance to bring it within their reach and grasp.

The syllabuses abounded in useful suggestions for teachers, and also took into account the conditions under which the classes usually met. Great importance was attached to project work, whilst rote learning was roundly condemned. It was this third session that produced the most stimulating discussion and controversy. Nevertheless, none of the ensuing speakers disagreed radically with the proposals, and after all the dissenting points and alternative suggestions had been discussed, the syllabuses were adopted unanimously.

The session concerned with Jewish education and youth differed from the previous three, in that it was not based on any report of an investigating sub-committee.[39] Several delegates pointed to the failure of the Joint Emergency Committee in the area of youth organizations, and it was acknowledged that most Jewish adolescents were outside any organized system. The social and sports clubs of the young needed spiritual guidance, co-ordinated by one organization. By contrast, the

Jewish Youth Study Groups movement, established during the war, was the only notable positive achievement in this sphere.

The crowded public meeting reflected the keen general interest which had been aroused. The speakers, all eminent leaders of Anglo-Jewry, stressed the importance of the Conference as a landmark in the history of the community. It was also emphasized that the Jews of Britain now constituted the only intact surviving Jewish community of Europe, and that its effective post-war reconstruction was an urgent necessity. Dr Epstein, chairman of the JEC, reminded the members of the audience of the new communal obligations resulting from the Conference's decisions about a new financing structure. When he asked them if they were prepared to pay, he was answered by loud cries of 'yes' from all parts of the hall. The meeting concluded with an exhortation from its chairman, Sir Robert Waley-Cohen: 'Go out and make your synagogues play their part in the great scheme to which we have set our hands'.[40] The non-representation at the Conference of the Reform and Liberal congregations and of the 'rightist' Orthodox segments was to prove ominous. Although their non-participation was regretted, their condition of separateness served to underline the fact that the unity achieved was not total. With regard to day-school policy, the Conference presaged a period of vacillation and uncertainty, in that it readily accepted the somewhat non-committal recommendations of the voluntary schools sub-committee. Here again, subsequent events were to show the regrettable effects of these reservations.

The New Central Administrative Bodies

The first sequel to the Conference was the replacement of the three pre-war London bodies by a single London Board of Jewish Religious Education. This was a comparatively easy task, since those bodies had already pooled their resources and activities at the beginning of the war, and their affairs were officially wound up at specially convened executive meetings. The London Board came officially into existence on the first day of May 1946, although its formal constitution was adopted only in March 1949.[41] This constitution assumed wide powers of administrative and financial responsibility, involving not only part-time Jewish education, but also the overall administration of the surviving pre-war day-schools in London, and of the assets of those schools which had closed down during the war.

Membership of the London Board was drawn primarily from congregations of the United Synagogue, which contributed to its funds by means of a levy on synagogue seat rentals or membership fees; but there were also representatives from other Orthodox bodies. The powers vested in the Board included the important clause: 'To enter into relations with government departments, local authorities and

other public bodies for the furtherance of its objects'.[42] One of its standing committees assumed responsibility for the withdrawal classes in council schools. In general, the constitution and by-laws of the new London Board were in the spirit of the draft scheme presented to the 1945 Conference. Its policy was consciously based on the principles of the three entities which it had replaced, while its leading officials were former education officers of those organizations. These officials had worked together in the wartime Joint Emergency Committee, so that the new administration presented no difficulties on that score. In terms of its constitution, the London Board had as its president the Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations, thus ensuring its adherence to accepted Orthodox principles. Chief Rabbi Hertz had died and the first president was his successor, Rabbi Dr Israel Brodie.

The second post-war body, the Central Council for Jewish Religious Education, also set up in 1946, was essentially the same entity as its pre-1939 namesake. It continued to function as the department of the Jewish Memorial Council (JMC) directly concerned with education, and its terms of reference included the clauses set out in the original *Memorandum of Association* of the JMC, ratified in 1924:[43]

> To promote and co-ordinate Jewish religious educational effort in the British Empire.
>
> To further the training of rabbis, ministers, and other congregational officials, and teachers of Hebrew and Jewish religion.
>
> To arrange for educational courses, lectures and examinations.
>
> To ensure adequate inspection of schools and other educational institutions.

It was proposed that the Central Council should also be responsible for the production and distribution of religious educational material, for the allocation of financial grants, for organizing consultations and conferences, and for conducting educational campaigns such as education weeks.[44] The Central Council exercised no direct administrative control over any particular area and although it was not primarily concerned with Jewish education in London, it worked in close liaison with the London Board.

The reports of the inspectors of the Central Council reveal other important activities in addition to those specified above. For example, the successful Jewish Youth Study Groups movement founded during the war was now under its charge, with one of its regular activities being the organization of summer and winter schools for secondary school pupils. The Central Council also supplied visiting tutors for Jewish pupils who were boarders at the prestigious English public schools, and therefore isolated from any Jewish influences. Altogether, twelve such schools received regular visits, and at two of them, Harrow and Malvern, small Jewish libraries were also provided.[45]

With the establishment of the two new administrative bodies, Anglo-Jewry was now able to devise an effective policy in keeping with the provisions of the 1944 Act. The position of the surviving pre-war voluntary aided schools was comparatively straightforward: under Section 15 of that Act, they could choose either the voluntary aided or the voluntary controlled status. All of them opted for the former, since their governing bodies had found the money to fulfil their initial obligations. The Act also provided an 'escape clause' which permitted voluntary schools to preserve or alter their pre-war form at the Minister's discretion.[46] Thus, the Stepney Jewish School in London, which had a senior department before the war, became a primary unit when it reopened while the Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham schools preserved their senior departments until the early 1960s.

Section 16 of the 1944 Act had a special bearing upon the problems facing the surviving schools, as well as those which had closed down during the war, but whose governing bodies wished to reopen them. The first paragraph of that section read:[47]

> Where the Minister is satisfied that it is expedient that any county school or any voluntary school should be transferred to a new site either because it is not reasonably practicable to make to the existing premises of the school the alterations necessary for securing that they should conform to the prescribed standards, or in consequence of any movement of population or of any action taken or proposed to be taken under the enactments relating to housing or to town and country planning, the Minister may by order authorise the transfer of the school to the new site; and any transfer so authorised shall not be deemed, for the purposes of this Act, to constitute the discontinuance of the school or the establishment of a new school.

Provision was also made for new voluntary schools 'in substitution for another school at the time being maintained by a local education authority as a voluntary school or for two or more such schools which is or are to be discontinued'.[48] This indeed provided the means of solving the problem of Jewish aided schools which had been adversely affected by the exodus of potential pupils to other districts.

As already indicated, the sections of the 1944 Act concerned with religious instruction in council schools during school hours were of particular concern to the Jewish community. While the agreed syllabus with its basically Christian doctrine remained unacceptable, the concessions now made for denominational teaching provided a great opportunity. The Act stated that if certain basic requirements were fulfilled, 'the pupil may be withdrawn from the school during such periods as are reasonably necessary for the purpose of enabling him to receive religous instruction in accordance with the arrangements'.[49] Due provision was also made for preserving the spirit of the time-honoured 'conscience clause', which exempted children from religious instruction if such instruction was not in accord with the wishes of the

parents. The new arrangements for denominational instruction were separate from the corporate act of worship prescribed by the Act for the beginning of every school day. It now remained for the community to provide the teachers, and to arrange with the authorities for these teachers to visit the schools.[50]

The new Jewish educational bodies set up in London and the provinces were not slow to take advantage of these new provisions affecting Jewish pupils in council schools. By 1947, sixty teachers were employed by the London Board of Jewish Religious Education to give instruction in withdrawal classes to an estimated total of 4,000 pupils on an annual budget of £2 per child.[51] The comment in an annual report about withdrawal class facilities in Manchester[52] that such classes provided, in many instances, the only Hebrew education which the pupils received was applicable to many Jewish children in communities all over Britain.

In due course, many county secondary schools with Jewish pupils on their rolls provided facilities on the school premises for Jewish religious instruction, which in many cases had its proper place in the curriculum, with end-of-term examinations and school reports. At several schools, the visiting Jewish teachers were treated as members of the permanent staff. By 1947 in London alone, of the 4,000 children mentioned above, Jewish religious instruction was provided at 19 secondary schools for about a thousand boys and girls over the age of thirteen. In Glasgow, Jewish teachers were visiting 646 Jewish children in state day-schools.[53] In Manchester in 1949–50, more than a thousand pupils in 17 schools were receiving Jewish education from 13 visiting teachers.[54]

The organization of withdrawal classes was not without its problems. Arrangements were usually inaugurated by requests from the local Jewish community, followed by negotiations with the school authorities. In most cases this was effected speedily and amicably, while in others there were some intransigent school heads. Within a very short time, a shortage of suitably qualified teachers was evident; as a result, many opportunities for opening new classes, where both facilities and permission were already available, had to be missed.

The Independent Systems

In contrast to the comparatively smooth adaptation to the new situation created by the withdrawal classes in the council schools, issues concerning day-school policy were complex. In the immediate post-war years there were three distinct categories of Jewish day-schools: voluntary schools in London, Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham which had survived the war and which continued to benefit from state aid; a small group of new schools which had been

established with the provisions of the 1944 Act in mind, and which enjoyed the advantages of state aid from the time they were established; and several schools in London and Manchester established during and immediately after the war as independent institutions, strictly Orthodox in their orientation, which relied on non-governmental sources for their financing, but which aspired to fulfil the conditions necessary for eventual state aid.[55]

A further category included the schools which had been compelled to close down during the war, and whose remaining assets, mainly in the form of funds and investments, were being held in trust. In theory, the twofold centralized administrative structure that resulted from the 1945 Conference would have provided an ideal solution to many of the problems besetting Anglo-Jewish education, and in particular there was a possibility for creating a new day-school system. In reality, however, the structure that emerged was somewhat different from that envisaged. In the case of the Central Council, although many provincial communities availed themselves of its facilities, it was not universally accepted or recognised as an official educational agency of Anglo-Jewry. Even several years after the end of the war, the reports of the Central Council frankly admitted this; for instance, the report for 1951 stated: 'In spite of difficulties, the Central Council is continuing to make every effort to establish itself as a central authority for Jewish Religious Education'.[56] At the same time, at each end of the communal spectrum, the Reform and Liberal movements, and the ultra-Orthodox congregations remained outside the main administrative structures.

In Manchester, with the second largest Jewish community in Britain, the Manchester Central Board for Hebrew Education and Talmud Torah was established after the 1945 Conference. That Board replaced several organizations which had been operating concurrently up to the war, and it came into being at a meeting of representatives of these organizations on 7 September 1946.[57] However, the ideal of complete unity was not achieved, since several independent Orthodox synagogues chose to remain outside the network. When the amalgamation of two newly-founded small day-schools was considered, the plan was rejected, although both schools would have benefited greatly. In this instance the basic reason was that one school, the Cassel-Fox Primary School, was under the aegis of the newly-established Manchester Central Board, whose authority the managers of the other school, the Broughton Jewish Primary School, refused to recognize.[58]

Similar instances of independent, unaffiliated institutions could be found in other cities. The most well-known centre of strictly Orthodox Jewish education was at Gateshead, whose Yeshiva and Seminary for Women Teachers were to play an important part in the subsequent development of Anglo-Jewish education.[59] Yet Gateshead remained in virtual isolation from the mainstream Anglo-Jewish establishments,

epitomizing those unattached 'right-wing' Orthodox congregations which maintained their own independent schools. It is worth reiterating that all these schools from their very inception had no links with the two newly-established central education authorities, so that in due course they were to prove an obstacle to any policies of centralization, co-ordination, or unity of purpose in the field of day-school development.

If there was one sentiment which these independent schools had in common, it was the dissatisfaction of their founders with the standards attained by part-time Jewish education. Many of their founders and the parents of many of their pupils were comparative newcomers to Britain, having arrived as refugees during the 1930s, and were imbued with the standards set by European Orthodox communities. Their ideal was 'to provide a first-class general education, of which the Jewish religion shall form an integral part . . . to impart a relevant knowledge of Judaism at its sources and to set this against a background of sound general education'.[60] This was indeed reminiscent of the educational principles of *Torah im derekh eretz* established by Samson Raphael Hirsch in his famous school at Frankfurt-am-Main.[61]

The prototype of these new independent schools and the source of their inspiration was the Jewish Secondary School established by Rabbi Victor Schonfeld and maintained after his death by his son Solomon. As noted above, this school had drawn many, if not most, of its original pupils from refugee families and from refugee children who had been allowed to enter Britain under various schemes, while their parents had to remain in Europe. After the war, the school returned to London from evacuation in Shefford, and its numbers were augmented by children who had survived the Holocaust and who had been brought to England through the efforts of Solomon Schonfeld.[62] As with the Jewish Secondary School, all these new institutions began their existence in penurious circumstances, having to rely upon the generosity of private benefactors for most of their income. They were usually accommodated in large Victorian or Georgian houses in residential suburbs of London or Manchester. As each school developed and more funds were available, often through bank overdrafts, extensions were added to the original building. Often such extensions were necessary as a prerequisite to obtaining eagerly sought-after state aid. Some of the schools had originally started as day nurseries, which were extended to provide primary education.

The most important independent group remained the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement. Early in 1944, it acquired two adjoining houses in north-west London, to be opened that September as a new grammar school, with a preparatory school in a house nearby.[63] The establishment of these schools, known as the Hasmonean schools, was a *fait accompli* even before there was any certainty of a constant and

reliable source of funds for their maintenance, apart from the fees of pupils. At the same meeting at which Schonfeld announced the impending opening of the new schools, he also inaugurated an appeal for funds to equip them. For the purpose of firmly establishing the new schools, three separate meetings were held on 24 May 1944, at which Schonfeld and Dayan Grunfeld, a close supporter of his, met representatives of 13 local synagogues.[64] By November 1945, the Hasmonean schools had an enrolment of 110 pupils, including 45 boarders. Meanwhile, the original Jewish Secondary School had returned to North London from evacuation, reopening in October 1945, and occupying two adjoining houses and six large huts in their grounds.

Thus, even before the 1945 Conference there existed in London one group of day-schools in no way attached to any communal central authority, and without any intention of losing its independence. In addition to the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement, there were other schools in London and Manchester, most of which were also to remain independent. Their continued existence can be attributed to the fact that the policies of their founders differed fundamentally from those of the London Board and of the Central Council. Sooner or later, these differences were bound to come to a head, as was the case in London.

The London Day-schools Controversy

Stated in their simplest terms, the differences over day-school policy concerned two main issues: whether or not new day-schools should be established, and under whose control they should function. The views of the honorary officers of the London Board of Jewish Religious Education conflicted with those of the governors of the newly-established day-schools in London, under the acknowledged leadership of Solomon Schonfeld. The dispute was resolved only in May 1954, with the result that more than one system of Jewish education was set up in London, rather than a network of day-schools under one single authority. The controversy itself dated back to 1944, with the Joint Emergency Committee plan for establishing at least one new secondary school in London, under the provisions of the new Education Act, and as a replacement for the Jews' Free School and for other schools which had closed down during the war. When this project was announced, Rabbi Schonfeld in a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* expressed doubts about the wisdom of providing only one large centrally-situated school for a scattered Jewish population. He considered that four or five smaller schools would be preferable. Over the question of control of the proposed new school, he raised deeper issues by referring indirectly to the London Board's emphasis on part-time supplementary schooling:[65]

> I cannot refrain from drawing attention to the organisational aspect of the problem. There is a difference of tendency between the Jewish Day School and the Hebrew and Religion Class; the former stresses quality, the latter quantity. It would hardly be conducive to the prosperity of either, both essential to religious education in Anglo-Jewry, if they were placed under one authority, especially where there is a scarcity of funds and personnel. A permanent tug-of-war would result.

Rabbi Schonfeld felt justified in maintaining that his own financially precarious institutions should derive benefit from funds now available in the form of assets from defunct schools. He also pointed out in his letter that with the impending centralized administration of Jewish education in London, control of these funds and of day-schools policy would pass to a body as it were descended directly from the pre-war organizations. Since these had been concerned primarily with part-time education, he was doubtful about their approach and competence with regard to day-school policy. Moreover, the comparatively lukewarm attitudes towards Jewish studies in the pre-war non-provided schools were incompatible with his own educational ideals. Finally, since his own day-schools had justified their pioneer existence, they were now worthy of official support from the community. Meanwhile, other bodies independent of the London Board of Jewish Religious Education had established new day-schools in the capital and the London County Council's *London School Plan 1947* included the original Jewish Secondary School (now renamed the Avigdor School, in memory of its benefactor) as a designated voluntary aided school.[66]

Decisive action on the part of the London Board was finally taken in February 1950, when its new secretary, Nathan Rubin, wrote to the Ministry of Education, reporting on discussions at the Board with regard to the future of the pre-war schools. Application was now to be made for voluntary aided status under Section 86 of the 1944 Act for six of the schools concerned. Of these,only two were still in existence, while it was intended to reopen the others in accordance with Section 16, subsection (1) of the Act. Rubin's letter also took note of the London County Council's provision for a new Jewish secondary school to be centrally situated, and for two primary schools in districts with a large Jewish population. Assets of those schools no longer operating were to be transferred to the new schools, and if additional funds were needed they would be raised by communal taxation.[67] Rubin's letter appears to represent the first positive step of any recorded action by the London Board towards the re-establishment of the Jewish voluntary schools in the capital.

While Rabbi Schonfeld and his supporters were occupied until 1950 in consolidating their own Jewish Secondary Schools Movement, they did on appropriate occasions raise the day-school question within the wider context of Anglo-Jewry. For example, at a conference on Jewish

education held in 1948, Schonfeld set out his point of view in a prospectus which contained the proposal 'that the trust funds of old Jewish day schools now defunct be made available for further development of the Jewish day schools in London'.[68] Since these funds had already been earmarked for the new schools proposed in a report of the voluntary schools committee of the London Board, and which were now officially part of the London County Council plan, there appeared to be no likelihood of wider support for this claim. Nevertheless, as the London Board set about arranging for the trust funds to be used for its own proposed schools, so Schonfeld intensified his campaign in a series of speeches as well as in letters and articles in the Jewish press.[69] In 1951, he estimated that there were approximately £250,000 in day-school trust funds 'lying idle', as he put it, and noted that the site of the Jews' Free School had been sold in 1949 for £100,000. With the 50 per cent grants for rebuilding authorized by the 1944 Act, another £250,000 could be added to these amounts. Meanwhile, the existing Jewish day-schools in London were operating in conditions of great financial strain and he insisted that existing trust funds should be made immediately available with the approval of the Ministry of Education, even if most of the money had been earmarked for the implementation of the London County Council plan. Finally, he reminded the community that several years had already elapsed without any progress, and that at least another ten years would pass before such a large building project as envisaged by the London Board could be licensed, let alone built, staffed, and functioning.[70]

On 7 September 1951, the situation was described in a *Jewish Chronicle* editorial as follows:[71]

> The managers of the Metropolitan voluntary schools have not yet shown their hand, although it is known that the utilisation of the trust funds in their keeping has been the subject of discussion by the London Board of Jewish Religious Education. In the meantime a new element has been making itself felt — the rise of Jewish primary and secondary schools established more or less by private enterprise ... Established without encouragement from the existing educational authorities, the continuance of the Jewish Secondary Schools has required many a feat of improvisation ... It is a pity that the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement has no connection with the London Board of Jewish Religious Education ... What is clear is that the schools, and the funds to run them, are urgently needed, and the community is entitled to be assured that monies which could be put to good use are not lying idle.

Under the circumstances, it was inevitable that battle over the trust funds would be joined in earnest. The London Board made more detailed proposals for their utilization at a meeting with representatives of the Ministry of Education on 25 September 1951. However, the Ministry was now unwilling to proceed with the transfer of the trust

funds to the London Board because of formal objections raised from other sections of the Jewish community.[72] To its credit, the London Board continuously kept the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement officially informed about developments. During its negotiations with the Ministry, one of the members of the London Board met representatives of the JSSM in an attempt to reconcile the two conflicting stands, and in the hope of arranging further consultations. Unfortunately, no more meetings took place and the areas of disagreement persisted. The London Board confirmed its decision to go ahead with plans to establish a large secondary comprehensive school in the Camden Town area, while the JSSM maintained that such a project was too great a risk and repeatedly argued that the trust funds should be used for the support of the existing schools, which were perennially in financial difficulties, in order to strengthen their bid for the much sought-after state aid.[73]

In another attempt to settle the controversy, Chief Rabbi Brodie requested S. S. Levin and V. D. Lipman to prepare a memorandum about the problems of Jewish education in London.[74] After describing the present situation, the authors warned that there were inherent dangers in disunity and added that 'it would be inconceivable to develop two systems of schools, day and voluntary'. They were of the opinion that a solution could be found by 'combining as autonomous units within a single system both the existing day schools and any new voluntary schools' which could be provided from the trust funds.[75] They also stressed the need to avoid duplication and overlapping and they recommended a three-tier system for the administration of the schools, since such a system would be a suitable compromise and would preserve the independence of the schools. The tiers were to consist of 1) the trustees of the school funds: 2) a council for voluntary schools composed of representatives of the London Board and of the other school bodies; and 3) the governing bodies of the individual schools.[76] In January 1952, the *Jewish Chronicle* summed up the situation:[77]

> This, then, is the problem. There is a body of Jewish day schools with no funds; on the other hand, there is the London Board with the prospect of considerable funds, but owning no schools, and with no experience of day school education. There seems to be real juststification for a *shidduch* [marriage] in which each party has much to give the other.

The Chief Rabbi persevered in his efforts to bring the two parties together, but early in 1952 he went on a pastoral tour of Australia and New Zealand and his absence from the London scene served only to intensify the conflict. This was in spite of the fact that shortly before his departure, he had written to the two parties to request them to take no drastic action while he was out of the country. The request was ignored by the London Board, which decided to proceed with its plan for the

transfer of the trust funds to provide new voluntary schools. Rabbi Schonfeld, who had been informed by the Board about that decision, retaliated by sending a letter to the Ministry of Education, on behalf of the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement, in which he raised a formal objection to the proposal. He also pointed out that the London Board (to which he sent a copy of his letter to the Ministry) had disregarded the advice of the Chief Rabbi.[78] The JSSM then established a Jewish Day Schools Trust for Greater London.

There the matter rested, with each side irrevocably committed to its declared policy. The impasse served only to tie up funds which could have been put to good use, while the London Board scheme for a central comprehensive school was now held up indefinitely. On his return from the Antipodes, the Chief Rabbi resumed his efforts to bring about a settlement but he did not succeed. Under the circumstances, the Ministry of Education declared in a letter to the JSSM, dated 13 July 1953, that it would postpone the allocation of funds until a decision was reached within the Jewish community over the proposed school.[79] The JSSM then announced that henceforth it would negotiate directly with the original trustees of the funds, instead of with the London Board. This tactic might well have been responsible for the eventual resolution of the conflict.

A two-day conference, on 11–12 May 1954, was held under the chairmanship of Mr Edmund de Rothschild at his offices in New Court and the contending bodies finally came to an agreement: a Jewish day-school for 500 pupils would be established in Camden Town, with a projected eventual entrolment of 1,000. The more able pupils of the new school could be transferred to one of the existing Jewish grammar schools which, it was recognized, set higher academic standards. Both Dr Schonfeld and Dr J. Braude, representing the newly-established Jewish Day Schools Trust, had sought an undertaking that the new school would be a comprehensive school, accepting pupils of all ranges of ability, as opposed to a grammar school.

The Ministry of Education was informed that agreement had now been reached within the Jewish community and it was hoped that development could proceed forthwith. The sum of £50,000 was to be transferred to existing Jewish day-schools in London under the terms of the New Court agreement and a governing body for 'certain Jewish educational foundations' would be set up, consisting of the Chief Rabbi, six representatives of the London Board, and two from the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement.

In return for the assurances that there would be no setting up of educational institutions to compete with the existing ones, and for a substantial part of the trust funds, the JSSM formally withdrew its objections to the new Camden Town school, thus enabling the development to proceed. The New Court agreement therefore

preserved the two separate day-school systems and the London Board was now entering the field of day-school education without any firm arrangements or procedures for co-ordination with the existing Jewish Secondary Schools. The unified system advocated by Levin and Lipman in their 1952 memorandum[80] never materialized.

The Camden Town comprehensive secondary school was opened only in September 1958 and was the first Jewish voluntary aided secondary school to be established in London since the end of the war. As for the other schools proposed in the 1945 report of the voluntary schools committee of the Joint Emergency Committee, and included in the London County Council 1947 Plan, not one of these had even reached the blueprint stage by the end of 1960.

Postscript

From the 1960s onwards, there was a steady growth of Jewish day-school education, while the endemic problems of the part-time sectors persisted.[81] When Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits assumed office in 1967, educational development received a new impetus and a Jewish Educational Development Trust was established.[82] By the 1980s, the system as a whole had expanded significantly, in both the full-time and the part-time schooling sectors, as well as in the field of informal adult education, while parliamentary legislation in Britain perpetuated the policy of state aid for denominational day-schools. The most recent major legislation, the Education Reform Act of 1988, is of special importance since it enables voluntary schools to attain a modicum of autonomy in determining their own policies and standards, while still benefiting from substantial state aid. This augurs well for the future of Jewish education in Britain.

NOTES

ABBREVIATIONS

JC	*Jewish Chronicle*
JEC	Joint Emergency Committee for Jewish Religious Education
JSSM	Jewish Secondary Schools Movement
LBJRE	London Board of Jewish Religious Education

[1] By the early 1980s, an estimated 15 to 17 per cent of Jewish children aged between three and 17 years in Diaspora countries were attending day-schools, as compared with 21 to 23 per cent attending supplementary schools: Nitza Genuth, Sergio DellaPergola, and Allie A. Dubb, *First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora 1981/2–1982/3. International Summary*, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1985, Table 10, p. 62.

[2] For the clauses in the 1944 Act concerned with schools functioning under the aegis of religious denominations, and its clauses relating to religious

education generally, see H. C. Dent, *The Education Act, 1944*, tenth edition, London 1964, pp. 22–36.

[3] See Alexander M. Dushkin, 'Analysis of some Recent Developments of Jewish Education in the Diaspora', *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, vol. XIII, Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1963, pp. 56–74.

[4] See Bernard Steinberg, 'Jewish Education in Great Britain During World War II', *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1, January 1967, pp. 27–63.

[5] See Union of Hebrew and Religion Classes, Minutes of executive committee meeting, 4 December 1944 and the report by Dr I. Fishman (the 1939 figures are extracted from Talmud Torah Trust, Council meeting, 23 March 1938.) The pre-war and wartime records and proceedings of communal organizations, from which relevant details have been cited and referred to in this paper, were until 1988 housed in the archives of the London Board of Jewish Religious Education and of the Jewish Memorial Council. They are now under the custodianship of the United Synagogue Board of Religious Education, the successor body to the London Board. They also form part of the Anglo-Jewish Archives, administered by the Mocatta Library, University College London. In this connection, I wish to express my thanks to Mr Joseph Munk, archivist at the Mocatta Library.

[6] See London Board of Jewish Religious Education, correspondence file, 'Financial Scheme (Pooling of Trust Funds)': letter to Minister of Education dated 5 May 1950.

[7] See Marjorie Cruickshank, *Church and State in English Education: 1870 to the Present Day*, London, 1964, pp. 143–45 and the White Paper, *Educational Reconstruction*, Cmd. 6458, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, July 1943.

[8] See the letter dated 17 September 1942 from Mr R. A. Butler to the Chief Rabbi, Joint Emergency Committee for Jewish Religious Education, administrative committee minute-book. Amongst other details, Mr Butler stated:

> 'You have two special interests: to provide for the future of the Jewish voluntary schools and to secure the religious training of Jewish children in council schools, where they are usually in a small minority ... We discussed the position of small Jewish minorities in council schools and I explained that I could hold out no hope of these children being given denominational religious instruction in their council schools ... Your difficulty, as I gathered, is to find places where the Jewish children can be gathered together on withdrawal. Since most of the Jewish population is to be found in the larger cities, however, you thought it might be possible to effect larger concentrations of Jews in certain schools. Since agreed syllabuses will be the rule in council schools, as well as in voluntary schools which have opted for Alternative 1, there might be a case for encouraging local education authorities to adopt, for the teaching of sizeable groups of Jewish children in their council schools, an alternative agreed syllabus ...'.

[9] The Chief Rabbi's original letter to the JEC expressing his views was published in the *Jewish Chronicle* on 9 May 1941, p. 5.

[10] JEC minutes of the executive committee meeting of 12 August 1943.

[11] See the Annual Report for 1944 of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the minutes of the Board's executive committee meeting, 15 April 1944.

[12] *The Education Bill*, pamphlet published by the Board of Deputies of British Jews, January 1944.

[13] See Marjorie A. Travis, *Dual System Reform in England and Wales, 1941–1944*, unpublished M.A. thesis, University of London, 1950, pp. 22–26 and 37–69.

[14] Quoted in Travis, op. cit., p. 122.
[15] *The Tablet*, 5 May 1943, quoted in Travis, op. cit., p. 145.
[16] In a number of issues of the *Jewish Chronicle* during the closing months of 1944, there were readers' letters expressing opposition to Jewish day-schools. For example, 3 Nov., p. 5; 10 Nov., p. 14; 5 Dec., p. 14; and 22 Dec., p. 12. See also news items in 1944: 15 Sept., p. 8; and 27 Oct., pp. 1, 5, and 14.
[17] Lloyd P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England: 1870–1914*, London, 1960, pp. 221–34.
[18] *Education Act, 1944*, Sections 28 and 103. See also Dent, op. cit. (in Note 2 above), p. 23.
[19] Ibid., Sections 19 and 27.
[20] Ibid., Section 16.
[21] Ibid., Section 26.
[22] *Proposals for the Re-organisation of the Jewish Voluntary Schools in London. Report Adopted by the Voluntary Schools Committee, June 1945* (originally published in full in *Jewish Education 1945*, JEC Publications, London, 1945, pp. 57–61).
[23] See Solomon Schonfeld, *Message to Jewry*, Jewish Secondary Schools Movement, London, 1953, pp. 176–84, for a résumé of articles and letters relating to this viewpoint.
[24] See David Kranzler and Gertrude Hirschler, eds., *Solomon Schonfeld. His Place in History*, New York, 1982.
[25] Solomon Schonfeld, *Jewish Religious Education*, National Council for Jewish Religious Education, London, 1943, p. 158.
[26] *JC*, 10 March 1944, editorial: 'The Price of our Future', p. 8.
[27] The absence of both the Reform and Liberal congregations, as well as that of the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations, was subsequently regretted by delegates at the Conference. See *Communal Conference on the Reconstruction of Jewish Education in Great Britain. Report of Proceedings*, Jewish Educational Publications for the Central Council for Jewish Religious Education in the United Kingdom and Eire, London, 1946, pp. 3 and 22.
[28] JEC, minutes of executive committee meeting, 22 December 1943.
[29] *Educational Reconstruction*, op. cit. in Note 7 above.
[30] Nathan Morris, 'The White Paper on Educational Reconstruction and the Future of Jewish Education', pp. 53–63, in *Jewish Education in Time of Total War*, JEC Publications, London, 1946.
[31] Ibid., p. 60.
[32] *JC*, 7 January 1944, pp. 1 and 5.
[33] The details are taken from the official record, *Communal Conference on the Reconstruction of Jewish Education in Great Britain. Report of Proceedings.*
[34] See the Report cited in Note 22 above.
[35] *Communal Conference. Report of Proceedings*, p. 24.
[36] Ibid., pp. 26–28.
[37] Ibid., p. 32.
[38] Nathan Morris, *Curriculum and Method in the Hebrew Class*, JEC Publications, London, 1946, p. 32.
[39] *Communal Conference. Report of Proceedings*, pp. 37–39.
[40] Ibid., p. 31.
[41] LBJRE, *First Report, 1949*, p. 1.
[42] Section 12, paragraph B, of the constitution and by-laws of the LBJRE.

[43] See Section 3 of the *Memorandum*.
[44] *Draft Scheme for the Creation of a Central Council for Jewish Religious Education*, paragraph 5.
[45] See Jewish Memorial Council, minutes of annual general meeting, 29 July 1947, and executive committee report, 31 December 1949.
[46] Education Act of 1944, Section 31, paragraph 3.
[47] Ibid., Section 16, subsection (1).
[48] Ibid., subsection (2).
[49] Ibid., Section 25, subsection (5).
[50] Ibid., Section 26.
[51] See I. Fishman, 'Jewish Religious Education in the State School' in *Jewish Education 1947*, JEC Publications, London, 1947, p. 10.
[52] *Manchester Talmud Torah School and Hebrew Education Boards Annual Report 1951*, p. 10.
[53] *Jewish Education 1947*, op. cit., p. 11.
[54] See I. W. Slotki, *Seventy Years of Hebrew Education*, Manchester Talmud Torah Schools and Hebrew Education Boards, 1950, p. 10. For corresponding developments in Liverpool during the early post-war years, see Cyril P. Hershon, *To Make Them English*, Bristol, 1983, pp. 96–106.
[55] By 1958, the position of these schools was as follows. In London, the Hasmonean grammar school for boys, which had been established in 1944, was granted voluntary aided status in 1957; the Avigdor school (formerly, the Jewish Secondary School), established in 1945, achieved that status in 1950; and the north-west London Jewish day-school, established also in 1945, became voluntary aided in 1958. In the Manchester area, the Cassel-Fox primary school and the Prestwich Jewish day-school had been established in 1945; the former achieved voluntary aided status in 1953 and the latter in 1951. The Broughton Jewish primary school, established in 1948, was granted voluntary aided status in 1953.
[56] See Central Council for Jewish Religious Education, *Executive Committee Report for Year Ending 31 December 1951*.
[57] See *Jewish Education 1946*, p. 53, JEC Publications, London, 1946.
[58] See the minutes of the meetings of the executive committee of Cassel-Fox school on 25 January and 13 June 1951.
[59] See, for example, Arnold Levy, *The Story of Gateshead Yeshivah*, The Wessex Press, Taunton, 1952.
[60] See the prospectus of Broughton Jewish Primary School, Manchester, n.d., p. 3.
[61] See, for example, Samson Raphael Hirsch, *Horeb. A Philosophy of Jewish Laws and Observances* (2 vols), translated and edited by I. Grunfeld, London, 1962, vol. 2, pp. 406–16.
[62] See Judith Grunfeld, *Shefford. The Story of a Jewish School Community in Evacuation 1939–1945*, London, 1980, for a personal account by the school's headmistress.
[63] Jewish Secondary Schools Movement minutes of the meeting of governors on 21 March 1944.
[64] Ibid., 24 May 1944.
[65] *JC*, 3 November 1944, p. 5.
[66] London County Council, *London School Plan 1947*, p. 92.

[67] Letter dated 5 May 1950, in LBJRE file *Financial Scheme (Pooling of Trust Funds)*. The six schools were: Jews' Free School (3 departments); Jews' Infants' School; Westminster Jews' Free School; Borough Jewish School; Stepney Jewish School, and Solomon Wolfson (Bayswater) Jewish School. Of these, only the Stepney Jewish and Solomon Wolfson schools were still functioning in 1950.

[68] JSSM prospectus, *Jewish Denominational Schools in Greater London*, n.d.

[69] For example, 'Idle School Funds', *Jewish Review*, 30 November 1951, p. 3.

[70] Ibid.

[71] *JC* editorial, 'Financing Jewish Schools', 7 September 1951, p. 12.

[72] LBJRE file, *Financial Scheme (Pooling of Trust Funds)*, minutes of 29 September 1951.

[73] JSSM minutes of the meeting of governors on 4 May 1952.

[74] S. S. Levin and V. D. Lipman, *Towards an Integrated System of Jewish Schools*, London, January 1952.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid.

[77] 'Ending the Day Schools Conflict' in *JC*, 11 January 1952, p. 13.

[78] LBJRE file, *Financial Scheme (Pooling of Trust Funds)*, letter from Rabbi Schonfeld dated 10 June 1952.

[79] JSSM minutes of the meeting of governors on 26 July 1953.

[80] Levin and Lipman, op. cit. in Note 74 above.

[81] See Jacob Braude, *Survey of Jewish Day Schools in the United Kingdom and Ireland*, a Research Report for the Institute of Jewish Affairs (mimeographed), London, 1975.

[82] Derek Taylor, ed., *Jewish Education 1981–1982*, Jewish Educational Development Trust, London, 1982, pp. 1–3.

ETHNIC VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS IN ISRAEL

Hannah Kliger

THE study of landsmanshaftn, Jewish ethnic voluntary associations of members with common origins (usually in an Eastern European city or town), illuminates the creative and complex responses of Jewish immigrants to the challenges of acculturation in their new countries of settlement. To date, there have been few published studies of landsmanshaftn in Israel. This paper reports on some of the results of fieldwork in Tel Aviv in 1983–84 that was part of a larger study of these associations in Israel and the United States.[1] Data were also gleaned from archival records, reports in the Yiddish press, and from personal interviews with leaders and members of American and Israeli organizations based on common regional origins in Eastern Europe: Antopol, Bialystok, Czestochowa, Lodz, Minsk, and Warsaw.[2]

I have described elsewhere the activities of American landsmanshaftn;[3] this paper will focus on the Israeli associations of Eastern European Jewish immigrants in order to provide a comparative perspective on the two settings: Israel and the United States. In both societies, ethnic organizations offer a forum where immigrants can discuss their adaptation to the new culture while maintaining the special region-based bonds unique to their transplanted community.

Most studies of Jewish ethnicity in Israel tend to overlook the diversity within the non-Oriental, Ashkenazi population from Central and Eastern Europe, which too often is incorrectly characterized as a culturally homogeneous immigrant group whose distinctions with respect to country of origin are muted. While this attitude persists, a recent review has stressed that work on 'the engenderment and dynamics of Ashkenaziness . . . needs to be done'.[4] The assumption that Ashkenazi culture in Israel is largely uniform and monolithic is challenged by my findings on the country's present Polish Jewish immigrant associations.

Contacts with these organizations were initially provided by landsmanshaftn leaders in New York City.[5] The Association of Jews from Poland in Israel, an organization founded in 1925, also supplied names; it is a branch of the World Federation of Polish Jews and is a

co-ordinating bureau for approximately 150 registered affiliates out of the estimated 250 Polish landsmanshaftn which operate in Israel. It is based in Tel Aviv and its office centralizes the activities of its member groups by distributing a newsletter, organizing symposia, and awarding scholarships to Israeli students of Polish descent.[6]

In contrast to the situation in the United States, there is in Israel only one registered landsmanshaft for each Eastern European city or town. While subgroups do develop informally within the framework of a particular representative body of immigrants from a particular locality, one does not find in Israel the multiplicity of associations based on a single place of origin in Eastern Europe which occur in America; for example, a book published in 1982 listed 46 organizations of immigrants and descendants of immigrants in Bialystok landsmanshaftn throughout the United States.[7]

Antopol

The society of immigrants from Antopol (*Irgun Yotsey Antopol* in Hebrew) has chosen not to affiliate with the Association of Jews from Poland in Israel. What is more, I discovered that that Association was not even aware of the group's existence in Israel in spite of the fact that the Antopol landsmanshaft has a synagogue in central Tel Aviv. A striking architectural feature of the building is an alcove where the names of Antopol's Jewish inhabitants who were killed during the Holocaust are inscribed.[8] When the Antopol synagogue centre in Chicago was sold, the proceeds provided the seed money for the construction of the Tel Aviv building.[9] This is an example of the general trend of American landsmanshaftn since the end of the Second World War: support for Israel's institutions. Before the war, they used to provide assistance for the needy inhabitants of their European towns of origin. Now, however, their focus is Israel, the old-new homeland.

The Antopol synagogue in Tel Aviv attracts foreign visitors from many countries who originate from Antopol and who wish to meet their compatriots.[10] However, in much the same way that in New York City (as a result of the move to newer areas) locality-based immigrant synagogues no longer have a permanent congregation of members from the designated place-name, settlers from Antopol who once lived in the vicinity of their synagogue in central Tel Aviv now reside in other neighbourhoods. Nevertheless, the synagogue still serves as a central meeting place for the former residents of Antopol: they come from all over Israel for annual memorial assemblies held in the building. In addition to the tasks of commemoration and remembrance, the Antopol landsmanshaft provides funds to help needy members of the organization and it also awards interest-free loans and student scholarships.

Bialystok

There is a community on the outskirts of Tel Aviv known as Kiryat Bialystok; it was established after the Second World War mainly by Bialystok organizations throughout the world who responded to the appeal for 'a hometown in homeland to be resurrected on Zion's earth' for the benefit of Holocaust survivors from Bialystok.[11] Many of the village's first residents have died or their children have moved away and their place has been taken by people who have no links with Bialystok; but some of the earliest settlers still live in Kiryat Bialystok, where schools and streets are named to commemorate the Eastern European city, and they are committed to perpetuating 'love for Bialystok even among the new non-Bialystok settlers' in the area.[12]

News of Kiryat Bialystok appears regularly in the bilingual Yiddish-English newsletter *Bialystoker Shtime* (*Voice of Bialystok*) which is distributed throughout the world from New York's Bialystoker Center. Reports on Kiryat Bialystok are sent by the publication's Israel correspondent and the newsletter also prints the impressions and comments of delegates from the Bialystoker Center who return from a visit to the village. Although support for Kiryat Bialystok was curtailed for many years because of disputes between the Bialystoker Center and the fund-raising arm for the village, the New York-based Kiryat Bialystok Foundation, the Center's current leadership has demonstrated an active interest in Kiryat Bialystok.[13] None the less, the villagers criticize the Bialystoker Center's vigorous and publicized initiatives on behalf of other projects in Israel, such as rehabilitation centres, hospitals, and community agencies.

The veteran settlers of Kiryat Bialystok look upon their village as a living transplant of their community of birth: the old Bialystok perished in the Holocaust but a new Bialystok has taken root in Israel.[14] The members of the Bialystok landsmanshaft in New York, however, are not as ready to see Kiryat Bialystok as a reincarnation or resurrection of the old European home town; this is true even of those who are familiar with the Israeli village.

Those who have joined the Association of Immigrants from Bialystok in Israel, with headquarters in Tel Aviv, do not always agree about the best use of their resources. One of the prominent members of the executive board of the organization, who came from Bialystok in 1925, advocates the building of a museum devoted to aspects of Jewish life in the town of his birth; such a museum would be an educational experience for the wider public. He favours Kiryat Bialystok as a fit location for the museum, but this proposal has not aroused much enthusiasm among the leaders of the village, who are of the opinion that refurbishing the community centre and other public buildings should have higher priority.[15] The plan was also opposed by another member of the executive board of the Bialystok landsmanshaft, a lawyer who is a

well-known civic leader in Tel Aviv and who can speak English. He said that he urged Bialystok immigrants not to look back to the past but to look forward to being full citizens of the State of Israel; his advice to each of them was: 'Don't be a local patriot. Become a member of the State of Israel. . . . We don't want you should always be a Bialystoker'. He added: 'We must not try to make out of landsmanshaft an ideology, it must be something temporary, transitory'.[16]

However, this does not mean that there is no desire to perpetuate the memory of Jewish Białystok. This same lawyer sought to promote the preparation of a scholarly Hebrew volume to complement the *Bialystok Memorial Book*, which was published in 1982 in the United States in English and in Yiddish. For those Hebrew-speaking children and grandchildren of Bialystok immigrants who do not easily read or understand either of these two languages, there is no access to the information contained in that memorial volume. In general, the necessity to reconcile old and new loyalties is the difficult task facing the landsmanshaftn in Israel.

Czestochowa

One of the leaders of the Association of Immigrants from Czestochowa in Israel was ambivalent about asserting ties to his birthplace. On the one hand, members of his generation were saddened by the lack of interest of their Israeli-born children about their parents' native town. On the other hand, they knew that they must make allowances for the fact that young Israelis would be naturally more preoccupied by their country's constant state of military preparedness and the consequent economic difficulties; moreover, Israel's nationalistic ideology put emphasis on creating and fostering comradeship and unity among its Jewish citizens and frowned upon distinctions on the basis of origin. Each one must be reminded: 'We are all Jews in Israel'.[17]

The activities of the Czestochowa landsmanshaft include meetings twice a month, biennial elections of office-holders, celebrations of religious festivals, and an annual Holocaust commemoration held at the monument to Czestochowa Jewry situated in one of Tel Aviv's cemeteries. Notices of events are usually published in the Hebrew newspapers and occasionally also in *Letste Nayes* (*Latest News*). This Yiddish daily is read by some members, as is Israel's Polish-language newspaper, but the meetings and all organizational affairs are conducted in Hebrew, as is true for most other associations. At some of these meetings there were reports about recent visits to Poland and the members planned a tour of the Holocaust museum at Kibbutz Lohamei Hagetaot (Kibbutz of the Ghetto Fighters). This last event was open to all societies registered with the Association of Jews from Poland in Israel, to which the Czestochowa group is affiliated. The

landsmanshaft sends a representative to meetings of the Association, which take place at its headquarters in Tel Aviv, and it also makes use of the meeting rooms available there for its own scheduled activities.

Communications from the Association of Jews from Poland in Israel or from institutions such as Kibbutz Lohamei Hagetaot or Yad Vashem (Israel's national Holocaust museum and archives in Jerusalem) reassure the Czestochowa landsmanshaft that the memory of their native Polish town will be preserved by these larger bodies if their own organization were to be dissolved. This group, consisting mainly of refugees from Nazi-ravaged Poland, has decided that it would relinquish any assets it still holds to Yad Vashem in such circumstances. The founding members of the organization were gradually outnumbered by Holocaust survivors, who recall that the veteran settlers 'just did not understand' them and add: 'But after a while, we new immigrants began to participate'.[18] Not all post-war refugees from Czestochowa did so, however. One man, who had stayed in Poland in order to direct the reconstruction of its Jewish community in the years immediately following the war, was dissatisfied with the Israeli landsmanshaft and remainded aloof from it when he eventually came to Israel. He claims that the members failed to appreciate the importance of his role as a leader of the minority of Jews who chose to remain in Czestochowa after 1945. He bitterly resents the fact that the organization was reluctant to send funds to those Jews to help in their rehabilitation in their native town and that the same was true of the American associations.[19]

Lodz

There is apparently no communication between the Lodz landsmanshaft in Tel Aviv and its counterpart in New York. The activities of the Lodzer Young Men's Benevolent Society in New York, for example, are not familiar to Israel's *Irgun Yotsey Lodz* (Association of Immigrants from Lodz). The Israelis claimed to have had no knowledge of either the American society's charitable efforts on behalf of Israel or of its initiative in organizing a World Gathering of Lodzer Survivors in 1984 in New York.

In Israel, factors such as age or pre-emigration experiences have caused divisions within the Lodz landsmanshaft. Those members who had left Lodz before the Second World War to settle in Palestine differed from the Lodz natives who came to Israel in the post-war decade about the organization's priorities. The later immigrants believed that it was their duty to document and stress Jewish creativity in Lodz and to this end they appointed in 1957 a Committee to Commemorate Polish Jewry (which has now merged with the Association of Immigrants from Lodz). Unlike the veteran settlers, they were

not content simply to memorialize the demise of their native community. They wished to reconstruct the vitality of Lodz Jewry and the Committee convened special groups of Israeli schoolchildren who were told about the unrelenting efforts that were made to create a semblance of normal living conditions in the Lodz ghetto during the Second World War. These programmes were intended to dispel some of the stereotypical myths about Jewish passivity during the Nazi occupation of Eastern Europe, myths which were readily believed by many young Israelis. The members of the Committee wanted the Hebrew-speaking public to learn about the rich heritage of Polish Jewry. One of them, who became a Hebrew journalist (after working for a Polish daily when he came to Israel in the 1950s) commented on his efforts to achieve an Israeli identity without obliterating his Polish origins and said: 'When I dream about the past, it's a dream in Yiddish or Polish. But if I dream about the present, it's in Hebrew'.[20]

Some of those who were in Lodz during the war like to get together socially every week, while an annual picnic on or near the date of their liberation from Nazi rule draws some 200 of their compatriots from all over Israel. These gatherings occur outside the official framework of the Association of Immigrants from Lodz, among a network of individuals whose memory of their collective ordeal in the Lodz ghetto sustains their camaraderie and special intimacy.

Admittedly, not all post-war immigrant survivors from Lodz join the landsmanshaft or any of its sub-committees for social reasons. One respondent decided to become a member of the association only in order to contribute to the creation of a monument in honour of Lodz Jewry. Another had been reluctant at first to revive his wartime ordeals by joining the Lodz landsmanshaft; but he is now an active member of the association and his Tel Aviv business office has also served as the office of the association during his tenure as chairman. The chairman's main tasks involve convening memorial assemblies twice a year, sending out invitations for these gatherings to about 2,500 registered members, and placing announcements about the reunions in the Yiddish and Hebrew press as well as on the radio. These events are well attended, because 'the public knows, between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, they know to come'; this is also true of the day every spring that is proclaimed throughout the country as a national day of solemn commemoration for the victims of the Holocaust.[21]

Israeli landsmanshaftn do not only participate in the national remembrance ceremonies but also sponsor their own private reunions to honour their martyrs. The Lodz landsmanshaft members gather at the sculpture which pays tribute to the Jews of Lodz and which was erected by the Israeli Lodz society, not at the memorial in Israel built by New York's Lodzer Young Men's Benevolent Society. This is another example of the divergence between the two groups. The two

monuments, which represent the same legacy, are also symbols of the separate activities of Lodz societies in Tel Aviv and New York.

Minsk

The lack of communication between Israeli landsmanshaftn and their American counterparts is most pronounced in the case of Minsk associations. As far as I could ascertain, none of the New York members could identify those in Israel, nor were they aware of the existence of a memorial book published in Israel in 1975 by the Association of Immigrants from Minsk, an organization which was formally registered in 1957. An Israeli office-bearer deplored this situation, just as he regretted the lack of interest of his local members who seemed not to be as concerned as he himself was about the failure of the Israeli landsmanshaft to extend a welcome to the newly-arrived Minsk émigrés from the Soviet Union and to invite them to join the association.[22]

The recent Soviet immigrants, for their part, have borrowed the landsmanshaft model but they have chosen to band themselves together in their own associations. One group appended the Hebrew plural suffix *im* to the Yiddish term, coining the word *landsmanshaftim* (the Yiddish plural is landsmanshaftn); it has used this neologism as part of the title of its organization. Russian newcomers arriving in Israel are guided through the initial stages of adjustment by the compatriots who preceded them; indeed, even before they depart for Israel, they are able to read about former residents who have successfully integrated into Israeli society in bulletins which are sent to specific target communities in the Soviet Union. Once in Israel, however, the localized regional orientation is replaced by a more overarching identification as Soviet Jews. Russian-language publications, radio broadcasts, and social clubs are aimed at the émigré population throughout Israel not according to particular cities of origin, but as a larger entity: Jews from the Soviet Union.

If connections with the older-established landsmanshaftn such as the Minsk society have not been pursued, it is in part because the recent waves of immigrants see themselves as a distinct group who came to Israel only after they had overcome the persistent refusal of the Soviet authorities to grant them exit visas. They identify themselves proudly as 'refuseniks', who endured many hardships before they were eventually allowed to leave their native land, and they stress that they are 'mostly intelligentsia, medical doctors, scientists, engineers', implying that they differ in terms of educational achievements from the members of Eastern European landsmanshaftn in Israel who may seek their affiliation. However, when the chairman of the Association of Immigrant Societies from Settlements in the U.S.S.R./

Landsmanshaftim was in the United States in the early 1980s, on sabbatical leave from his teaching post at Bar-Ilan University, he claimed that he tended to feel 'close, much more close with Israeli Jews than with former Russians'.[23] Thus, there are complexities in the pattern of identification, when different aspects of the process of adaptation to Israeli society are emphasized: in some contexts, the Russian immigrant may still describe himself or herself as an Eastern European Zionist intellectual while in others, as a committed Israeli citizen.

Warsaw

The Warsaw landsmanshaft in Israel is proud of the superior abilities of its members, for much the same reasons advanced by the Russian immigrants. The president of the principal Warsaw association in Israel, who left Poland after the Second World War, was quick to stress the high social and intellectual standards of the leaders of his society. He also pointed out that the medium of communication during meetings was Polish, a language which upper-class Polish Jews consider more prestigious than Yiddish. Nevertheless, the Israeli landsmanshaft did not wish to distance itself from Warsaw societies in other countries and lamented the fact that its American counterpart was generally unresponsive to any attempt to foster co-operation on joint projects — not even for the publication of a memorial book for Warsaw Jewry did they send a single dollar.[24]

Such a memorial volume was published in 1974 by another Warsaw landsmanshaft, the Association of Immigrants from Prage-Warsaw. This independent organization aims in particular to preserve the memory of the special qualities of Jewish life in that suburb of Warsaw and it is therefore unlikely that it will merge in the near future with the larger Warsaw group. Moreover, the leader of the Prage-Warsaw society observed that his active stance in his labour union and in organizations which promote Yiddish culture are not looked upon with favour by the wider Warsaw association.[25]

Former residents of another suburb of Warsaw, Povonsek, have their own old-established association in New York while those who now live in Israel meet only informally. The organizer of these social reunions sends out annual dinner invitations to Povonsek-born Israelis on the anniversary of the death of her husband, who was killed in action during Israel's War of Independence in 1948. When former compatriots from that city come to Israel on a visit, they usually call on her; for this widow, old loyalties are more private and familial.[26]

However, the World Federation of Polish Jews does not encourage loyalty to a particular city or locality; it urges member landsmanshaftn to identify themselves more generally as Jews of Polish origin. It sends

out a newsletter to seventeen countries, publishes books about Polish Jewish culture, sponsors research on Polish Jewish history at Israeli universities, and maintains ties with the Polish government, in an effort to co-ordinate the Polish Jewish presence in Israel and throughout the world.

Conclusion

One of the main differences between the American and the Israeli landsmanshaftn is that the latter are still largely composed of members who were born in Eastern Europe while the former include large numbers of American-born Jews whose parents or grandparents had come to the United States as immigrants. Another point of differentiation is that whereas the Israeli associations are still strongly committed to memorializing the Jews of a particular locality in Eastern Europe, the American societies have now largely transformed themselves into philanthropic groups sponsoring charitable institutions and undertakings in Israel. Before the Second World War, they sent funds to those needy Jews who had stayed behind in their native towns, but since the Jewish population of Poland has now virtually disappeared, most of the American landsmanshaftn now direct their benevolent efforts towards Israeli causes in general — that is, not necessarily connected with a specific endeavour to preserve and document the European Jewish heritage of a particular area.

In Israel, since the State has undertaken the task of honouring the victims of Nazism on a national scale, the various landsmanshaftn can use their resources to produce educational programmes for young Israelis to learn about the trials and achievements of some of their forebears in specific parts of Europe. Such programmes were implemented in the 1960s, well before Holocaust Studies were established in other countries.[27] The Israeli associations also provide a social circle for members to reminisce freely, often in their own native language, about their common heritage, to compare their present experiences as immigrants, and to help those among them who are in need of assistance. In a country where there is great stress on the importance of fluency in the Hebrew language and on pride in one's Israeli identity, the ethnic voluntary association provides a social haven for those who cannot (or do not want to) forget their roots in their community of birth, enabling them to maintain relationships with others who are similarly circumstanced.

The immigrant organizations in Israel, both those based on Eastern European origins and those based on African or Asian countries of birth,[28] have been vehicles for the transmission of cultural continuity and for adaptation to the new homeland. More comparative research is needed to discover the degree to which these various voluntary

associations have delayed or hastened the forging of a new Israeli identity more than four decades after the establishment of the Jewish State.

NOTES

[1] At various stages during this research, I received the financial support of the University of Pennsylvania, the Max Weinreich Center of the Yivo Institute for Jewish Research, the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, the National Foundation for Jewish Culture, and the American Jewish Archives. I also wish to acknowledge the Penn-Israel Exchange program at the University of Pennsylvania for facilitating my travel to Israel to conduct fieldwork in December 1983–January 1984. In 1988, a Travel to Collections Grant #FE–21794–88 from the National Endowment for the Humanities enabled me to study archival records in Israel.

[2] Interviews in Israel were conducted mainly in Yiddish. Translations of the transcripts that appear in this text are my own. For a fuller description of the research design employed in this study, see Hannah Kliger, *Communication and Ethnic Community: The Case of Landsmanshaftn*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1985.

[3] See Hannah Kliger, 'Traditions of Grass-Roots Organization and Leadership', *American Jewish History*, vol. 76, no. 1, September 1986, pp. 25–39; and Hannah Kliger, 'A Home Away from Home: Participation in Jewish Immigrant Associations', in Walter P. Zenner, ed., *Persistence and Flexibility: Anthropological Studies on the American Jewish Experience*, Albany, 1988, pp. 143–64.

[4] See Kevin Avruch, 'The Emergence of Ethnicity in Israel', *American Ethnologist*, vol. 14, no. 2, May 1987, p. 334.

[5] New York interviewees from landsmanshaftn of Antopol, Bialystok, and Czestochowa supplied names of potential interviewees in Israel. I would also like to acknowledge the kind advice of Wolf Glicksman of Philadelphia, who sent me off to Tel Aviv with a long list of his Czestochowa colleagues. For Lodz respondents, I thank Lucjan Dobroszycki for his suggestions. In New York, Jechiel Dobekirer and Benjamin Meed recommended a meeting with Anshl Reiss, and Norman Gilmovsky directed me to Moshe Ron. These were all significant contacts that provided me with a broader perspective on landsmanshaftn in Israel. For published material on Israeli landsmanshaftn, see L. Losh, ed. *Landsmanshaftn in Yisroel* (Landsmanshaftn in Israel), Tel Aviv, 1961, and M. Tsanin, *Tsen yor medines Yisroel* (Ten Years of the State of Israel), Tel Aviv, 1958. Other sources include reports of landsmanshaft activity in the *yisker* (memorial) books.

[6] Interview, Association of Jews from Poland in Israel.

[7] See I. Shmulewitz, ed., *Bialystok Memorial Book*, New York, 1982.

[8] Interview, Association of Immigrants from Antopol.,

[9] See Ben-Zion H. Ayalon, ed. *Antopol* (*Antopolie: sefer yizkor*) (Antopol (Antopolie): memorial volume), Tel Aviv, 1972.

[10] Interview, Antopoler Young Men's Benevolent Association.

[11] This slogan was adopted in the fund-raising campaign of the Kiryat Bialystok Foundation, a fund-raising arm of the Bialystok Center created in

1949. Publications of this body are housed together with the records of the Bialystoker Center of New York at the Diaspora Research Institute Archives in the Mehlman Library at Tel Aviv University. I would like to thank Yoel Raba, Ilana Kedmi, and Steven Yaari for their assistance during my visits to their Institute.

[12] Interview, Kiryat Bialystok. One of the most memorable occasions during the period of my research in Israel was boarding the public bus to Kiryat Bialystok from Tel Aviv, only to be asked by the driver, 'Do you want to go to Bialystok?'. This question highlighted the enticing yet impossible prospect of returning to this once thriving centre of Jewish life in Eastern Europe.

[13] See issues of the *Kiryat Bialystok Bulletin*, Diaspora Research Institute, Tel Aviv University.

[14] Interview, Kiryat Bialystok.

[15] Interview, Association of Immigrants from Bialystok.

[16] Interview, Association of Immigrants from Bialystok.

[17] Interview, Association of Immigrants from Czestochowa.

[18] Interview, Association of Immigrants from Czestochowa.

[19] See S. D. Singer, ed., *Tshenstokhov: nayer tsugob-materyal tsum bukh 'tshenstok-hover yidn'* (Czenstochow: a new supplement to the book 'Czenstochover yidn'), New York, 1958, pp. 81–84.

[20] Interview, Committee to Commemorate Polish Jewry.

[21] Interview, Association of Jews from Lodz.

[22] Interview, Association of Jews from Minsk. See Shlomo Even-Shoshan, ed., *Minsk: ir ve'em* [Minsk, Jewish mother city: memorial anthology], Tel Aviv, 1975.

[23] Interview with a representative of the Association of Immigrant Societies from Settlements in the U.S.S.R./Landsmanshaftim.

[24] Interview, Association of Immigrants from Warsaw.

[25] Interview, Association of Immigrants from Prage-Warsaw. See Gabriel Weisman, ed., *Sefer Praga: mukdash lezekher kdoshey 'ireynu* [Prage Book: dedicated to the memory of the martyrs of our town], Tel Aviv, 1974.

[26] Interview, Povonsek Jews in Israel.

[27] See, for example, Dina Shtekhl and Dalya Hurvitz, eds., *Kovetz lezekher kehilat Lodzsh* (Anthology in Memory of the Jewish Community of Lodz), Tel Aviv, 1965.

[28] See, for example, Walter P. Zenner, 'Sephardic Communal Organizations in Israel', *The Middle East Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, Spring 1967, pp. 173–86. The *Zionist Year Book*, published in London, contains an updated directory of immigrant associations in Israel that confirms the pervasiveness of this model of affiliation. See also Josef Korazim, 'Immigrant Associations in Israel', in Shirley Jenkins, ed., *Ethnic Associations and the Welfare State: Services to Immigrants in Five Countries*, New York, 1988.

THE SOCIAL POLITICS OF ANGLO-JEWRY

Max Beloff

(Review Article)

EUGENE C. BLACK, *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920*, xvi + 428 pp., Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1988, £35.00,

PROFESSOR BLACK, an American historian of things British and European, has written a long, scholarly, absorbing, and occasionally exasperating book. He tells us that it is a by-product of a major history of the establishment and growth of the British Welfare State. In the course of his researches, he found himself dealing with the large apparatus of charitable institutions and funds created in the middle of the nineteenth century by members of the Anglo-Jewish élite to give assistance to their less well-circumstanced brethren, mainly in the East End of London. This help was extended during the following decades to the large numbers of *Ostjuden* (eastern European Jews) who landed in Britain and could not be persuaded to move on to the greater opportunities of the New World. Religious as well as material needs were dealt with both generously and economically, according to particular requirements, since most of those responsible for the administration of charitable funds shared the ethos of the Charity Organization Society, founded in London in 1869, that everything must be done to avoid creating a permanent class of dependants.

Some of those who are now concerned with the situation of the newer ethnic minorities in Britain and with their attitudes to State provision have pointed to their Jewish predecessors as examples of what a community can do for its own members, thereby providing — in addition to material aid — a training in civic spirit for donors and recipients alike. One might note as relevant to this argument the role which Jewish women increasingly played in the establishment of communal institutions and their management; Lily Montagu, a daughter of the first Lord Swaythling, was one of the pillars of Liberal Judaism. Such widespread female participation would seem to be foreign to most of the ethnic minorities from Asia, if not to the Afro-Caribbeans.

Professor Black is not content to bring out the importance and achievements of Anglo-Jewry's own endeavours; he is also at pains to show that both the growth in the numbers of those requiring help and the raising of standards of provision generally — in housing, in working conditions, in education, and in the care of delinquents (thankfully few) — made the financing of communal welfare activities increasingly beyond the scope of voluntary institutions dependent on charitable donations. Gradually, the Jewish institutions found themselves eligible for State funding and thus became to an increasing extent the means through which the community's needy were subsidized by the general ratepayers and taxpayers. Of course, this did not mean that no outlets for communal generosity were available; the money could be channelled into other areas of concern — the provision of facilities for worship in the provinces as well as in the newer areas of Jewish settlement in the suburbs of London, while abroad there were constant requests for assistance. Jews were subjected to discrimination and persecution in several countries, with Russia and Roumania at the top of the list, and those who emigrated to build new lives in Western countries and in Palestine needed help.

No tribute could be too high to the assiduity with which Professor Black has combed his sources, official and unofficial, in order to give a full picture of all these remarkable activities. But what has so far been described is only a portion of the task he set himself. He stresses that one important motive for looking after poor Jews was the desire on the part of the Anglo-Jewish establishment to accelerate the process of anglicization which the community had entered upon under the leadership of Nathan Adler, its Chief Rabbi. To be recognized as full citizens entitled to participation in every aspect of British life and distinguished only by their adherence to an ancestral religion, no less decorous in its rites than Anglicanism itself — such was the ambition of the leaders of Anglo-Jewry, who included the remarkable cousinhood that provided for more than one generation the principal holders of communal offices and contributed to Britain's first contingent of Jewish members of parliament and peers. While political ambitions were not unknown among Jews in Western Europe generally — Professor Black is particularly instructive on the British community's relations with the organs of French Jewry — British Jews were more successful than their Continental brethren, perhaps because their community was comparatively small and their hosts less moved by either religious or racial antisemitism.

If one sees the social welfare activities of the Anglo-Jewish élite as motivated largely by a desire for social control, one can then of course understand the far from equivocal stance it took up when there was a national popular demand for restrictions on Jewish immigration from the ghettoes of Eastern Europe. The Jewish establishment accepted the

inevitability of these restrictions as part of a bargain by which the treatment of those who had been allowed to enter Britain was to be as humane as possible.

A further cause of anxiety was the appeal that extreme left-wing doctrines came to have for a small section of East End Jewry. To have Jews identified with anarchism would both give a new impetus to antisemitism and weaken the position of the Jewish leadership. When war came in 1914, the unwillingness of some recent immigrants to fight on the side of their former Russian persecutors, and hence to join the British armed forces, was followed after the 1917 revolution by a new identification of Jews and Bolsheviks. (A similar problem was to arise in later years, which Professor Black's cut-off point in 1920 does not permit him to consider.)

A third strand in the author's complex tapestry is the description of the ending of the control by some of the old-established Anglo-Jewish families of the central Jewish institutions, in particular the Board of Deputies of British Jews. He believes it was the result (apart from the failure of individual members of these families to pick up the torch) partly of the development of a new leadership in the East End and elsewhere in London, and partly the development of a local leadership among the principal provincial communities, notably Manchester and Leeds. But it was also the result of the growing appeal of Zionism which, after dividing the old-established leaders, became at least for a time the dominant factor in the politics of the community.

In order to chronicle that development, Professor Black was obliged to enter upon his fourth theme — somewhat remote from the world of soup kitchens, friendly societies, and orphanages — that of the evolution of a 'Jewish' foreign policy. The conflict between those who gave primary importance to preserving a communal (religious) rather than a national identity for Western Jewries and sought to obtain by international agreements for their brethren in Russia, Roumania, and the Balkans the full rights which they had been accorded in the West, and those who accepted a national identification in either its Zionist or anti-Zionist garb, was a long-drawn-out one; it came to a climax in the work of the Paris Peace Conference and the minority clauses of the Peace Treaties as well as in the commitment of the Allies to a Jewish National Home in Palestine. In this conflict, the leading role on the anti-Zionist side was that of Lucien Wolf, who can fairly be described as the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Anglo-Jewish establishment at that period.

Given the general thrust of Professor Black's analysis and the prominence he assigns to Lucien Wolf, it is curious that he omits one very important aspect of Anglo-Jewry's activities in the field of foreign policy — its campaign against the Entente with Tsarist Russia. I dealt with it in my Lucien Wolf Memorial Lecture, 'Lucien Wolf and the

Anglo-Russian Entente, 1907–1914', delivered as long ago as 1951, and printed in my collection of essays entitled *The Intellectual in Politics* (1970). Professor Black may be excused for not having made use of this reference (no one can read everything) but I find it hard to understand why, with access to Wolf's own archives, he did not come across a topic which played so large a part in Wolf's political and journalistic activities in the years leading up to the First World War.

Perhaps the clue to this extraordinary omission is that the author does not have an altogether sure touch where the British politics of the period are concerned. Otherwise he would not have described Sir Michael Hicks-Beach as a Liberal (p. 278) when he was in fact a Conservative or described Sir Kenelm Digby as 'senior' Permanent Secretary at the Home Office: in those happy days, one Permanent Secretary was enough for any department. What Parliament discusses is the 'Address to the Crown', not 'from' the Crown (p. 293). And why Winston Churchill should suddenly be accused of having 'an unfailing genius to have the wrong answer to the right question' (p. 379) is something nowhere made clear in the book under review; *obiter dicta* should be left to the judges.

It remains to justify my own use of the adjective 'exasperating' to describe the book. I think it derives from the fact that its four themes, all of them well worth exploring and certainly closely linked in reality, remain substantially undigested into a single whole. Any section taken by itself is both interesting to read and full of suggestive material, but what seems to be lacking is the narrative skill to relate the sections to each other. The book deals with forty years of crowded history, both general and Jewish; is marked by great crises, and is studded with notable personalities (Professor Black's studies of individuals are excellent); but one does not get the feeling of progressing from the first stage to the last. So that the reader is forced to enquire, 'What period are we talking about now?'. Even the events which led to the displacement of the original Anglo-Jewish élite are alluded to rather than described. And if it is argued that the book is already long enough, one must reply that it is also repetitive, particularly in relation to the roles of leading members of Professor Black's *dramatis personae*.

It is perfectly true that the ability to combine sociological analysis with narrative is the rarest of gifts among historians and no one should be censured for lacking this talent; but it may mean that Professor Black's book will be cherished for the nuggets of information it contains rather than for having successfully accounted for the transformation of Anglo-Jewry and its leadership. But the nuggets are well worth having.

ANTISEMITISM IN BRITAIN

Geoffrey Alderman

(Review Article)

TONY KUSHNER, *The Persistence of Prejudice. Antisemitism in British Society during the Second World War*, ix + 257 pp., Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York (distributed in the U.S.A. and Canada by St Martin's Press), 1989, £29.95.

TONY KUSHNER and KENNETH LUNN, eds., *Traditions of Intolerance Historical perspectives on fascism and race discourse in Britain*, x + 245 pp., Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York (distributed in the U.S.A. and Canada by St Martin's Press), 1989, £29.95.

ANTISEMITISM is a complex phenomenon, incorporating (as Theodor Herzl noted in *Der Judenstaat* (English translation, London 1967, p. 15)) a miscellany of religious, economic, and social prejudices, themselves often contradictory but melded together by political and even diplomatic pressures. Most of the ingredients that one finds in the antisemitism of the European Continent have shown themselves at one time or another in Britain, at both the street and state levels. The Aliens Acts of 1905 and 1919 had Jews as (respectively) *the* major and a major target. But even if the passage of these measures is explained away on other grounds, and even if the absolute right of the state to restrict the freedom of entry within its borders is conceded, the fairness of some of the regulations may be questioned. For example (as Dr Cesarani reports in his contribution to *Traditions of Intolerance*) the *Jewish Chronicle* of 2 April 1926 quoted the view of William Joynson-Hicks, the Home Secretary, that naturalization would not be granted to a Jew who married 'a woman from his own country'. London County Council housing regulations of 1923 had as their prime objective the curtailment of the right to LCC housing where aliens (in effect, Jewish immigrants) were concerned — no matter how long they had been resident in London and regardless of the fact that they were ratepayers.

The nature and extent of British antisemitism in the 1920s has indeed hitherto been 'an under-researched and comparatively neglected area, an omission all the more surprising since the prejudices at work in that decade (fuelled as they were by fears of Bolshevism which sometimes bordered on public hysteria) laid the groundwork for

Oswald Mosley and his British Union of Fascists in the 1930s. Many of the contributors to *Traditions of Intolerance* make this point, though in a somewhat disjointed fashion: the material is there, but the seven-page Introduction hardly begins to pull the strands together. The book is based on papers delivered at a conference held at the University of Southampton in 1987. Ten of the volume's eleven essays are concerned in part or in whole with the period 1918–45. (The exception is the contribution by Roger Eatwell entitled 'Fascism and political racism in post-war Britain'.) Britain had emerged triumphant from the Great War but was burdened with industrial problems and renewed class conflict; the Empire was larger than it had ever been but the country was no longer sure of the validity of its imperial mission. In victorious Britain, no less than in defeated Germany; the search for scapegoats began and led (perhaps inevitably) to the Jews. In pointing to the patriotic anti-alienism of Stanley Baldwin and to the robust anti-semitism of his Home Secretary (1924–29), David Cesarani's 'Joynson-Hicks and the radical right in England after the First World War' reveals little that is new; but the author has sharpened the definition of the picture, added extra detail, and emphasized the impact on domestic antisemitism of the Palestine dimension.

This dimension was to become even more important in the 1930s because, through it, British Jews could be accused of 1) national separatism or at least dual loyalties, 2) exploiting British taxpayers (who were paying for the British military presence in Palestine) for their own racial or religious ends, 3) creating added difficulties in the already-strained Anglo-Arab relations and in Britain's Muslim possessions and 4) engaging in an international Zionist conspiracy that made that infamous forgery *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* eminently believable. The outbreak of war in 1939 did nothing to diminish the intensity with which these charges were preferred. Indeed, the tragic conflict between the British army and Jewish elements in Palestine that marked the final and most bloody years of the Mandate increased the force with which they were pressed — a theme that is not treated in Dr Kushner's own contribution to *Traditions of Intolerance* and which is under-emphasized in his monograph, *The Persistence of Prejudice*. Meanwhile, persecution of Jews in mainland Europe had created another refugee problem, as a result of which the argument that Jews deprived native-born Englishmen of jobs and housing (this time comfortable middle-class Englishmen living in Hampstead rather than in working-class Stepney) received a novel endorsement.

The Persistence of Prejudice is a work of considerable scholarship — thorough in its combing of sources and deep in its examination of its subject-matter. In view of what we now know about the scope and extent of antisemitism in Britain between the two World Wars, the survival of anti-Jewish prejudice during the war against Hitler should

come as no surprise. Britain's declaration of war in 1939 was not, of course, the opening move in a crusade against antisemitism. Britain did not take up arms against Germany in order to defend Jews, but rather as a desperate act of self-defence. It is true that on 17 December 1942 the House of Commons did stand in silent protest when news was given of the Holocaust; but little had been done by the Allied forces to prevent or at least mitigate that catastrophe, and even less had been attempted by Britain to provide a haven in Palestine for the survivors. Antisemitic journals, such as *Truth*, continued to be published; Herbert Morrison, the Home Secretary in Churchill's wartime coalition government, refused to ban *Truth* ostensibly on the grounds that to do so would impinge upon freedom of the press, but more probably because the paper was virtually an organ of the Conservative Party, and Morrison dared not, therefore, move against it. Morrison had no illusions about the prevalence of antipathy to Jews in the various strata of British society. His own attitude to Jews was ambivalent, unlike that of his Labour-party colleague Hugh Dalton, whom Dr Kushner quotes as referring (in November 1942) to Barnett Janner (also by then in the Labour Party) as 'a malodorous Jewish solicitor'.

The Persistence of Prejudice should become required reading for all who are interested in the social and political history of Britain during the Second World War, as well as for students of antisemitism. My personal fascination is with the reaction of British Jews to the prejudice they encountered, and their response to it. In a now famous but at the time highly secret meeting that Neville Laski, the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, had with Harry Pollitt (the secretary of the Communist Party) and Herbert Morrison (then Labour Member of Parliament for South Hackney) a week after the 'battle' of Cable Street, in October 1936, Laski was told that the Jews themselves (especially Jewish landlords, estate agents, and businessmen) had made a very significant contribution to anti-Jewish feeling in east London. Although the 'battle' had only been a consequence of the determination of tens of thousands of anti-Fascists to stop a march of the British Union of Fascists through the East End of London, Laski apparently accepted that the Jews could not be exempted from blame. (There is a typescript note of this meeting in Laski's papers in Anglo-Jewish Archives, AJ33/90.)

During the 1930s, the Board of Deputies itself had had to deal with a number of issues in respect of which there could be no doubt that Jewish behaviour had triggered off antisemitism. In the charged atmosphere of the times, this argument carried weight with an Anglo-Jewish leadership afraid to confront public opinion head on and fearful of the true extent of anti-Jewish prejudice in society at large. At the St John's Wood synagogue in May 1939 Laski condemned 'the price-cutting activities of some Jewish traders . . . it was no use replying

... that there were non-Jewish price-cutters. He knew there were. But Jews must not trade in this way' (*Jewish Chronicle*, 19 May 1939). This, as I have argued in *The Jewish Community in British Politics* (1983, p. 116) was tantamount to asking Jews to accept a second-class status. It led inexorably to the view (espoused by the Board's Defence Committee in 1940) that priority should be given to fighting 'the internal causes of antisemitism' — initially identified as the behaviour of Jewish refugees and evacuees but later widened to include other issues, such as Jewish involvement in the wartime black market.

On the issue of the black market, Dr Kushner makes a valuable point (in *The Persistence of Prejudice*, p. 121) by demonstrating that 'the Jewish involvement in the black market was closely related to the proportion of Jews in the British economy' — that is, it was no higher than we would expect given the disproportionate representation of Jews in certain trades and service industries. On the other hand, Dr Kushner is noticeably restrained on the theme of Jewish responsibility for antisemitism, a topic which the various contributors to *Traditions of Intolerance* (for example, Christopher Husbands in his survey of 'Racial attacks' and Gerry Webber in his study of 'Conservatives and British fascism') simply ignore.

In an examination (more by way of chronicle than analysis) of 'Jewish responses to political antisemitism and fascism in the East End of London, 1920–1939', Elaine Smith quotes from the indignant letter sent by Morry Davis (leader of the ruling Labour group on Stepney Borough Council and President of the Federation of Synagogues) to the Home Secretary after the 'battle' of Cable Street, complaining that 'one of England's most progressive boroughs ... [had] become the cockpit for hooligans and political racketeers'; but she omits to tell us that Davis was one of the biggest racketeers of them all, and that his brutal and corrupt conduct of Stepney politics brought obloquy upon the Jews as well as upon the local Labour Party. Arguably, Herbert Morrison's greatest contribution to Anglo-Jewry was his decision, in 1940, to strip Davis of his responsibility for the provision of air-raid shelters, a matter that threatened to become a national scandal.

It is true that many of the cruder and more absurd accusations spread about Jews by fascists and antisemites were grounded in religious bigotry, ethnic prejudice, and economic greed and envy. But it is also true that Jewish involvement in the circumventing of the Sunday-trading laws was widespread; that the Jewish Board of Guardians supplied blackleg labour; that Jewish employers (particularly in the furniture trades) were needlessly antagonistic towards trade unions; and that the representation of Jews among rack-renting landlords (as well as among their victims) was a major communal embarrassment. Simply because these matters were spoken of *ad nauseam* in the fascist press does not mean that historians should not

take them seriously. At the very least, they deserve scholarly investigation, but there is none in *Traditions of Intolerance*, and Dr Kushner, in his monograph, confines himself to the black economy.

In arriving at a fair assessment of the nature and extent of anti-Jewish prejudice in the first half of the present century, the willingness of some Jews to condone anti-immigration legislation, and even to collaborate with it, must also be recognized. Dr Cesarani, in his contribution cited above, questions my assessment of Jewish participation in the North-West Manchester by-election of 1908, when the Conservative Joynson-Hicks defeated the then Liberal Winston Churchill, who had fought hard against what became the 1905 Aliens Act. Jewish Conservatives in the constituency defended their stand by pointing to the dire financial consequences that would befall Jewish voluntary schools if the Liberals were permitted to repeal Balfour's Education Acts of 1902–03. My assessment (in *The Jewish Community in British Politics*, pp. 80–83) that Jews contributed to Churchill's defeat because some voted socialist, others abstained, and *a few* switched to the Conservative side, is supported by the evidence and by the views of contemporary observers such as Dr Joseph Dulberg (President of the Jewish Working Men's Club in Manchester) and the Reverend J. G. Emanuel of Birmingham (see *Manchester Courier*, 16 April 1908 and *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 and 15 May 1908).

There is nothing particularly surprising about Jewish support for legislation designed to curb immigration, even Jewish immigration. In a celebrated incident in 1926 (on which Dr Cesarani is strangely silent), Joynson-Hicks (then Home Secretary) refused to admit into Britain a Polish rabbi whom some Orthodox Jews in Gateshead wished to appoint at the head of a proposed yeshivah; but this refusal, far from being the result of anti-Jewish prejudice, was made at the request of none other than Chief Rabbi Hertz, who did not want Gateshead to become an independent congregation and who did not want a yeshivah to be established there as a rival to Jews' College in London (see *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 and 19 February 1926).

In a speech at Cardiff in October 1933, Neville Laski blamed Jews who 'by their own conduct fostered anti-Semitism'; the following year his father, Nathan, threatened that he would block the appointment of a communal rabbi in Manchester by telling unspecified authorities in London to 'prevent any foreign gentleman' from taking the post (*Jewish Chronicle*, 20 October 1933 and 28 September 1934). The wholesale internment of Jewish enemy aliens in 1940 was approved by some Anglo-Jewish circles (the evidence is in *The Persistence of Prejudice*, p. 174), while the records of the Board of Deputies' Aliens Committee (C2/2/6, June 1940) reveal that Jewish refugees were instructed to spy on each other, probably as part of a wider exercise to defend the communal image. There was also substantial prejudice against

German and Austrian Jewish refugees from sections of British Jewry (see my monograph, *London Jewry and London Politics*, 1989, pp. 100–01).

Of course, none of this excuses the widespread antisemitism that flourished in Britain at that time; but it does put the matter into a more realistic perspective.

BOOK REVIEWS

GEOFFREY ALDERMAN, *London Jewry and London Politics 1889–1986*, v + 186 pp., Routledge, London and New York, 1989, £25.00.

Professor Alderman, the leading authority on the politics of Jews in Britain, has turned his attention to what might at first sight seem a relatively restricted subject — Jewish participation in, and attitudes towards, local government in London from the establishment of the London County Council (L.C.C.) in 1889 to the dissolution of its successor body, the Greater London Council (G.L.C.), in 1986. He notes that Jews had some experience as municipal councillors and his full recognition of the basic factors in the composition of the Jewish community, as well as of the changing framework of local government and of the attitudes of the Jewish communal leadership about the problems that have to be faced, serves to illuminate the picture he presents. In the periods of, first, 'Progressive' (that is, Liberal) dominance, then of Municipal Reform (that is, Conservative) rule, and finally of the Labour preponderance resulting from Herbert Morrison's efforts, Jews as individuals played an active part; but on the whole, they did not, like the Irish before them or other immigrant groups after them, seek to use their influence to further special communal interests. Pressure-group politics did not play a large part in the Jewish case, although there were exceptions.

The author is particularly interesting on the Jewish split with the Liberals after 1903, owing to the threat posed by their educational policy to the subsidies to Jewish (as to other denominational) schools. Later, during the period of Conservative domination, there were efforts to deal with discrimination in public housing and in employment policies. After 1945, the apparently natural alliance on general issues with Labour was damaged by the Labour Party's attack on the grammar schools, which had been seen by Jewish parents as the vehicle for the economic and social promotion of their offspring. Professor Alderman's narrative gives room for the play of personality and for some oddities of political alignment — for instance, the East End alliance with Irish Roman Catholics for subsidies to denominational schools in the inter-war years. That alliance ended when the Jews and the Irish differed over the Spanish civil war and the Second World War.

Meanwhile, the feeling that the Jewish leadership and the Labour Party in general were doing too little to combat in the 1930s the rise of Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists led to the sudden growth of

Jewish participation in the activities of the Communist Party, which in turn came to an end as the antisemitism of the Stalin regime was fully perceived. Until then, the main focus of interest is the East End; but the post-war decades saw a continuous movement of Jews away from the inner London boroughs. However, when the Greater London Council (G.L.C.) replaced the London County Council in 1964, the result was that a much higher proportion of the country's Jews were brought into the orbit of London local government. On the other hand, although some of the borough councils in Greater London attracted Jewish members and Jewish interest, the G.L.C. was not, on the whole, given any particular set of responsibilities with which Jews, as Jews, found it natural to identify.

Professor Alderman's final chapter deals with the attitude of the Jewish community to the G.L.C. after the Ken Livingstone coup which brought into the control of County Hall a regime committed to a pro-Arab view of the Holy Land conflict so marked as to be a constant source of offence to Jews generally. Consequently, while Jews as a whole now tend to vote Conservative more heavily than do persons of the same socio-economic brackets in Gentile society, this change in their political allegiance (manifest also in parliamentary elections) which might have occurred eventually, was clearly hastened by the hostility they encountered from the Labour Left.

In these matters of current concern, the author's scholarly objectivity is not so strong as to prevent his own political preferences from making themselves felt. He clearly dislikes 'Thatcherism' and laments the increasing domination of central over local government, which might not in all circumstances be desirable from the Jewish point of view. While Professor Alderman does not deny that the language of Mr Livingstone and his friends went far beyond mere differences over Israel's policies, he is himself undoubtedly unhappy about the way in which Anglo-Jewish communal affairs have come to be so identified with the Zionist cause. But it seems hard to disagree with the view that if, by 1981, 'Zionism had become a critical litmus test of responsibility and respectability in Anglo-Jewish circles' (p. 131), that merely reflects the fact that almost everywhere in the Diaspora Israel has come to represent the major element in Jewish self-consciousness. Jewish leaders are doing no more than representing the wishes of their constituents. To talk of the Board of Deputies of British Jews being 'saturated' with Zionism (ibid.) is like talking of the Vatican being 'saturated' with Roman Catholicism. Professor Alderman is particularly critical of the failure of the Jewish community to fight against 'racism' alongside the Afro-Caribbean and Asian minorities in Britain. He disputes the view that the 'Anti-Nazi League' was so dominated by parties and groups hostile to the Jews, as upholders of the State of Israel, that its claim to stand for racial toleration generally was invalid.

But while admitting that Jews can be no less prejudiced than are other racial or ethnic groups, that desire to see an alliance between Anglo-Jewry and the recent immigrant minorities seems to ignore reality. Jews in the United States had long been in the forefront of the Civil Rights movement — and their reward from American Blacks was Louis Farrakhan and Jesse Jackson. Jews, as Professor Alderman ably shows, have always sought recognition as part of the host community with no special claims other than those essential for their religious observance. The post-war immigrant groups, on the other hand, have developed other, more far-reaching aspirations. *Poale Zion* (the Labour Zionists) could be found a home in Britain's Labour Party; but Black Sections cannot, and for good reason.

These reservations apart, Professor Alderman has written a most instructive book, which will repay study.

MAX BELOFF

DANIEL J. ELAZAR, ed., *The New Jewish Politics* (American Jewish Policy Agenda Resource Book No. 1), vii + 76 pp., University Press of America for The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs/ Center for Jewish Community Studies, Lanham, New York, and London, 1988, $8.25 (library binding, $17.50).

The political behaviour of United States Jews, who constitute the largest Jewish community in the world (though soon to be overtaken by that of Israel, according to present demographic trends), must always be a matter of interest, if only because of the role which the 'Jewish lobby' has played or is thought to have played in American foreign policy. The present collection of papers, written over the last decade, has some useful information on the subject, though it demands of the reader some alertness to notice when the situations described and the figures adduced were current. The main papers deal with Jewish behaviour in the 1980 and 1984 presidential contests.

Professor Elazar shows in his useful introductory essay that the American Jewish community, as a highly organized self-conscious actor on the political scene, is a relatively recent phenomenon; he believes that the main spark that set its creation in motion was the discovery of the full extent and horror of the Holocaust. But perhaps to mark its beginning in 1944 is to devalue the significance of other and earlier manifestations of Jewish activism in the United States, whether in the labour and revolutionary movements after the First World War or in the Zionist movement from the time of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 to the Biltmore Conference of 1942, when American Zionists firmly advocated the establishment of an independent Jewish State in Palestine.

The contributors to this collection are in agreement that Jews, by and large, like other newly-arrived immigrants, found their natural home in the Democratic Party and their natural vehicle for expression in 'liberal' causes of the New Deal variety. (British readers will need to be aware of the different usages which the terms 'liberal' and 'conservative' have in the American context.) What needs explaining is why, when climbing up the ladder of wealth and social promotion, the Jews alone have to so large an extent remained faithful to the Democratic Party. The only challenges to this allegiance, in the period covered by the book, were when particular Democratic leaders seemed less sympathetic to Israel than were Republicans, since identification with Israel is part of the Jewish self-awareness that the communal bodies exist to strengthen and to perpetuate. This devotion to Israel's cause has seemed to call for a fairly robust attitude towards the Soviet Union, and hence towards a tough American defence policy, while the instinct of most Jews is believed to be anti-militaristic. There could thus be an inherent conflict between the two standpoints.

A further complication is that while antisemitism, whose danger is never far from the minds of American Jews, used to be associated with the Right in politics, it has come, through the impact of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its appeal to the countries of the Third World, to be more frequently found today on the Left. What would Jews do, if at the next presidential election Jesse Jackson were to be the Democrats' candidate or if he would be proposed as mayor of Washington? The 'rainbow coalition' has little place for Jews. One must also bear in mind, as more than one essay in this collection points out, that it is the activists and the funds which constitute the important Jewish contribution. Not even in New York, where there is the highest concentration of Jews, is the 'Jewish vote', as such, conclusive.

All the authors are aware that the ability of the Jewish community to play so active a part is largely the result of the changes in the American political system generally: the decline of parties and the rise of single-issue groups. But questions remain as to tactics. Can too much pressure be counter-productive? Professor Elazar himself counsels prudence, as does Michael J. Malbin with reference to Jewish PACs (local political action committees). Marshall J. Breger (formerly President Reagan's liaison with Jewish leaders) goes further and suggests that Jews should confine themselves as Jews to issues with a direct Jewish content and not try to broaden their platform to include all matters of a general interest. There may be good reasons for such a stance, apart from the danger of antagonizing the Gentile majority. On some issues, Jews themselves are divided. In the matter of what is rather clumsily styled 'Church-State' relations, the Orthodox (who, like the Hassidic groups, are in the Republican camp) take a view different from that of the mass of Reform and

Conservative Jewish congregations, who adopt the pure 'liberal' separationist standpoint.

MAX BELOFF

GUDRUN KRÄMER, *The Jews in Modern Egypt, 1914–1952* (no. 4 of Publications on the Near East, University of Washington), x + 319 pp., I. B. Tauris, London, 1989, £24.95.

Those readers who, like the present reviewer, had hoped that this book would recall memories of the years spent as a member of the cosmopolitan Jewish community in Egypt, will be disappointed. The author states in her Introduction: 'Throughout this study, the focus will be on the social and economic position of the Jews in Egyptian society as well as on their political activities. Aspects of culture and religion, daily life, the position of women, and related questions, interesting and important as they are, must be left to a separate study' (p. 6).

The present study is scholarly and is based on an impressive range of source material. The author has consulted archives in Egypt, France, Israel, the United Kingdom, and Western Germany, and has conducted interviews in Egypt, France, and Israel. Her bibliography includes, under the heading of 'secondary sources', works published in Arabic, English, French, German, Hebrew, and Italian; she also lists the titles of various newspapers and periodicals — published in Austria, in Egypt (in Arabic, French, and English), in England, and in Italy — as well as unpublished doctoral dissertations.

A few thousand Jews (estimated at 6,000–7,000) had lived in Egypt for many centuries, but it was only at the end of the nineteenth century that they began to settle in the country in large numbers. They came mainly from Turkey (Izmir and Istanbul), Syria, Greece (especially Salonika), and North Africa; smaller numbers came from Italy, Palestine, Iraq, and the Yemen. Nearly all those from Turkey and Greece were Sephardim who spoke Ladino (Judeo-Spanish) and the vast majority lived in Cairo and Alexandria. The Ashkenazi Jews originated mainly from Russia, Poland, and Rumania and numbered only 5,000–6,000 during the interwar period; nearly all of them spoke Yiddish. In the 1930s and 1940s, the Jewish population of Egypt amounted to about 80,000, including some 7,000–8,000 Karaites who lived mainly in Cairo.

The Montreux Convention of 1937 and the implementation in the 1940s of the process of Egyptianization severely limited the salaried employment of those Jews who could not prove that they were Egyptian nationals. After the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, an estimated 20,000 left the country, to be followed by a further

50,000–60,000 after the Suez War of 1956 and the Six-Day War of 1967. Nowadays, only some 300 Jews remain in Egypt, most of them elderly.

Gudrun Krämer describes the communal structure of Egypt's Jews in the first half of this century, their socio-economic situation, and their political attitudes. The wealthiest families were those of bankers, international traders, and owners of large department stores. Some of them achieved eminent positions. Queen Nazli's first lady-in-waiting was a Jewish woman, Valentine Rolo; on her death in 1920, her place was taken by another Jewish lady, Alice Cattaoui (wife of Cattaoui Pasha, minister of finance in 1924). At the other extreme, there were needy Jews wholly dependent upon the charity of their more fortunate correligionists for their subsistence and for the education and care of their children. Jewish schools, hospitals, clinics, and homes for the aged were established and maintained.

In the 1930s, there were several Jewish deputies and senators in the Egyptian Parliament; the Chief Rabbi of Egypt, Haim Nahum, was appointed senator in 1931 and had direct access to King Fuad. The large majority of Egyptian Jews, however, did not engage in political activities. A small group of writers and journalists advocated the promotion of a sense of Egyptian identity and patriotism and in 1934 they launched the publication of an Arabic weekly, *al-Shams*. The following year, they founded a Jewish youth club whose slogan was 'Fatherland, Faith and Culture'; it had attracted only about fifty members by 1941. Another small group of Jews joined forces with Muslim and Christian communists and founded Marxist study circles. Many of them were imprisoned during the Arab-Israeli war of 1948 and after they were released late in 1949, several of those who were stateless were expelled.

As for Zionism, mass rallies of thousands of Jews welcomed the Balfour Declaration of 1917. Two Zionist papers were launched, but one of them ceased publication in 1924. Zionist clubs were established in Cairo and in Alexandria but their membership was limited. Hitler's rise to power led to the formation of committees which collected funds to help German Jews settle in Palestine. On the whole, in the 1920s and the 1930s the Jewish population felt secure in Egypt, where there was no perceptible anti-Jewish prejudice. Gudrun Krämer comments: 'Palestine was seen as an indispensable refuge for persecuted Jews from other parts of the world, notably from Europe, not for the Jews of Egypt' (p. 190). The wars of 1948, 1956, and 1967 were to cause them to revise that opinion.

This book will be of great value to students of Jewry and to historians of the Middle East. However, those Jews who lived in Egypt in the 1930s and the 1940s will be puzzled by some of the author's statements. On p. 69 she says that Jewish charitable institutions provided 'dowries for Jewish girls and pregnant women' while on p. 223 she claims that in

Egypt 'the Greeks rivaled the Jews in numbers, economic power, social prestige, and cultural influence'. What cultural influence and who were the recipients of that cultural influence? One must assume that she is not referring to the ancient Greeks.

Her transliteration of Arabic words is scholarly but there are some lapses: she gives consistently Darb al-Barābira for the Cairo district of Darb al-Barabra and inserts another intrusive 'i' in 'Abdin, rendering it as 'Abidīn. As for Hebrew, she spells Magen David as Maghen David on p. 113. But perhaps the most striking spelling mistake is that about the famous Simon Artz emporium in Port Said which she renders twice as Simon-Arzt-Stores (on pp. 51 and 112).

JUDITH FREEDMAN

IVAR OXAAL, MICHAEL POLLAK, and GERHARD BOTZ, eds., *Jews, Antisemitism and Culture in Vienna*, xiv + 300 pp., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and New York, 1987, £30.00.

Interest in the Jews of Austria continues to grow. There are nearly twice as many books on the subject in the 1980s as there were in the 1970s. The particular fascination lies in a striking contrast. On the one hand, we have a Vienna which has produced Freud and his psychoanalysis, Wittgenstein and his linguistic and analytic philosophy, the music of Mahler and Schoenberg, and the art of Klimt and Kokoschka. Famous names were represented in Viennese literature from Hoffmansthal and Schnitzler to Kraus, Canetti, and Broch. At the same time, Austria has been the centre of an endemic and virulent antisemitism and can claim the dubious distinction, with only eight per cent of the greater German population, to have furnished fourteen per cent of the S.S. More Austrians than Germans served as guards in Nazi concentration camps. It is this contrast which impels many historians and social scientists to seek a greater understanding of this complex society by exploring new primary sources.

The volume under review here belongs in this category. It is a collection of some thirteen papers dealing with aspects of the history of Austrian Jewry between 1848 and 1945, based on a symposium which was held at the Austrian Institute in Paris in 1985. Some of these articles are especially valuable (for example, Ivar Oxaal's 'The Jews of Young Hitler's Vienna' and Steven Beller's 'Class, Culture and the Jews of Vienna 1900') while others disappoint, perhaps because the editors did not agree basic definitions with their contributors, especially on so complex a subject as antisemitism.

In 1980, an American, Carl E. Schorske, published a study entitled *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* in which he explained the cultural upheaval in that city in terms of a 'declining liberal

bourgeoisie'. Steven Beller, in the article cited above, challenges the concept of 'liberal bourgeoisie' by demanding a closer definition of this somewhat loose category. The problem, as Beller poses it, is this: '... at the strategic points of Viennese modernism, there was a very large Jewish presence ... one might perhaps talk of a Jewish preponderance, and, in certain fields ... a Jewish predominance' (p. 43). Yet Jews constituted only about ten per cent of the city's total population, so that a closer examination of the Jewish membership of this liberal bourgeoisie was clearly called for. Beginning with a traditional, occupation-based analysis which proved to be unsatisfactory, Beller moves to a highly innovative examination of 'more or less complete records' of eight gymnasien in the period 1870–1910. This enables him to conclude that those who were part of Vienna's 'cultural personnel' were likely to come from a Jewish background (which is very loosely defined); that is to say, 'Jews were not merely a part of a "liberal bourgeoisie", but constituted a different and separate liberal bourgeoisie' (p. 57).

If Beller's study brings some clarity to the overused concept of liberal bourgeoisie in a very specific situation, then the papers dealing with various aspects of antisemitism are more likely to confuse and distort. Here the lack of a uniform conception of 'antisemitism' is disconcerting, as is the tendency to set the core of every argument against the Holocaust. Thus, in an analysis of types of antisemitism (Christian, bourgeois, fascist, and post-fascist/post-Holocaust), Bernd Martin states in his 'Antisemitism Before and After the Holocaust: The Austrian Case' that fascist antisemitism 'can be seen as a calculated mass irrationality' (p. 217). It is difficult to understand what that means. If it is intended to suggest that the extermination of Jews was an irrational act, then it is clearly wrong. The terrifying reality of the Holocaust was precisely that, within the parameters of Nazi thinking, it was logical and rational. To argue for less can lead to extraordinary assumptions about antisemitism, when the author of that contribution talks about 'antisemitism without antisemites' (p. 219).

Another paper, 'Political Antisemitism in Interwar Vienna' by Bruce Pauley, refers to Georg von Schönerer as the 'first great [sic!] antisemitic leader' (p. 162), and confusion is worse confounded when we are presented with a literary analysis by Sigurd P. Scheichl ('The Context and Nuances of Anti-Jewish Language') which argues for three types of antisemitism: 'Prejudice, Kulturkritik and fully-fledged racist antisemitism' (p. 95). The first two types seem to be comparatively harmless while the third form, historically, has led to Auschwitz. Therefore, only that third form is truly intolerable while the other two, though in the context of Auschwitz to be deprecated, are nevertheless relatively 'good' (my inverted commas) types. This makes for complex reasoning. There is a quotation from the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*: 'Dreyfus is a

Jew. So there are enough reasons to distrust him and to believe that he rather than a Frenchman proud of his nation has committed high treason'. Such a sentence notwithstanding (and there are more of the same kind), the author assures us that the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* 'was anything but antisemitic' and that it is only to us, the generation after Auschwitz, that 'allusions of this kind must appear at best frivolous if not criminal' (p. 91). Again, on the following page: 'Nobody who spoke or wrote against the Jews is free of guilt. But many of these . . . were far from . . . any intention to persecute Jews'. Kraus's and Weininger's hostility to Jews were Kulturkritik, 'but' they did not want to disadvantage Jews (p. 94), etc., etc. In truth, while it is undoubtedly correct to point out that men like Kraus and Weininger, or publications like the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, did not advocate, indeed explicitly rejected, any persecution of the Jews, they must nevertheless share the responsibility for subsequent events, because they played their part in creating a climate which made 'racist antisemitism' and its horrifying consequences possible.

The volume ends with a curiously nostalgic, but also bitter, essay by George Clare, entitled 'Last Waltz in Vienna: A Postcript'. Clare confirms the main theme running through all the papers in this collection, the stark contrast between the creativity of Viennese Jews and Austrian antisemitism. His sorrowful lament reveals that, unlike most of his peers, he has not come to terms with the end of Jewish-European culture. The papers in this volume notwithstanding, he appears to be busily scanning the horizon for signs of hope and signs of renewal.

JULIUS CARLEBACH

MICHAEL STANISLAWSKI, *For Whom Do I Toil? Judah Leib Gordon and the Crisis of Russian Jewry*, ix + 263 pp., Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1988, £26.00.

Judah Leib Gordon (1830–92), the Russian champion of Haskalah and the foremost Hebrew poet of the nineteenth century, began his career during the heyday of the Russian Jewish Enlightenment and lived to witness its submergence during the 1880s. Gordon's passionate involvement with the issues of his time is clearly revealed in his poetry, while his prose works are almost exclusively concerned with the problems and the future of Eastern European Jewry. He wrote in German, Russian, and rarely in Yiddish (which he scorned), but his finest work and his literary importance lie in Hebrew. Gordon's reputation declined and his poetry suffered neglect when socialism and Zionism eclipsed his Haskalah ideals. Nevertheless, Hebraists of all persuasions acknowledged, in some cases reluctantly, his literary

eminence. He remained loyal to the Haskalah platform for reforming Russian and Polish Jewry in the spirit of Western bourgeois liberalism even after the Empire of the Czars turned decisively towards political reaction.

Judah Leib Gordon belongs to a past which is now truly remote. A historical account of his life and works, free of anachronism, has long been owed to him and it has been splendidly accomplished by Professor Michael Stanislawski of Columbia University, who published in 1983 his important study of *Tsar Nicholas I and the Jews*. He focuses here on one man and his achievements, setting out Gordon's *belles-lettres* in their biographic and historic contexts without neglecting their aesthetic qualities. We learn as much about the Russian Haskalah and the Jewish communities among which Gordon lived as we learn about the man and the writer.

Stanislawski treats the Haskalah as a basically unified movement which expressed itself not only in Hebrew, but also in Russian and Yiddish — each linguistic wing with its own emphasis. Drawing on recent Israeli research, he observes that in Gordon's native Lithuania a narrow passage to a limited Haskalah was opened by the new yeshivot which viewed with favour the study of Hebrew grammar and even minimal secular studies which were pertinent to Talmudic texts. But Gordon went much further. He sought radical religious reform and aimed to uproot the communal establishment. He wished to sweep away the mass of custom and tradition, replacing it with 'European values and concepts in an enriched Hebrew language' (p. 34), absorbed by Jews who would be Russian in their life and speech.

Of all the European 'enlighteners' to whom Gordon has been compared in the present book and elsewhere, Voltaire seems the nearest. Gordon resembled the Frenchman in his skill at withering irony and sarcasm and his hostility to traditional religion. Both also knew how to exploit mercilessly the weaknesses of their opponents. But the sage of Ferney lived in luxury and safety in a castle near Geneva, whereas Gordon for many years barely made ends meet until he acquired a well-paid job in St Petersburg. The malicious falsehoods of an informer caused him to endure a shattering ordeal of imprisonment and banishment in 1879–80.

Stanislawski's explication of Gordon's poems is generally convincing and his translations are generally felicitous. However, it is difficult to accept his interpretation of the tragically sad poem 'For Whom Do I Toil?' (*Le-mi ani 'amel?*) as merely the unhappy reflections of a reformer who is 'caught between the Orthodox on one hand and "nihilists" on the other' (p. 105). Gordon in these verses is not simply reflecting: he seems to be in utter despair.

Where did Gordon's Haskalah lead? There have been many conflicting answers and Professor Stanislawski offers a new one.

According to him, Conservative Judaism in America synthesizes modernism and tradition in the manner Gordon advocated. Such 'an innate East European approach to the reform of Judaism' (p. 229) was not possible in Russia, but masses of emigrants from Russia gladly adopted it in the United States, where they eagerly took to the American way of life. This is an interesting theory, but it requires more qualification and discussion than a mere review of this fine book can provide.

LLOYD P. GARTNER

GADI WOLFSFELD, *The Politics of Provocation: Participation and Protest in Israel* (SUNY Series of Israeli Studies), xii + 210 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1988, $44.50 (paperback, $14.95).

The early pioneering days of modern Israel have already attained a myth-like quality as a time of collective wisdom and co-operation. The settlers have been depicted as representing the highest levels of European enlightenment and education, with an overriding group commitment to build a new Jewish civilization in Palestine. It was not that the Jews of pre-independent Israel were innately endowed with idealism, but rather that certain factors, particular to the time, reinforced and nourished a collective altruism.

The response of the Jews of Palestine to British Mandatory rule was to organize themselves as an autonomous community with all the functions that term implied: an elected government, the power to raise taxes, and the maintenance of community defence. The most efficient way to fulfil these functions was through the political parties and these organizations flourished as they undertook the tasks of providing health and welfare services and, importantly, employment opportunities. Thus, the infrastructure of a state was in place when independence was finally achieved. Apart from the war that followed the declaration of independence in May 1948 and the subsequent years of mass immigration, Israel was markedly different from other new states. Government was placed in the hands of a highly-educated and civilian élite fully qualified to assume responsibility for affairs of state at all levels, and responsible to citizens well-used to participating in free and open debate and decision-making.

It is against this 'golden age' that Gadi Wolfsfeld's book must be viewed. For the author argues that the marked idealism and civic virtue of the early years have slowly but inexorably declined into the street-brawling and mass protest that passes for Jewish political participation in Israel today. He cites as evidence national survey data, newspaper reports, and unstructured face-to-face interviews and

attempts to explain why, in a country where the citizens are noted for a high psychological involvement in political matters, where freedom of expression in all its manifestations is fiercely maintained, and elections are constitutionally guaranteed, a significant minority finds the politics of the street demonstration an acceptable alternative to the use of established formal institutions.

Dr Wolfsfeld's work lies firmly within that area of political science that deals with the complex interaction between social values and norms on the one hand, and formal political organization and relationships on the other. Its ancestry may be traced back to the seminal work of Almond and Verba who, in *The Civic Culture* (1963), tried to delineate the components that underlie democratic values and freedom of choice in political life. *The Civic Culture* symbolized the great optimism felt during the 1950s and early 1960s in Western Europe and North America about a world of economic prosperity and political stability. The study of political culture and politics generally was, in a way, an intellectual celebration of the post-war world and the obvious success of the Western bloc in rehabilitating Japanese and German society. The energy and intellectual effort that went into this particular discipline were further stimulated by the changes then sweeping through countries which had been part of the empires of the pre-war European states. How best could the nation states newly created in Africa and the Middle East be persuaded to emulate the market economies and democratic institutions of the West rather than fall into the errors evident in the countries of Eastern Europe? *The Civic Culture* was concerned with the maintenance of political stability and the promotion of economic growth and it was assumed that the West, most notably the United States, exhibited these desirable traits and represented a model of social development towards which all other societies had to strive or risk disintegration.

In marked contrast, most political scientists in the 1980s track the process of political change and adaptation to what is variously termed modernity and/or modernization. Dr Wolfsfeld's book is a product of this pessimistic intellectual environment, where protest and violence are calculated choices in a political game. Social conflict is inevitable and protesters, far from being part of an alienated mass, are rational, purposeful participants using the most cost-effective ways of translating political demands into desired social outcomes. In later chapters of his study, the author gives an excellent résumé of the literature on political participation but essentially adds little new to it. I would hesitate to confirm his thesis that the deterioration of public life to the level of political brawling is more particularly prevalent in Israel than in other Western-style democracies. The incidence of demonstrations is gathered from newspaper reports between 1979 and 1984 (apparently, a purely arbitrary choice of period) and may have been exaggerated by

editors anxious to fill column inches and sell their papers. Furthermore, Dr Wolfsfeld admits that the intensity and violence of these street demonstrations were never acute. Indeed, he describes the ritualistic nature of the protests and the comparative absence of spontaneous violence. This is in marked contrast with the recent conflicts between the British police and the demonstrators in the miners' strike and in the print unions' disputes at Wapping.

I have no wish to belittle the general usefulness of this book for the study of political behaviour, but I think that its real value lies in the implied criticism of the Israeli electoral system. For Wolfsfeld's argument is that the politics of provocation, the resort to street demonstrations and protests, is a response to the bureaucratic impenetrability of the major political parties where the leadership is shielded from the electorate even at election times. Israel's system of proportional representation does not allow for the representation of geographically or functionally defined constituencies; the idea of the individual member of parliament taking up the cause of a constituent or group is virtually unknown. A politician's inclusion in a party's election list and his or her position in it depend upon the labyrinthine relationships and power broking within the party, hidden from public view. This book will therefore provide strong ammunition for those seeking to change the electoral system and to make members of the Knesset personally more accountable to the electorate. Many books and articles have been written criticizing the number of parties standing at any one Israeli general election and the shameless coalition-building that follows the inevitable lack of a party with a clear majority; but comparatively little attention has been given to the internal organization of political parties.

Israel's ageing leaders must delay no longer the task of dismantling the hierarchical structure of the major political parties and then they must establish a system in which every member of the Knesset has a constituency, however defined, whose members may approach him or her with their grievances and problems. The winds of 'glasnost' and 'perestroika' are blowing strong and they are urgently needed in the present Israeli political system.

DAVID CAPITANCHIK

CHRONICLE

By the end of the Jewish year 5749 (the end of September 1989), Israel's population reached 4,530,000, according to the Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel; more than four-fifths (81.6 per cent) were Jews. The population increased by 1.6 per cent over the previous year. There were some 17,000 immigrants in 5749, nearly a third (30 per cent) more than in the previous year.

*

The Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel announced last September that 12,283 immigrants had arrived in the first eight months of 1989, compared with 7,351 in January-August 1988. Nearly 2,000 (1,884) came from Latin America. Some 800,000 tourists came to Israel in the first eight months of 1989, an increase of 3.5 per cent over the same period in 1988. There were 102,000 visitors in August, 13 per cent more than in August 1988.

*

The Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, based in Geneva, announced last July that 20,162 Jews emigrated from the Soviet Union in the first six months of 1989, slightly more than for the whole of 1988. Nearly four thousand (3,965) of them left in June, one of the highest monthly figures in the last ten years, but the number who emigrated last August, 6,756, was even higher and was in turn surpassed by the September 1989 total of 8,431; 793 went to Israel in August and 1,042 in September.

*

The Second International Congress for Research on Activity Theory will be held on 21–25 May 1990 at the Lahti Research and Training Centre of the University of Helsinki, Finland. English will be the official language of the Congress.

*

The Community Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews reported last June on synagogue marriages and on burials and cremations under Jewish auspices in Great Britain in 1988.

The total number of marriages was 1,104, an increase of 5.2 per cent over the previous year's 1,049. There were 876 weddings under Orthodox auspices (Central Orthodox, Right-wing Orthodox, and Sephardi), 182 in Reform synagogues, and 46 in Liberal synagogues. All three sections of the Orthodox group showed an increase over the previous year: in 1988 there were 702 Central Orthodox marriages (659 in 1987), 118 Right-wing Orthodox marriages (101 in 1907), and 56 Sephardi weddings (43 in 1987). On the other

hand, there was a slight decline in Reform marriages (182 in 1988 compared with 184 in 1987) and a very marked decline in Liberal marriages (46 in 1988 compared with 62 in 1987). Nearly three-quarters (74.1 per cent) of the 1988 synagogue marriages were solemnized in London and the rest (25.9 per cent) in the provinces.

In 1988, there were 3,545 Orthodox burials (against 3,605 in 1988), 526 Reform burials and cremations (579 in 1987), and 356 Liberal burials and cremations (302 in 1987). Two-thirds (66.7 per cent) of the burials and cremations took place in London and the remaining third (33.3 per cent) in the provinces.

*

The June 1989 Report of the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization states that a group of 28 rectors of universities in Latin America, Spain, and Portugal visited the Center last February. They came from Brazil, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The visit was organized by the Central Institute of Cultural Relations Israel-Latin America, Spain and Portugal.

Another group of visitors to the Center came from Korea: six representatives of Kon-Kuk University at Seoul, which has some 20,000 students. The Korean guests came to Israel to explore the possibility of establishing Jewish Civilization studies at their university.

Last April, nine members of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic were the guests of the International Center. They were interested in the materials they needed in order to develop the teaching of Jewish Civilization in Soviet Georgia and to pursue research on the history of the Jews in that Republic.

The Report also states than an 'interdisciplinary research program totally devoted to Jewish Civilization is being developed at the Faculty of Humanities of the National University of Tucuman, in the north of Argentina. The program is devoted to "Sephardic Culture in the Argentinian North-West", involving research in the fields of history, language, literature and music. Six faculty members of the university and a visiting researcher from the University of Virginia, USA, are working currently on the project ... The project is partially supported by the CONICET, National Council of Scientific and Technical Research of Argentina'.

*

The Fall 1989 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that 20 physicians from Argentina, Cyprus, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, and Sri Lanka have completed the first course of the International Postgraduate Training in Medicine Program held in its Faculty of Medicine. The duration of the course is three months. 'The second course which began in June of 1989 enrolled 19 physicians from Ethiopia, Cyprus, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Haiti, Portugal, Ecuador, Guatemala, Argentina, Paraguay, Honduras, Jamaica and Nigeria. The next course already has a waiting list of 60 physicians, including a year-long list for the *in vitro* fertilization course. Many of the participants, who

are senior physicians and heads of departments, come from countries with which Israel has no formal diplomatic relations.'

*

An Ibero-Israel Symposium on Constitutional Law was organized by the Department of Law of Tel Aviv University, the Cultural and Scientific Relations Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Israel, and the Israeli Bar Association. The participants included the President of the Supreme Court of Venezuela and the Spanish Minister of Justice.

*

The Spring/Summer 1989 issue of *Hebrew University News* states that with the support of the Minerva Society of the West German Ministry of Research and Technology, two new research centres have been established at the Hebrew University: the Landau Center for Research in Mathematical Analysis and the Ehrlich Center for the Study of White Blood Cells. 'This brings to eight the number of Minerva-backed research centers at the University. Like the other six, the new centers are named for distinguished German-Jewish scientists'. Edmund Landau (1877–1938) had been professor of mathematics at the University of Goettingen while Paul Ehrlich (1854–1915) was one of the pioneers of modern hematology and immunology.

*

The *Annual Report to the Assembly of the Jewish Agency for Israel for the Year 1988/89*, prepared by the Comptroller's Office of the Jewish Agency, was published in Jerusalem last June. The Report includes a section on olim (immigrants) associations in Israel.

The Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel (AACI) was established in 1951. Its national office is in Jerusalem and it operates in five regional offices: Beersheva, Haifa, Jerusalem, Netanya, and Tel-Aviv. In May 1988, Jerusalem had the largest number of members, 6,894, followed by 4,890 in Tel-Aviv, 2,776 in Netanya, 2,536 in northern Israel, and 1,472 in southern Israel. The 18,568 members live in about 13,000 households. The Report notes that two-thirds of the membership fees are retained by the regions while one third is transferred to the national office. The association derives the bulk of its income from the allocations made by the Jewish Agency for Israel and by the World Zionist Organization.

According to the Jewish Agency's Immigration Department, the number of olim from North America was 2,377 in 1985, 2,700 in 1986, 2,334 in 1987, and 2,034 in 1988. 'In 1986 one of every four, in 1987 one of every six immigrants to Israel came from the U.S. & Canada', with the United States providing the greater number. 'It emerges from the statistics that the typical oleh from the U.S. is a professional, orthodox, is part of a family and tends to settle in the Jerusalem area.'

The absorption services of the Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel range from reception at the airport and guidance during the first days of settlement to assistance in finding adequate housing and employment. There are counsellors in all five regional offices while the national office employs a

'culture shock' counsellor and a national employment co-ordinator. The Report notes that the absorption services 'are not limited to new immigrants, and the number of "clients" who have been residing in Israel for over five years is significant'. The culture shock counsellor was appointed in September 1986; she is a social worker with a university degree and deals with cases referred to her by the regional counsellors as well as with olim who approach her directly. These are often persons who are on the verge of leaving Israel and the counsellor may handle the problem either through a series of interviews with them, or, if she deems it necessary, by referring them to one of the psychologists on her list. The national employment co-ordinator also deals with individual cases referred to her by the regional absorption counsellors; she is assisted by the association's employment committee and its network of professional contacts. The association publishes an annual, five regional newsletters, and a quarterly entitled *Israel Connection* for overseas readers. It also sends its members a calendar of forthcoming events.

The British Olim Society (BOS) was registered in Israel as a private company at the end of 1959, but the Association of British Immigrants had been established some ten years earlier and it continued with its activities after the Society was registered. The Society is recognized by the Jewish Agency as an olim association and receives allocations from the Agency but this is not the case with the Association of British Immigrants. On the other hand, BOS transfers to the older association an annual amount out of the funds it receives from the Agency. The articles of the British Olim Society state that the aim of the Society is to further the absorption of immigrants from Britain and Ireland by counselling them and providing assistance for their settlement; but the Society is not limited by its constitution to taking care of immigrants only from Britain and Ireland, and it gives assistance to immigrants from Australia, New Zealand, and Scandinavia, at the request of the Zionist Federations of these countries.

BOS's head office is in Tel Aviv and it has five branch offices in Ashkelon, Beersheva, Carmiel, Haifa, and Jerusalem. The report of the Comptroller's office of the Jewish Agency states that the 'standard of service that the Society gives is high, and it has a reputation as a successful organization'. One of BOS's employees maintains contacts with young tourists staying in kibbutz ulpanim, who are potential immigrants. The Report notes further: 'Among those eligible for financial aid from the Society, apart from olim, are those who have lived in Britain for at least five years and who are able to prove that they worked or studied there. Children of olim, who were 10 years old or more on arrival in Israel, are also considered entitled to the Society's services in their own right. The Society also gives financial aid for housing to kibbutzim founded by former residents of Britain or that have a settlement group whose members came from Britain'.

*

The June 1989 Report of the Comptroller's Office of the Jewish Agency for Israel includes a section on the Rehovot Settlement Study Center. The Center was registered as a limited liability company in 1964 and its main aims, according to its memorandum of association, are: 'To study the processes of rural development in Israel, to draw lessons from the past and to try to forecast

the future. To sort out all the information that has accumulated about the settlement enterprise in the country and to try and apply this experience in developing countries'. The Center is situated close to the Weizmann Institute in Rehovot; it has three divisions: the 'Research Division, that focuses on issues of development in Israel'; the 'Instruction Division, that deals mainly with conveying know-how to developing countries'; and the 'Special Projects Division that provides guidance and counsel on matters associated with settlement both in Israel and overseas'.

The main income of the Center is derived from the Jewish Agency and from the International Co-operation Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Israel which pays for those overseas students attending the Center's courses of instruction. Additional income is obtained from outside bodies which commission research or advice and instruction from the Center. The staff of the Research Division include 'experts in economics, sociology, geography and other disciplines', and the policy of the Center is to publish the results of the research, even if the 'client' does not view those results favourably. The Instruction Division started operations in 1965, and its students come mainly from developing countries. The Report states that in 1972, 'the Center was recognized by the Department for Regional and Community Development of the United Nations Organization as a teaching institution on subjects of regional rural planning'; it also notes that by September 1987, '1,600 professionals from 54 countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean Islands and Spain had taken part in the teaching programs of the Center in Israel and overseas'. The number of candidates greatly exceeds the number of available places. The Special Projects Division offers consulting services in urban planning for municipalities and local councils and prepares master plans for regional co-operation and integration.

The library of the Center specializes in the subject of regional development and planning; it contains more than 30,000 titles and subscribes to about one hundred professional journals in Hebrew, English, and Spanish.

*

The June 1989 Report of the Comptroller's Office of the Jewish Agency for Israel has a section on youth centres of the Youth Aliyah department of the Agency. In the financial year 1987–88, there were 18 youth centres in 14 towns: two each in Ashkelon, Beersheba, Jerusalem, and Netanya and one each in Ashdod, Dimona, Herzlia, Kiryat Shmonah, Lod, Ofakim, Ramla, Rehovot, Tel Aviv, and Tiberias.

The Report notes that youth centres were established in the 1950s for the benefit of some of the immigrants' older children who could be absorbed neither in the ordinary education system nor in the work-force. The centres provided then 'a non-residential, one-year rehabilitative educational framework, at which children of olim would receive basic vocational training in trades such as carpentry, metalwork, sewing, together with some progress in basic education (Hebrew, arithmetic)'. Nowadays, the youth centres do not have a specific role in immigration absorption but are designed for young persons who have dropped out of the ordinary educational system. They are non-residential trade schools for the 14–18 age group, and in the academic

year 1987–88 they had 2,268 pupils: 1,576 boys and 692 girls. This represents a marked decrease from the total of 2,943 in 1980–81. The subjects which have the largest numbers of pupils are wood processing, metal processing, electricity, motor mechanics, hairdressing, secretarial and clerical skills, and fashion and sewing.

*

The May 1989 issue of *Les Cahiers de l'Alliance Israélite Universelle* states that in the academic year 1987–88 there were 18,476 pupils in the *Alliance*'s 44 institutions and affiliated schools in eight countries, representing an appreciable increase over the total of 16,466 in the previous year (1986–87). The establishments are in Belgium, Canada, France, Iran, Israel, Morocco, Spain, and Syria. In Iran, out of a total of 920 pupils in four schools, only 282 are Jewish — 188 in Teheran and 94 in the provinces (Ispahan, Kermanshah, and Yezd).

Belgium has one school, which is affiliated; Canada has 12, all but one being affiliated, and all of them in Montreal; France has three institutions; Iran has four; Israel has the largest number: 13; Morocco has eight; Spain has two; and Syria has one.

The library of the *Alliance* was visited by some 2,500 readers, while 1,825 items were borrowed, 45 of them by various French and European libraries.

*

The Summer 1989 issue of *Les Nouveaux Cahiers*, a quarterly publication of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle*, and issue no. 25–26 (1989) of *Combat pour la Diaspora* have special articles on the emancipation of Jews during the French Revolution.

*

The Summer 1989 newsletter of the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism, at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, includes an item entitled 'Grants to Students' which states: 'To encourage young scholars, we award a limited number of grants to students in Israel and abroad. Grants are awarded primarily to PhD students although a number are available to MA students as well. The basic requirement is that the topic of the thesis address the subject of antisemitism'.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

Abitbol, Michel, *Les deux terres promises. Les Juifs de France et le sionisme 1897–1945*, 298 pp., Éditions Olivier Orban, 14 rue Duphot, 75001, Paris, 1989, n.p.

Allouche-Benayoun, Joëlle and Doris Bensimon, *Juifs d'Algérie hier et aujourd'hui. Mémoires et identités*, 290 pp., Bibliothèque historique Privat, Toulouse, 1989, 180 French francs.

Bauman, Zygmunt, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, xiv + 224 pp., Polity Press, Oxford, 1989, £27.50.

Bensimon, Doris, *Les Juifs de France et leurs relations avec Israel 1945–1988*, 285 pp., Éditions L'Harmatan, 5–7 rue de l'École-Polytechnique, 75005 Paris, 1989, 140 French francs.

Bowes, Alison M., *Kibbutz Goshen. An Israeli Commune*, 165 pp., Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, Illinois, 1989, $8.95.

Danet, Brenda, *Pulling Strings: Biculturalism in Israeli Bureaucracy*, xviii + 374 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1989, $49.50 (paperback, $18.95).

Deshen, Shlomo, *The Mellah Society. Jewish Community Life in Sherifian Morocco*, xiii + 152 pp., University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1989, £9.50 or $13.75 (hardback, £23.95 or $34.50).

Goldberg, Sylvie-Anne, *Les deux rives du Yabbok. La maladie et la mort dans le judaïsme ashkénaze: Prague XVI^e–XIX^e siècle*, with a Preface by Yosef Hayim Yérushalmi, 308 pp., Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1989, 147 French francs.

Haferkamp, Hans, ed., *Social Structure and Culture*, viii + 340 pp., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 1989, DM88 or $44.95.

Homans, Peter, *The Ability to Mourn. Disillusionment and the Social Origins of Psychoanalysis*, xiv + 390 pp., University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, $40.25 or £27.95.

Ilicki, Julian, *Den Foranderliga Identiteten* (English title: *On Changing Identity Among the Younger Generation of Polish Jews Immigrating to Sweden in 1968–1972*), no. 7 of Publications of the Scandinavian Society for Jewish Studies, xiv + 371 pp., Stockholm, 1988, n.p.

Isenberg, Shirley Berry, *India's Bene Israel. A Comprehensive Inquiry and Sourcebook*, xxii + 443 pp., Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1988, distributed by Sangam Books, 57 London Fruit Exchange, Brushfield Street, London E1 6EP, £24.95.

Lederhendler, Eli, *The Road to Modern Jewish Politics. Political Tradition and Political Reconstruction in the Jewish Community of Tsarist Russia*, xi + 240 pp., Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, 1989, £27.50.

Lerman, Antony, ed., *The Jewish Communities of the World. A Contemporary Guide*, fourth edition, ix + 206 pp., Macmillan Press in association with the Institute of Jewish Affairs, Houndmills, Basingstoke, 1989, £25.00.

McDowall, David, *Palestine and Israel. The Uprising and Beyond*, xiii + 322 pp., I. B. Tauris, London, 1989, £14.95.

Mosse, W. E., *The German-Jewish Economic Elite 1820–1935. A Socio-cultural Profile*, xiv + 369 pp., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989, £35.00.

Prell, Riv-Ellen, *Prayer and Community. The Havurah in American Judaism*, 335 pp., Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1989, $16.50 (hardback, $37.50).

Roland, Joan, *Jews in British India. Identity in a Colonial Era*, xvi + 355 pp., published for Brandeis University Press by University Press of New England, Hanover and London, 1989, $48.00 or available from Trevor Brown Associates, Suite 7B, 26 Charing Cross Road, London WC2, for £26.75.

Sacks, Jonathan, *Traditional Alternatives. Orthodoxy and the Future of the Jewish People*, x + 274 pp., Jews' College Publications, London, 1989, available from Jews' College Publications Department, 44a Albert Road, London NW4 2SJ, £8.95.

Sinclair, Daniel B., *Tradition and the Biological Revolution. The Application of Jewish Law to the Treatment of the Critically Ill*, vii + 117 pp., Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 1989, £19.95.

Storper-Perez, Danielle and Harvey E. Goldberg, *Au pied du mur de Jérusalem*, with photographs by Frédéric Brenner, 224 pp., Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1989, 125 French francs.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

ALDERMAN, Geoffrey; Ph.D. Professor of Politics and Contemporary History at Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London. Chief publications: *The Railway Interest*, 1973; *British Elections*, 1978; *The Jewish Community in British Politics*, 1983; *Pressure Groups and Government in Great Britain*, 1984; and *The Federation of Synagogues*, 1987.

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

KLIGER, Hannah; Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Judaic and Near Eastern Studies and of Communication, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Chief publications: 'Traditions of Grass Roots Organization and Leadership: The Continuity of Landsmanshaftn in New York' in *American Jewish History*, vol. 76, no. 1, 1986; 'A Home Away from Home: Participation in Jewish Immigrant Associations' in Walter P. Zenner, ed., *Persistence and Flexibility: Anthropological Studies on the American Jewish Experience*, 1988; 'The Continuity of Community Landsmanshaftn in New York and Tel Aviv' in U. O. Schmelz and S. DellaPergola, eds., *Papers in Jewish Demography 1985*, 1989; 'In a Common Cause, in This New Found Country: Fellowship and Farein in Philadelphia' in Gail F. Stern, ed., *Traditions in Transition: Jewish Culture in Philadelphia 1840–1940*, 1989; and 'Judaism' in *International Encyclopedia of Communications*, 1989.

STEINBERG, Bernard; Ph.D. Associate Professor, Department of Hebrew Studies (formerly Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education), University of Cape Town. Chief recent publications: 'The Present Era in Jewish Education: A Global Comparative Perspective' in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1984; 'The New Education: Fifty Years After' in *Journal of Education*, vol. 16, 1984; 'Origins, Attitudes and Aspirations of Student Teachers' in *The South African Journal of Education*, vol. 5, no. 4, 1985; 'Social Change and Jewish Education in Great Britain' in *Jewish Education*, vol. 54, no. 3, 1986; and 'Comparative Education in South Africa: An Irrelevant Exercise?' in Douglas Young and Robert Burns, eds., *Education at the Crossroads*, 1987.

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR Judith Freedman

VOLUME THIRTY-ONE 1989

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

CONTENTS

BOOKS REVIEWED

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS