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INTRODUCTION

The British Isles have a total population of 53,420,000 residents, including an estimated 450,000 Jews. Politically the British Isles constitute two countries, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of Ireland. Of their 450,000 Jewish inhabitants, all except 5,000 live in the United Kingdom, whose total population is 50,674,000. The remaining 5,000 live in the Republic of Ireland (population 2,948,000). The United Kingdom itself is divisible into three distinct parts; 1. England and Wales, 2. Scotland, and 3. Northern Ireland. England and Wales represent the largest, richest, and most densely populated area with a population of 44,166,000, of whom 433,000 are Jews. In Scotland live 15,000 Jews and in Northern Ireland 1,800.

The differences between the several parts of the United Kingdom are of far less significance than the characteristics they have in common; and although the Republic of Ireland has withdrawn from the United Kingdom, the links forged by history, geography, and economics remain very strong. The Jewish communities of these countries look upon themselves as a unity; whether in strict accuracy or not, they are usually referred to collectively as the Anglo-Jewish community and as such they commemorated in 1956 the tercentenary of their readmission to England.

Of the 450,000 Jews in the British Isles, 280,000 live in the Greater London area and the remainder in some 100 provincial towns. After London the next largest communities are to be found in Manchester (51,000) and Leeds (25,000). Both these towns are within four hours of London by rail, and the principal communities of Scotland and Ireland are accessible to the capital by an overnight journey.

The cohesion which geography countenances is also encouraged by history. Continuity and gradualness are among the distinctive keynotes of English life. Its sharp breaks occurred in the distant past. Institutions have been transformed but rarely overthrown. Government is not based upon a single document, such as the Constitution of the United States; it rests on the practice of centuries, and the
process of change is never liable to be arrested by a fixed immutable constitutional principle. Theory has its influence, but its logical application usually gives way before the practical needs of the moment.

These influences have left their mark on the relations of church and state. In England there is still an established or state church. When the foundations were laid of the modern Anglo-Jewish community, those who did not belong to the state church were liable to suffer persecution. Various shades of tolerance soon replaced persecution, and during the nineteenth century the disabilities which in strict law (though not always in fact) attached to citizens who did not adhere to the Church of England were removed; religious equality for individuals was established—an equality mitigated by the formal precedence and privileges accorded by the state to the Church of England. Since that time other denominations have organized freely as voluntary societies, and the state has adopted a benevolent attitude toward them, particularly in the field of education.

The complex influences of history, but also a strong thread of continuity, are to be seen in Anglo-Jewish life. As in the United States, but unlike the continent of Europe, the Jewish community has always been organized on a voluntary basis; freedom to dissent is now recognized, but tempered by a strong belief in cohesion. The synagogue, though tending now to be pushed into the background by secular bodies, remains the basic unit. There is no single comprehensive body which exercises an executive or supervisory role over the whole compass of Jewish life in England, or over any of its local communities. (There are community councils in a number of provincial towns, e.g., Birmingham, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool, Sheffield; but their authority is limited). However, in the course of three centuries the community has developed a number of well-recognized central institutions. About 85 per cent of the synagogues follow the Ashkenazic ritual and acknowledge the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Orthodox chief rabbi; in the Greater London area the most influential of the Ashkenazic synagogues form an organic whole known as the United Synagogue. On the secular side, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, 90 per cent of whose members are delegates from synagogues, functions as a representative organization.

The symmetry of the pattern is nowhere complete. There is a minority of non-Orthodox synagogues and quite a number of London Orthodox synagogues that are outside the orbit of the United Synagogue. The Board of Deputies does not operate unchallenged in its own sphere.

Jewish life in England must be visualized also, first as exhibiting continuous growth through the centuries, and secondly against the background of recent changes in the Jewish world position. The thirty-
five families who made up the first congregation were Sephardim who had fled the Inquisition. Ashkenazim from Holland, Germany, and Poland soon followed. By 1700 there may have been 500 Jews in England; at the end of the eighteenth century the number of Jews in England was estimated at 20,000 to 26,000, and for 1851 the figure is in the region of 35,000. By 1881 the number of Jews had risen to 65,000. Throughout this period there was a steady flow of immigration, the newcomers being for the most part Ashkenazim, though it must be remembered that during the nineteenth century the population of England as a whole increased very rapidly by natural growth. During the period from 1881–1914, 100,000 to 150,000 Jews settled in England. The flow was curtailed by restrictions imposed in 1905 and was cut off by the outbreak of World War I. In that year—the great dividing line in modern English life—the Jewish community stood at 250,000 to 300,000 souls. Its subsequent growth to 450,000 can be accounted for partly by natural increase and partly by the settlement of 60,000 refugees from Nazi oppression. The proportion of Jews to the general population grew from 0.4 per cent in 1901 to 0.8 per cent in 1951.

What is more significant is the change in the position of the Anglo-Jewish community relative to European Jewry. In 1939 there were 9,500,000 Jews in Europe; in 1951 there were only 3,424,000 of whom only about 1,000,000 lived westwards of the Iron Curtain. Preserved from the storm of destruction, British Jewry has assumed numerical importance in the Jewish world; and, long accustomed to feeling itself the western extremity of a strong European Jewish community, it now finds that the hinterland has disappeared.

**Retrospect**

There are not wanting suggestions that Jews may have lived in Britain in Roman times. Though this remains unproved, they certainly came to England in the wake of William the Conqueror. With the medieval community we are not here concerned; Edward I expelled the Jews in 1290, and for nearly four centuries there was a complete break in organized Jewish life in England. In none of these intervening centuries do we fail to find any trace of Jews living in England. Thus the records of the Lisbon Inquisition show that a small crypto-Jewish community was in Bristol from 1545 to 1555, and over eighty Marranos are known to have lived in London during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. The most famous of them, Dr. Roderigo Lopes, became physician to the Queen. He was executed in 1594 on a trumped-up charge of attempting to poison Elizabeth, and his fate caused the Marrano colony to dwindle away.

Interest in the people of the book was stimulated by Protestant
devotion to the Bible. In 1648 the Council of Mechanics passed a resolution in favor of tolerance for all religions “not excepting Turkes, nor Papists nor Jewes”; and in 1649 there came from Amsterdam a petition by two English Baptists, Joanna and Ebenezer Cartwright, requesting the readmission of the Jews to England. There is no direct evidence as to the inspiration of this petition, but it might not be merely coincidental that there flourished in Amsterdam at that time a great rabbi who, according to his own boast, “held friendship with many great men, and the wisest and most eminent of all Europe. . . .” Menasseh ben Israel was a man of parts. He was an author and printer and drew on Rembrandt for illustrations for his books. His preaching brought Christians to hear him; he welcomed Henrietta Maria, Queen of England, to the Amsterdam synagogue in 1648, as he did in 1651 the mission which Cromwell had sent to negotiate an alliance between England and the United Provinces.

For reasons which today appear somewhat bizarre, England had by this time become the object of Menasseh’s speculations concerning the advent of the Messiah. Menasseh’s interpretation of certain biblical verses led him to believe that when the Jews had been dispersed to the ends of the earth the Messiah would come. In 1644 a Marrano traveler had reached Amsterdam with the report that the lost ten tribes had been discovered in what is now Ecuador. Therefore, reasoned Menasseh, if there were Jews in America, they had only to settle in England for their dispersion throughout the known world to be completed. Menasseh believed that if the Jews returned to England the Messiah would come, and he argued his case in a Latin work, published in 1650 and immediately translated into English. His scriptural speculations were much to the taste of the times, and he was invited to visit England.

Arriving in 1655, Menasseh pleaded for the repeal of all laws against the Jews. The expedition with which authorities acted suggest that Cromwell was interested in according to his petition. The Council of State set up a special committee to consider the question, and a conference was summoned to meet in Whitehall in December 1655, to which “divers eminent ministers of the nation” were invited. The most significant outcome of this conference came early in the proceedings, when the two judges who had been invited declared that there was no law which forbade the Jews to return to England, because, they said, the expulsion of 1290 had been directed only against the persons then involved.

The conference then proceeded to consider on what terms it was “meet” to bring back the Jews. Some divines feared that they might proselytize, and regarded public exercise of their religion as blasphemous. The merchants of the City of London, whose relations with
Cromwell were, in any case, none too friendly, disliked the possibility of competition. Rumors spread that the Jews had offered to buy St. Paul's for conversion into a synagogue, and that they were negotiating the purchase of libraries at Oxford and Cambridge.

Discussions at the conference were confused, and, although it would probably have given an affirmative answer to Menasseh's petition, there would have been rigid conditions. That was not what Cromwell wanted. On December 18 he reproached the conference for having failed to give him clear and practical advice, and brought it to an abrupt close. But he did not, as Menasseh expected he would, promptly act by exercising his own prerogative.

Suddenly another set of circumstances precipitated definite action. At this time a group of Marranos were already settled in London. They were Spanish or Portuguese Jews who outwardly passed as Roman Catholics. Seven of them, joined by Menasseh ben Israel and Antonio Fernandez Carvajal, signed a "Humble Petition of the Hebrews at present Residing in this City," addressed to Cromwell, and dated March 24, 1656. They asked that "such protection may be granted us in writing that we may . . . meet at our said private devotions in our Particular houses without fear of molestation either to our persons families or estates, our desire being to live peaceably under your Highness's government, And being we are all mortal we also humbly pray your Highness to grant us license that those which may die of our nation may be buried in such place out of the city as we shall think convenient. . . ." The decision to submit this petition clearly arose from the personal insecurity in which the Marranos unexpectedly found themselves.

In the autumn of 1655 war had broken out between England and Spain, and in March 1656 the Council of State declared all Spanish moneys, merchandise, and ships liable to seizure; the property of one of the leading Marranos was confiscated under this head. He defended himself on the grounds that he was not a Spaniard but a "Portuguese born and of the Hebrew nation." The admiralty commissioners, after hearing evidence, found themselves unable to give any definite opinion on the question of his nationality. But the Council of State decided to restore his property on the basis of his religion (May 16, 1656). Thus, by a simple precedent in an individual case, the right of a Jew to live in England was tested and for the time being established.

The petition went further, and asked for the right to open a synagogue and burial ground. It was long thought that no formal action was taken, and that the matter rested on connivance. But recently Cecil Roth has stated that, on June 25, the Council decided to accede to it, though no evidence has come to light as to how the decision was communicated. Later in the year, Carvajal took a lease of 5, Creechurch
Lane for the purpose of converting it into a synagogue and, in the following February, he was one of the lessees of a plot of land in Stepney, to the east of the City of London, for use as a cemetery.

These proceedings left Menasseh disconsolate, for they fell far short of the proclamation for which he had labored. His hopes dashed, he returned to Holland a broken man, dying there in November 1657. Yet, in his failure lay the foundation of security of the Anglo-Jewish community. He had sought for the Jews a régime d'exception such as existed in most Continental countries. As things turned out, the Jews settled in England under the general law of the land. With all who did not adhere to the Established Church, they shared serious political disabilities, but in practice their civil rights were not interfered with. Moreover, any “Resettlement” such as Menasseh sought might never have survived the Commonwealth. After the restoration of the monarchy more than one attempt was made to have the government or the courts pronounce that Jews were not entitled to reside in England or to carry on worship. These received no countenance from Charles II. When attempts were made to exclude the Jews, that easy-going monarch gave them the written assurance of security which was the object of the petition to Cromwell.

It has been estimated that the Creechurch Lane synagogue accommodated 110 worshippers. John Greenhalgh, writing, on April 2, 1662, of his visit there, reported “I counted about or above a hundred right Jews, one proselyte among them, they were all gentlemen [merchants]. I saw not one mechanic person among them.” It is widely believed that the Jews brought a substantial amount of bullion to England, and that Cromwell desired their presence for their contribution to the revival of English commerce after the Civil War. Greenhalgh’s comment confirms that they were comfortably off.

Ten years later, the seating in the synagogue needed to be doubled, and in 1699 the size of the congregation made it necessary to purchase a site in Bevis Marks, on which a larger house of worship was erected and opened in 1701. This synagogue, now surrounded by the offices and warehouses of the City of London, is still in use and was the scene of the religious service commemorative of the tercentenary held on March 22, 1956.

The Ashkenazim

By this time London had a second Jewish congregation. The first had been composed of Spanish and Portuguese Jews, or Sephardim. Soon after the Restoration there was a trickle of immigration from Eastern and Central Europe of Jews of humbler status who adhered to the Ashkenazic ritual, and by 1690 they were numerous enough to
establish their own synagogue. The first Jewish congregations in the provinces were formed in the seaports of southern and western England, and they date from the middle of the eighteenth century.

The continuous growth of the Jewish community has resulted from immigration, as well as from natural increase. While immigration has been practically continuous, it was stimulated from time to time by disastrous happenings on the Continent of Europe. The arrival of the first Ashkenazim at the very beginning of the Resettlement was probably an aftermath of the Chmielnicki Revolt (1648–49). In the next century the Bohemian persecutions of 1744–45 and the Haidamack massacres of 1768 resulted in successive waves of Ashkenazic immigration; the Siege of Gibraltar caused an accession of Sephardim. In the nineteenth century the repression of the popular movement of 1848 brought many political refugees from Central Europe. But by far the greatest influx, due to Tsarist oppression, began in 1881 and continued until 1914. The entry of Jews from Europe, due to Nazi oppression, is too recent to require more than mention.

The Sephardim did not spread beyond London until the 1870's, when a group of merchants from the Levant established themselves in Manchester. The majority of the Ashkenazic immigrants tended to settle in London, but, often with the active encouragement of the communal authorities, who were usually embarrassed by the presence of too many indigent newcomers, they spread to the provinces. Throughout this period London Jewry seems to have kept roughly the same numerical relationship to Anglo-Jewry as a whole—between one-half and two-thirds.

**Anglo-Jewry in 1881**

The mass immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe which occurred in the period 1881–1914 transformed the community. By 1881, however, the main institutions of Anglo-Jewry had taken shape; though the newcomers formed congregations and schools of their own, and tensions developed between the native and immigrant sections of the community, the existing institutions proved both strong and adaptable enough to meet the new situation.

What of the Anglo-Jewish community in 1881? As mentioned earlier, it numbered about 65,000 souls. Three-quarters of the Jews had been born in England, and two-thirds of them lived in London. Among the Jews of London the middle class predominated—estimated in 1883 at 42 per cent of the whole. At the same date 15 per cent of London Jewry belonged to the upper or upper middle class, and 20 per cent to the lower. More than 20 per cent—this would include the
first of the refugees fleeing from Tsarist Russia—were in receipt of relief.

Socially, the distinctions between Sephardic and Ashkenazic had long ceased to count, though they maintained separate religious organizations. As there were only two congregations of Sephardim in the country, this separateness impinged very little on communal life. The Ashkenazic synagogues throughout the country acknowledged the jurisdiction of one chief rabbi. The office had taken its modern form on the appointment of Nathan Marcus Adler, who was the first incumbent to combine traditional Jewish learning with modern secular culture. Adler had promoted the establishment of a theological seminary (Jews' College) in 1855, and had encouraged the three Ashkenazic congregations of the City of London (together with the two branches they had established in the West End) to amalgamate. The result was the foundation in 1870 of the United Synagogue. By 1881 this body, which was confined to London, had seven constituents. In addition, there were in London a few small congregations of Ashkenazim outside the orbit of the United Synagogue. Their position was similar to that of the provincial congregations: in financial and administrative matters each was absolutely independent, but in religious matters they subjected themselves to a single ecclesiastical chief.

Both Ashkenazic and Sephardic congregations sent delegates to a representative body, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, but the Board of Deputies was concerned to "watch over legislative and municipal enactments concerning Jews." Its mandate covered relations with the gentile world and it was inactive in education, philanthropy, and synagogue matters. The board traced back its origins to 1760, and in 1836 it had been recognized in an Act of Parliament. On religious matters the board subjected itself to the guidance of the ecclesiastical authority of the Ashkenazic and Sephardic congregations. Sir Moses Montefiore, who served as president of the board from 1835 to 1844, had made the name of Anglo-Jewry famous throughout the Jewish world by his spirited interventions in aid of his coreligionists in other lands. In 1871 the pan-Jewish feelings of the community were asserted on an organized basis by the establishment of the Anglo-Jewish Association. The association had been founded in connection with the Alliance Israélite Universelle, established in Paris eleven years earlier, and sought by means of political representations and educational work to ameliorate the lot of Jews in backward countries. In 1878 the Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association formed a Conjoint Committee on Foreign Affairs, which lasted with one short break till 1943.

In the country as a whole there were three synagogues outside the orbit of religious orthodoxy, and these were not yet represented on
the Board of Deputies. This was a relic of the schism that had rent the community in 1842 when the West London Synagogue had been established, only to be excommunicated by the chief rabbi for making liturgical reforms of a most moderate kind.

Religiously, the community was static. Jewish scholarship was negligible, and what there was had been imported from continental Europe. The growth of Jews' College was stunted, and the standard to which it trained ministers was not an advanced one.

The prevailing Christian sentiment, which dominated the religious life of the country, was based on the Bible and the prayer book, and English Jews were inclined to regard the same works as the limit of the literary requirements of their own religion. Anything beyond that was a matter for stuffy German pedants or benighted Russian Jews.4

The community had its schools—including day schools—and a round of charitable societies. Until 1859 the granting of relief to the Jewish poor had been a matter for the synagogues, and the apportionment of responsibilities in this field had caused friction between the synagogues of the City of London. To obviate this, and to bring about a more scientific system of charitable administration, the synagogues set up in 1859 a conjoint Jewish Board of Guardians.

Jewish life in the provinces was naturally on a much smaller scale. Leeds, Liverpool, and Manchester were the only towns with more than one congregation, and the totality of communal life was usually included within the synagogue.

By 1881 The Jewish Chronicle of London was securely established and had become, as it has since remained, the primary source of Jewish news for the greater part of Anglo-Jewry. In estimating the forces which made for cohesion within the community, account must be taken of its allegiance to a single independent newspaper which, in addition to its other functions, has at various times in its long history had well-defined policies to advocate to the community.

As important as any list of institutions is the spirit in which they were administered. England itself was governed by an aristocracy working within a democratic framework. The House of Commons had been reformed, by stages the franchise had been widened, and the secret ballot had been introduced; but both locally and nationally men still looked for leadership to members of the great landed families, and the great landed families continued to take it for granted that it was part of their business to devote themselves to the government of the country. A similar spirit pervaded the Anglo-Jewish community. The laws of its institutions were framed on democratic lines, but its members looked to great families of established position in the land—the Rothschilds, the Goldsmids, and the Montefiores—to give the lead. In 1881 Sir Moses Montefiore's patriarchate was well advanced, and he died a
centenarian in 1885. In the same year, Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, M. P., president of the United Synagogue, was raised to the peerage and became the first Lord Rothschild. The financial and social prestige of the House of Rothschild was at its height, and its hegemony in the Anglo-Jewish community was undisputed. To the Rothschild offices in New Court, near the Bank of England, came appeals for help from home and abroad; it was there that the officers of the leading Jewish organizations proceeded for the major issues of communal policy to be resolved. Lord Rothschild was the lay head of the Anglo-Jewish community till his death in 1915 and he was publicly acknowledged as such.

Emancipation

There was another great circumstance which affected the outlook of the Anglo-Jewish community of 1881—namely, the recent achievement of civic emancipation.

It is a commonplace of Anglo-Jewish history to date the emancipation at 1858. In that year the oath required to be taken by members of the House of Commons was altered so as to omit in the case of Jews the words “on the true faith of a Christian,” and for the first time a Jew—Lionel de Rothschild—was enabled to take his seat. This was the culmination of thirty years of struggle, it was hailed as a great victory, and it set the seal on the position of legal equality for which several of the leaders of the community had been striving.

The admission of Jews to the House of Commons was only one of a number of measures designed to place them in a position of legal equality with their fellow citizens. One which was passed later, and which deserves mention, though the context in which it was debated and forced through Parliament was not specifically Jewish, was the Universities Tests Act of 1871. This threw open in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge all lay posts to men of all creeds on equal terms.

The struggle for legal equality must be seen in the light of the general development of political thought in England. In some countries, e.g., France and the United States, the conception of the secular state, or at least of equality between religions, has led to the severance of all connection between the state and religious organizations; in others, e.g., Belgium, Germany, Holland, it has led to state recognition and support of religious bodies on more or less equal terms. In England a single state church has succeeded in retaining its ancient institutional privileges, though individual citizens have been put on a position of equality, whatever their creed. Further, the state gives its support to
religious bodies outside the state church, so that in practice all denominations approach a position of equality.

Until the First World War the privileges of the state church were the subject of debate, and there was agitation to have them abolished, principally by Nonconformists, i.e., "non-Episcopalian Protestants." The quarrels of the various Protestant sects were largely submerged by the common struggle of the First World War, and since then the position of the Church of England has gone unassailed. Jews took little part in the discussion of these matters when they were live issues. The statement that England is a "Christian country," and the existence of a state church, evokes no kind of resentment or feeling of relegation among Jews. The former is taken to express a general sentiment that life is governed by certain ethical principles which in fact are common to Judaism and Christianity; the latter is one of the picturesque survivals of a past age which help to make up the charm of the English scene and involve no practical curtailment of the liberties of the individual.

Emancipation in the political sense came two centuries after the Resettlement. Yet it was a mere coping stone to what had long existed in the social field. The term "emancipation" conjures up the notion of a move from slavery to freedom and is not really applicable to the English scene. Caste-ridden as English society was, the barriers to newcomers were never insurmountable. For example, the manufacturers who rose to wealth through the Industrial Revolution often tried to establish themselves as country gentlemen, and if snobbery barred their way, their sons were usually able to find the entree. Jewish magnates used the same procedures. Their position was enhanced by the favors shown by the Prince of Wales (later King Edward VII), in whose circle the Rothschilds and the Sassoons were seen conspicuously to move. Once they were within the royal circle, there could be no question of Jews being unacceptable to loyal subjects of the sovereign.

Titles had been conferred on Jews at an earlier date—Sir Moses Montefiore became a knight in 1837, and Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid became a baronet in 1841. Rothschild's was the first peerage to come to a professing Jew. The deference paid to the bearers of titles was greater in the Victorian age than it is now, and in a society which was full of officially ordained differences of rank and station there was little temptation to express human inequality in terms of religion. Thus, a pattern was set which ran counter to the notion that Gentile and Jew had to be segregated.

Further, it must be noted that Jews were not expected to purchase their place in English society at the expense of their religious observances. (Montefiore and Goldsmid were both strictly observant of tradi-
tional rituals; the Rothschilds and Sassoons were committed institutionally to their maintenance.) Defections from the community there were, but not because the gentile world made it a *sine qua non* of acceptance. On the other hand, leading English Jews looked on the perpetuation of Yiddish as an unwarrantable self-alienation from the land which had given them emancipation.

The favorable position of the Jews in England reflected the favorable position of England itself. Prosperity, progress, liberalism at home, and dominion the world over brought material comfort and assurance of mind. Thus, if the religion of the English Jew was easy-going, the circumstances of his environment made his patriotism more ardent. It was not the fervor born of building a new society, of entering and shaping a virgin country, of working out a new Judaism that would suit a Messianic age; it was something less energetic and more self-satisfied. The English Jews of that age would have turned a glance at their coreligionists in poorer, less stable, and less liberal countries and have echoed the sentiment of the Psalmist, "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage."

**The Russo-Jewish Immigration**

Between the established Anglo-Jewish community and the Russo-Jewish immigrants the points of personal contact were few. They belonged to different economic strata; they spoke different languages; they lived in separate districts. It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that they lived in different civilizations.

The greater part of the newcomers huddled in the tenements of the East End of London, and they built up considerable communities in the poorer areas of Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, and Liverpool. Some of them established small workshops of their own, chiefly in the tailoring and furniture trades; many more were employed in these underpaid and unorganized industries. They established their own *chevrot* and *landsmanshaften*; they had their own *rabbanim*; *chadarim* and Talmud Torahs catered to the religious education of their children.

In 1887 the Federation of Synagogues was established under the leadership of Samuel Montagu, member of Parliament for Whitechapel, later Lord Swaythling. It embodied sixteen small synagogues in the East End, and it sought to provide burial facilities for their members and to give them representation on communal institutions. At this stage, however, the influence which the immigrants were able to bring to bear on the institutions of Anglo-Jewry was of less importance than the currents that flowed in the opposite direction. Philanthropy early brought the newcomers into contact with the established community. The Jews' Temporary Shelter shepherded the new-
comers on their arrival in London, and the Jewish Board of Guardians provided them with relief. Institutionally, there was a more lasting point of contact. Orthodox Judaism had remained the “official religion” of the established Anglo-Jewish community. It was an orthodoxy of a latitudinarian kind (as was much of the religion of the Church of England). It did not commit its adherents to definite acceptance of rigid beliefs or to personal observances of a great many mitzvot, though good form demanded that there should be no flagrant denial of Orthodox doctrines or no public flaunting of Orthodox practices. The synagogue ritual, which constitutionally was anchored to Orthodox principles, came in for a little more questioning, and in some synagogues slight curtailments were made with the authority of the chief rabbi, but none of them ran counter to rabbinical law. There was much in English Judaism to make the newcomers suspicious. It lacked the learning and the talmudical fervor they were accustomed to, and presupposed a voluntary discipline—in particular, subordination to a chief rabbi—that they were definitely not accustomed to. There were disputes on personal and religious grounds, most serious in regard to the supervision of shechitah, or ritual slaughter.

One of the reasons why these disputes were reprobated was that they “split the community,” and the desire to avoid this usually enabled them to be compromised: the belief in the virtues of a united Anglo-Jewish community remained strong. Religiously the respective parties to these disputes were not complete strangers. The East End may have derided Dr. Hermann Adler for assuming the airs and the garb of a bishop of the Church of England, or for not having the mastery of the Talmud that they were accustomed to in their own rabbis; still he was a rav who presided over a traditional bet din and professed to be guided by the same Shulhan Aruch. The minhag of the Great Synagogue may have been too formal for the Russian Jew, but it was not something alien to him, as was a Reform Temple or the Union Prayer Book—and the children, ready to educate their parents, were always growing up.

Another factor forging a link between the established community and the newcomers was the community’s sense of responsibility towards the latter. Condescending and patronizing the older settlers often were, and in their efforts for the newcomers there was more than one indication of fear lest their own favorable position be endangered. Nevertheless, they repudiated the idea of separate communities of natives and foreigners, and endeavored to draw the immigrants within existing institutions. The fact that men of all ranks thought in terms of an Anglo-Jewish or a London Jewish community, not as a single all-embracing institution, but as an idea that should inform the activities of a number of separate voluntary institutions, dictated an
effort in the direction of coalescence. The fact that these institutions were voluntary meant that they could adapt themselves to the requirements of the new situation, and that their individual members were accustomed to use their own initiative to cope with a novel social problem. This was a different situation from that which existed on the continent of Europe. There, Jewish communities were state-regulated, it might be natural to await authority from the government, and immigrants may have been unable to participate in communal institutions because they were not citizens.

The Russo-Jewish problem continued to preoccupy the Jews of England until the First World War. Diplomatic efforts to ameliorate the lot of the Jews in the Tsarist Empire were the concern of the Conjoint Committee of the Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association. At home the Board of Guardians and other charities endeavored to mitigate the distress caused by unemployment, sweated labor, and bad housing; clubs and classes sponsored from above and served by voluntary workers from the established community served to anglicize the younger generation and to fit them for citizenship. The East End had its own self-sustained cultural life, religious and secular. There was a Yiddish press and theatre and a Jewish trade union movement. There were anarchist and international socialist groups. Secular education (which had become compulsory in 1870) was exclusively “English” in character. The avidity with which the children of the immigrants grasped any opportunity to acquire a secular education was frequently remarked upon, as was the aptitude with which they took to higher studies. The outstanding successes at Cambridge achieved in 1908 by a child of the East End, Selig Brodetsky, may be mentioned in view of the sensation they caused at the time, as well as of his subsequent role as Zionist leader in Anglo-Jewish life.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, an anti-alien agitation grew in strength. In 1902 the government was moved to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject (Lord Rothschild was one of its members), and in 1905 an Act of Parliament was passed which curtailed, though it did not cut off, the flow of immigration.

The Russo-Jewish problem was one of the factors which gave rise to a new phase in Jewish life—namely, the Zionist movement. This had immediate repercussions in England, where Theodor Herzl early sought support, and created a fresh line of division in the Jewish community. “Official” Anglo-Jewry, almost to a man, was hostile to the new movement, which looked for support to the intellectuals and the disinherited. The British government became sufficiently interested to make an offer in 1903 of territory in East Africa for an autonomous Jewish region. The question of the acceptance of this offer
led to important defections from the Zionist Organization and the formation of the Jewish Territorial Organization, which managed to gain the support of influential leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community who had held aloof from Zionism. In the decade that followed the death of Theodor Herzl the Zionist Organization battled in the wilderness, and in England on the eve of the First World War it was in a state of disintegration.

Though the Anglo-Jewish community did not rank high in the world of Jewish culture, mention should be made of the minor efflorescence which relieved the darkness at the end of the nineteenth century. Jewish letters had a notable patron in Frederick David Mocatta. He presided over the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition of 1887, and bequeathed his considerable library to the Jewish Historical Society, which had been founded in 1893. In 1890 Simeon Singer, minister of the most fashionable of the constituents of the United Synagogue, translated the daily prayer book with conspicuous success, producing a volume which immediately became standard in his own community and gained wide acceptance in the United States. This was followed by the editing and translation of the festival prayer books—accomplished under the direction of Arthur Davis, an amateur scholar, who, having achieved success as an engineer, devoted himself to the study of Hebrew. In the rendering of the poetry of the machzor into English he was assisted by his gifted daughter, Nina Salaman, who later was to produce a translation of Judah ha-Levi, and also by Israel Zangwill, who had become widely known as an English man of letters.

Claude Goldsmid-Montefiore, scion of two of Anglo-Jewry's most honored families, in addition to devoting himself to philanthropy and public work, had made a name for himself in the fields of theology and Bible studies. Montefiore had brought to England as his tutor in rabbinics Solomon Schechter. Both as a savant and a personality, Schechter had made an impact on those with whom he came into contact at London and Cambridge. When Schechter left for the United States in 1902, he was succeeded as reader in rabbinics at Cambridge by Israel Abrahams, a scholar of wide interests who, together with Montefiore, had founded the Jewish Quarterly Review in 1888.

One suspects that for the run of English Jews none of these developments caused as much pride as did the social achievements of the Rothschilds and other families at the top of the financial ladder. Yet at the lower rungs a minor interest in Jewish studies was evidenced by the development of the literary society movement; it was also stimulated by the Zionist movement.

The turn of the century also saw the beginnings of Liberal Judaism. In 1902 a small group led by Claude Montefiore and the Hon. Lily
Montagu (daughter of the ultra-Orthodox president of the Federation of Synagogues) established the Jewish Religious Union. In his Oxford days Montefiore had come under the influence of Benjamin Jowett, a Greek scholar whose thought in religious matters was distinctly liberal. Popular Christian theology in England had been dominated by belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, and this was reflected in Jewish attitudes. "The impregnable rock of the Holy Scripture," as Gladstone called it, was assailed by such studies as Biblical criticism, comparative religion, and anthropology. This again was reflected among Jews, and Montefiore was the exponent of the new theological outlook. The Jewish Religious Union at first ran services supplementary to those of the existing synagogues that were designed to provide religious worship and teaching consonant with modern ideas. Considerable controversy was aroused by such innovations in the service as the uncovering of the head during worship, the seating together of men and women, the elimination or modification of traditional prayers, and the use of English hymns. The movement was anathematized by the chief rabbi, and gradually those leaders of the United Synagogue who had associated with it withdrew. However, the emergence of a new element in Anglo-Jewish religious life was confirmed in 1910 when the Jewish Religious Union decided to establish the Liberal Jewish Synagogue. The union turned to the United States for a spiritual leader, and in 1912 installed as its first rabbi Israel I. Mattuck, a young graduate of Hebrew Union College. Thereafter, Anglo-Jewry developed a phase of religious expression comparable to the "classic Reform" of American Judaism.

Another American-trained rabbi followed Mattuck in 1913. Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler died in 1911, and after a prolonged controversy J. H. Hertz, then attached to Congregation Orach Hayim in New York, was appointed to succeed him.

In 1906 Liberalism in the political sense triumphed in England after two decades of Conservative government. In the new administration we find the names of two Jews whose fame was later to spread far and wide: Herbert Samuel and Rufus Isaacs (later 1st Marquess of Reading). We also find a small whiff of parlor anti-Semitism, associated with the names of Hilaire Belloc and G. K. Chesterton.

The First World War and After

The First World War brought an era of uninterrupted progress and security to an abrupt close. A great deal that had been thought immutable was thrown into the melting pot, and, though strenuous efforts were made to restore the status quo ante after 1918, the world had moved on and the past was irrecoverable.
Temporarily, the war sharpened some of the differences between the native and immigrant sections of the Jewish community. England found herself the ally of Tsarist Russia, the great oppressor of the Jews. Those Jews who had fled from the Russian knout could hardly be as oblivious to the character of the ally as were the native-born, in whom fervent patriotism overshadowed all other feelings. The war, which called for unprecedented sacrifices from all classes, caused an upsurge of democratic feeling; hereditary leaders who assumed that the same deference would continue to be paid to their views found that there were new ideas and new personalities to be reckoned with.

These factors partly account for a serious conflict on the future of Palestine which arose during the war. The Conjoint Committee of the Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association engaged in the systematic study of the matters in which Jews would be interested at an eventual peace conference. The alignment of Turkey with the Central Powers and against England made it inevitable that the future of Palestine would be one of the subjects on which these powers would state a policy. Now, in pre-1914 Europe diplomacy had been very much a matter of the relations of monarchs among themselves—diplomacy was the last citadel to fall before the advancing tide of democracy—and the Conjoint was accustomed to conduct its proceedings in an atmosphere of secrecy and aloofness. Ideological differences apart (and they were pronounced), one may imagine the chagrin of these dignitaries at the pertinacity of a group of youthful Zionists, none of them of any particular social or financial eminence, and headed by a lecturer at a provincial university, who proceeded to establish their own contacts with the British government, and went directly to the Jewish community to rally support for their policy. There were protracted negotiations between two groups, but they led nowhere, and on May 24, 1917, the presidents of the Boards of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association published a manifesto in The Times of London denouncing the proposals of the Zionists. The sequel was swift and sure. The Board of Deputies repudiated the action of its president, who resigned together with his colleagues, and the Conjoint Committee was temporarily broken up. The Board of Deputies enhanced its status as the democratically elected representative body of the community in secular matters, and the notion was banished that decisions on major policy could be determined and issued on behalf of the community without reference to the spokesmen of the rank and file. The Zionists have never allowed this incident to be forgotten. The action of the two presidents has been represented ever since as the selfishness of a minority of oligarchs bent on thwarting the aspirations of the masses to preserve their own privileges; indeed, it has been argued that the practical effect of the Balfour Declaration
was weakened by the presidents' activities. "May 1917" was appealed to in after years whenever it was suggested that an Anglo-Jewish body might have a policy in relation to Palestine differing from that of the Zionist Organization.

The war brought changes of a profounder kind which were to level out accepted social distinctions. On the day after the outbreak of hostilities, Parliament passed an act giving the government absolute discretion to prohibit the landing of aliens. This was intended to be an emergency measure only, but the act has been continued in force. Since 1914, therefore, immigration to Britain has been on the basis of individual approval by the Home Office. Since during the First World War there was a strong anti-alien feeling, and for nearly the whole of the period between the first and the second world wars there was a severe unemployment problem, immigration remained on a small scale.

Service in the armed forces for the younger generation effaced for many the distinction between East End and West End Jew. Economic changes hastened the process. The war produced a demand for uniform clothing which was the making of many a humble East End enterprise, and economic advance stimulated migration from the crowded East End to the more salubrious suburbs of north and northwest London. The Jewish population in East London, estimated at 125,000 in 1900, was only 85,000 in 1929. In the meantime, heavy taxation and changes in the value of money cut into inherited wealth. The class of persons who were accustomed to be endowed with the ample means and the leisure to devote themselves to public affairs was reduced. The toll of war was heavy, and often meant that there were no sons to carry on the traditions of their fathers.

Though it did not disappear altogether, patrician rule was on the wane. The first Lord Rothschild died in March 1915, and thereafter no one spoke of a lay head of the community. The influence of the Rothschild family remained strong and generous, but it was no longer to the fore, and the Rothschild identification with anti-Zionism separated it from the pro-Palestine sentiment that steadily grew in strength.

A son of one of the community's oldest families who impressed his personality on public affairs was Sir Robert Waley Cohen. From 1919 onwards he was to all intents and purposes head of the United Synagogue. Endowed with phenomenal energy and unfailing courage, he was able to give strong personal direction to the administration of synagogue and educational affairs throughout the country. Under his leadership the United Synagogue followed every group of Jews that moved to the sprawling suburbs of London, with the result that the English metropolis was never without a complete network of Orthodox
congregations and some sense, however limited, of constituting a single
kehilla. The Federation of Synagogues, on the other hand, remained
essentially an immigrant body, and did not advance with the rising
status of its members.

If, however, the United Synagogue increased in membership and
financial strength, the war had blasted some of the respectable con-
ventions in which its older members had found spiritual anchorage.
Like church attendance, synagogue attendance ceased to be a social
necessity, and the ample, leisured family life that formed the back-
ground of much of English traditional Judaism grew weaker; the
motorcar and the weekend habit made people increasingly mobile;
old patterns of belief were increasingly challenged. A small section
was drawn to Liberal Judaism which, under Rabbi Mattuck's capable
leadership, consolidated its position in London and began to establish
itself in the provinces; but more persons lapsed into religious indiffer-
ence. The main community showed itself ill-equipped to deal with the
spiritual uncertainties of the times. Personal incompatibilities devel-
oped between the chief rabbi and Sir Robert Waley Cohen, the prin-
cipal layman of the hierarchy; little was done to advance Jewish edu-
cation or to insist on the best possible training and status for the
Jewish ministry.

In the matter of secular representation a better situation prevailed.
The acerbities of 1917 died away, and the Board of Deputies provided
a forum in which the standpoints of the older and the newer elements
in the community could be adjusted. Lucien Wolf represented the
community at the Versailles Peace Conference with distinction, and
until his death in 1930 he went regularly to Geneva whenever ques-
tions relating to minorities came before League of Nations bodies.
As president of the Board of Deputies from 1926 to 1933, Sir Osmond
d'Avigdor Goldsmid provided dignified and unifying leadership; though
the main negotiations took place in the United States, he was
prominent as a founder of the "enlarged" or "mixed" Jewish Agency
for Palestine in which Zionists and non-Zionists found a place.

While there was no little indifference, opposition to Zionism had
become inconsiderable. The ideology of the English Zionist Federation
was as latitudinarian as the religion of the United Synagogue, and
could be reconciled with philanthropy, Marxist dogma, or the mes-
sianic emotions of religious orthodoxy or imperialist sentiment, accord-
ing to taste. The fact that Palestine was under British administration,
and England the international headquarters of the World Zionist
Organization, added considerably to the responsibilities and prestige
of the English branch of the movement, and was a stimulus to some
of the best minds of the younger generation.

It is not too much to say of the spiritual life of Anglo-Jewry during
the interwar years that, while traditional Judaism continued to provide the backcloth, the dynamics came more and more from Zionism. Zionism was practical, yet it appealed to every kind of idealism; it breathed a democracy that contrasted sharply with the distinctions made in the more conservative branches of Anglo-Jewish life; while appealing to pride in the Jewish heritage, it did so in twentieth-century terms, not on the basis of fundamentalist religion; and it wafted its followers out of the narrow parochialism of the synagogue to the plane of international politics. A body of sentiment was gaining strength, and with it the organizational forms, which, if they did not yet challenge the older Anglo-Jewish community, ran parallel to it and set the pace.

When 1933 came, the cohesion of the Anglo-Jewish community enabled it to take the strain fairly well. Once more the House of Rothschild proved the rallying point round which decisions were made to meet the crisis caused by the victory of the Nazis in Germany. A central British Fund for German Jewry was quickly established in which Zionists and non-Zionists were equally represented. Local agencies were set up to deal with immigrants of a new variety—middle-class refugees whose grasp of European culture was usually superior to that of the indigenous community.

There was an element which demanded a more activist policy in the political field than that pursued by the Joint Foreign Committee, which continued in its tradition of deference to the British Foreign Office. However, the community as a whole was disposed to resent any breach of discipline in a time of crisis. London assumed a new importance as an international Jewish center. The fact that the tide of anti-Semitism had flowed westwards made the Jewish position precarious throughout Central Europe. American Jewry was generous, but it was distant. Moreover, the United States at that time played no role in world diplomacy, whereas the British government had it in its power to gather together a coalition against Hitlerism and to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish refugees. In 1935, after the promulgation of the Nuremberg laws, when the alleviation of the position of Jewish citizens in Germany was seen to have become impossible, plans were formulated for the evacuation of the German Jewish community, and a mission headed by Sir Herbert (later Viscount) Samuel left for the United States to enlist American support.

The failures of British policy during these years are too well known to need mentioning. Whether Jewish leaders—in Britain and elsewhere—exerted themselves sufficiently or wisely in the political field to rouse their governments to the meaning of Hitlerism is a question on which sufficient materials do not exist to form a judgment. What is clear is that the personal exertions of leading British Jews in the field
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of politics and the field of relief were considerable and self-sacrificing.

The by-products of Nazism were felt in England itself. From 1933 onwards the British Union of Fascists, under the leadership of Sir Oswald Mosley, engaged in virulent anti-Semitic propaganda, and provoked physical attacks on Jews in the East End of London. In 1936 the Board of Deputies was compelled to set up a special department to deal with this problem. Its approach was not militant enough for a section of harassed London Jewry, and similar work was done by the Jewish People's Council Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism, which had a strong left-wing coloring. In 1936, also, there was established the British Section of the World Jewish Congress, the Board of Deputies having declined to become associated with the new organization.

The German pogroms of November 1938 necessitated an intensification of local effort for the reception and relief of refugees, and under the strain a note of acerbity appeared to be growing in the relations between the parties involved in this effort.

By this time decisive questions concerning Palestine were dividing the community. The Arab rebellion which began in April 1936 was followed by the appointment of a Royal Commission, whose terms of reference foreshadowed the possibility of fundamental changes in the government of Palestine. The report of the Royal Commission, published in July 1937, recommended the partition of the country into Jewish and Arab states. The prospect of a Jewish state revived ideological differences that had slumbered since 1922, and whose irrelevance seemed to have been confirmed by the bringing of non-Zionists into the Jewish Agency for Palestine. It also created divisions within the ranks of Zionists on the question of partition itself. However, in the face of restrictive policies of the government, eventually embodied in the Macdonald White Paper of 1939, the Anglo-Jewish community was able to close its ranks. All sections of Anglo-Jewish opinion were associated with the Jewish delegation to the St. James's Palace conferences on Palestine in 1939, and accepted the leadership of Chaim Weizmann.

The Second World War

The outbreak of war in September 1939 temporarily disorganized Jewish life. Schoolchildren, and many adults too, were evacuated to the country from London and other large centers of population. Scarcely had the Jewish organizations made arrangements to provide religious education and rudimentary synagogue services for the evacuees, when the fall of France in June 1940 made many evacuation areas invasion zones, and necessitated drastic rearrangements of the system. The heavy air raids which began in September 1940 caused serious damage
in the East End of London, and landmarks that had been familiar to
generations of Jews were wiped out. The Great Synagogue, erected in
1722, was totally destroyed. Military service, civilian war work, and
the blackout curtailed seriously the activities of most Jewish bodies,
but they managed to carry on at a reduced scale. Organized anti-Semi-
tism was discredited and the British Union of Fascists proscribed as
the result of its treasonable connections with the enemy.

Temporarily, the war brought embarrassment and often acute trag-
edy to the 60,000 refugees from Nazism settled in England. After the
invasion of the Low Countries, they were all interned, and some of
them lost their lives when the vessels carrying them abroad were tor-
pedoed by German submarines. In the long run, the war hastened
their assimilation to the English community. Many served in the Brit-
ish forces, and others found in the war effort unexpected opportunities
for their technical skill or business abilities. The war, and the feverish
business activity that followed it, likewise enhanced the position of
the business community—which included a high proportion of Anglo-
Jewry—while inflation and high taxation cut still further into the
value of inherited wealth, downgrading economically some of the
older elements in the community and consequently curbing their
influence.

The Second World War saw the disappearance of the old united
leadership on which much of the smooth running of Anglo-Jewish af-
fairs had depended. The direction given to the community's affairs
was impeded seriously by friction between the chief rabbi and some of
his lay coadjutors, particularly Sir Robert Waley Cohen. Their dis-
putes interrupted a wartime Recall to the Synagogue, helped to render
inconclusive discussions for the establishment of a united synagogue
for the whole country, and impeded plans for the postwar reorganiza-
tion of Jewish religious education. More than that, the disputes signi-
fied an end of the system under which a large measure of communal
amity had been achieved under a group of like-minded lay and ecclesi-
estical heads.

The disuniting effect of these stressful times appeared in a more
serious and more permanent form in 1943. Throughout the war the
British government clung rigorously to the negative aspects of the
Macdonald White Paper, particularly the clauses restricting Jewish
immigration to Palestine. The Zionists, in England and the United
States, campaigned for the opening of the doors of Palestine to Jewish
refugees from the Nazis, for the establishment of a Jewish fighting
force, and for the constitution of Palestine as a Jewish state. Further,
as the Central British Fund ceased to appeal for funds, first the
Keren Hayesod and later the Joint Palestine Appeal began to cam-
campaign, using the contacts and the technique which had been acquired in connection with the campaigns for German Jewish relief.

Some individuals in the community regarded with distaste the attempt to force ultimate political issues while the country was distracted by total war. However, actual opposition to Zionist policy was of no consequence, though the beginnings were made, in 1943, of a feeble effort that was ultimately to blossom forth as the Jewish Fellowship—a British counterpart of the American Council for Judaism. In the elections to the Board of Deputies that took place in the summer of 1943, the Zionist Federation was able to ensure the election of a majority of officers and committees pledged to the support of their program. The Zionist Federation at the same time succeeded in bringing to an end the long standing arrangements whereby the Board of Deputies conducted its foreign affairs jointly with the Anglo-Jewish Association, which had declined in membership and was reputed to be reactionary in its attitudes.

This revolutionary action was resented widely. The Anglo-Jewish Association strengthened itself; but while from the point of view of intellect and standing in British life it was able to present a superior front, the association suffered from the handicap of appearing aristocratic in a democratic age. Its contacts with the rank-and-file of Anglo-Jewry were slender, and it could not claim, as the board did, a formally representative character. As in the country as a whole, the rule of patricians was at an end in Jewish affairs, and the day of the professional politician had come. To such an extent did the standing of the Board of Deputies decline that in 1949 a few influential congregations took the unprecedented step of withdrawing. After protracted negotiations they returned.

The Anglo-Jewish Association disputed with the Board of Deputies the title deeds giving the Board of Deputies the right "officially" to represent the community; once plurality had taken the place of unity, the way was opened for multiplication of Jewish organizations concerned to make representations to the government. The World Jewish Congress from about 1943 greatly increased its activities in England, and the Agudas Israel World Organization began taking an independent line.

Thus, it was a community that had lost its old cohesion that faced the difficult postwar situation. This was particularly unfortunate as the situation was overshadowed by the embittered relations between the Zionist movement and the mandatory power in Palestine, Great Britain. This is not the place to narrate the course of events from the appointment of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine in December 1945 until the tardy recognition of the State of Israel by the British government on January 31, 1949. The effect of
the Palestine situation on relations between Jews and Gentiles was to produce anger and bewilderment on both sides. The ordinary citizen, overwhelmed (as was his government) by more immediate problems, could not understand why England, "the Jews' best friend," which had just bled itself white to destroy the Jews' greatest foe, should become an object of attack by Jews all over the world, and have its soldiers and civil servants shot by the very people whom they had protected. The average Jew was angered by the sudden turnabout of the Labor government (for which, it is believed, a high proportion of Jewish electors voted in 1945); but he was naturally embarrassed by the course of events in Palestine and the abuse showered on England from countries which were making no conspicuous attempt to provide homes for the remnant of European Jewry.

British Jews protested and demonstrated repeatedly against the repressive measures taken against the Jews in Palestine, and the propriety of this action was nowhere questioned. There was no hostile response by the British public in June 1946 to a Jewish march to Trafalgar Square in the heart of London to protest the arrest of the leaders of the Jewish Agency.

Naturally the situation was a gift to such anti-Semitic propagandists as were active, but the incidents directed against Jews were few. The most serious single incident was an unexpected and largely inexplicable outbreak of anti-Jewish mob violence in Liverpool in August 1947. Acts of violence of a less serious character, though over a more prolonged period, were reported from the Hackney district of London. Less newsworthy, but equally disturbing, was the frostiness towards Jews exhibited at official levels of English society, where relations had previously been most cordial and sympathy for Jewish aspirations assured.

The various Anglo-Jewish organizations exerted little influence on their government's policy during the events leading to the establishment of the State of Israel. The decline in leadership (in contrast to the multiplication of organizations) and the lessened influence in international Jewish gatherings showed itself also when the disposal of collective restitutions from Germany came to be considered. The Central British Fund conducted one appeal after World War II; but it made an early decision to liquidate its affairs as soon as existing commitments could be discharged.

The crises in Palestine diverted attention from the internal problems of Anglo-Jewish life. The Chief Rabbi, Joseph H. Hertz, after an intermittent illness of long duration passed away on January 14, 1946, and his successor, Rabbi Israel Brodie, was not installed until May 1948.

The religious institutions of the community were dominated by the rigid application of the laws of Orthodox Judaism. The proceedings of
the Board of Deputies became particularly acrimonious, and its denial to the Liberal synagogues of the right to have marriage secretaries recalled the religious intolerance of earlier ages and seemed to indicate a further drawing apart of the different elements in Anglo-Jewry.

**Anglo-Jewry Today**

Our description of contemporary Anglo-Jewry necessarily is occupied more with institutions and trends related to specifically Jewish interests than with the day-to-day lives of the 450,000 individuals concerned.

Those individuals, the greater part of whose lives is governed by circumstances external to the Jewish community, are found in every rank of British society. In contemporary Britain social stratification is a continuous hierarchy of classes and subclasses based mainly upon wealth, but also upon a complex of social and cultural factors. The economy is not nearly as open as is that of newer countries, and it is more difficult for the man without resources to rise to wealth. On the other hand, there are attributes not associated with wealth that confer prestige and influence, e.g., a place in the higher ranks of the civil service or the Church of England, eminence in learned professions, or possession of a title. Distances between the various strata of society have contracted remarkably since the First World War. High and progressive rates of taxation, the gains wrested by organized labor, and the widening of popular education have lessened economic disparities or given greater opportunities to ability. The motorcar, the popular press, wireless and television, the cinema, and the supply of good factory-made clothing and furniture have lessened the differences between the habits and tastes of the different classes of society.

Jewish society in England has changed through the gradual erosion of the former barriers of language, custom, and residence that divided the native and immigrant communities. Another special factor is that as the life of the Jewish community is to a great extent concerned with the raising of funds for a multitude of charitable causes, the ability to make large donations and, therefore, the possession of wealth, confers a greater prestige than in the gentile world, where the pace of fund raising is infinitely less. A third factor, which cuts across the second, is that prestige in the gentile world confers prestige in the Jewish world; and, concomitantly, descent from a family that was identified with Anglo-Jewish life prior to the Russo-Jewish immigration is a prestige-giving factor.

The wealth factor carries more weight in the provinces than in London, since communal life in the capital is much more impersonal, and many institutions are large and secure enough to be departmentalized.
As elsewhere, the popular notion of Jews as great financiers still exists. The Jewish merchants, whose settlement in England Cromwell was anxious to encourage, were men of substance, and they brought a considerable amount of bullion to the country. Sampson Gideon was an outstanding financier in the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth century several firms of Jewish private bankers assumed positions of great importance in the financial life of the City of London. These firms still exist, though sometimes their members are no longer identifiable as Jews, but private banking has long been overshadowed by great corporate banking concerns in which Jews play no role whatsoever. In the development of heavy industry in the nineteenth century Jews played no particular part. Ludwig Mond, a German Jew, was one of the pioneers of Britain's chemical industry, and his son Alfred (the first Lord Melchett) was architect of Imperial Chemical Industries, one of the world's great combines in this field. Likewise, it was Marcus Samuel (the first Viscount Bearstead), who founded the Shell concern, one of the giants of the oil world. In the absence of a census by religions or of adequate research work it is not possible to give precise information as to occupational trends within the Jewish community. It appears certain, however, that a higher proportion of Jews are self-employed or in the professions than among the general population. In the country as a whole 6 per cent of the men in the trades and professions work on their own account. Of the sample of the Jewish communities of Liverpool and Sheffield who replied to the questionnaire issued to them in 1955, 67 and 70 per cent, respectively, declared that they were self-employed. The sample taken in connection with a social survey begun by The Jewish Chronicle suggested that 75 per cent of the Jewish males engaged in trade and half of those engaged in professions were self-employed.\(^{18}\) By contrast, an investigation published in 1945 suggested that only 15 per cent of all gainfully occupied Jews were self-employed,\(^{19}\) though even that was two and a half times the proportion for the general population. Observation would suggest that Jews are particularly prominent in the distribution of consumer goods and the manufacture of clothing and furniture.

The survey taken by The Jewish Chronicle gives statistical confirmation of an impression which common observation alone makes undeniable—namely, the preference of Jews for the professions. Of the gainfully occupied males in the sample taken, 22 per cent were engaged in professional pursuits, as against 5 per cent in the general population. The heavy Jewish representation in the professions is confirmed by a survey of the Jewish student population taken in 1951. In 1949–50 there were 85,421 full-time university students, and it was estimated that 3,000 were Jews. Thus, while the proportion of Jews to
the general population was less than one in a hundred, one in twenty-eight was a university student.

Organizational Development

The organizational structure of Anglo-Jewry exhibits the needs and the tendencies of three centuries. Although religious organizations conform to a single pattern to an extent far greater than in the United States, the basis of all organized Jewish life in England is voluntary association. There is not, and never has been, anything in the nature of a state-established Jewish community, such as was the rule on the continent of Europe, and such as Menasseh ben Israel sought in England. Nevertheless, the influence of the European form of Jewish life lost less of its force crossing the English Channel than it did crossing the Atlantic. If at times there has been a high degree of conformity to a single pattern it is because, although the state freely allows voluntary association, habits of mind encourage voluntary restraint. Such restraint can be seen in many fields of English life, and in the case of Jews it is reinforced by a desire to maintain solidarity towards the Gentile world.

Jewish organizations can be classified under many headings. For present purposes we may separate out two groups. The older group, which consists of synagogues and institutions which have grown out of synagogues, still forms the basic community. The newer group, reflecting the outlook of a secular age, is concerned to propagate Zionism, to raise funds for local or overseas causes, or to provide social attachments within the Jewish fold.

The original Sephardic community—the London Congregation of Spanish and Portuguese Jews—constituted a synagogue-community in itself. It maintained a house of worship and a burial ground; it had a rabbi and a slaughterer; it maintained a school for the education of its children, and a physician for the healing of its sick; it relieved the poor; it had its spokesman with the gentile world; and, above all, it exercised stringent discipline over its members, based upon the ultimate sanction of expulsion.

Though circumstances have reduced to a negligible quantity the discipline which any Jewish congregation in England can exercise over its members, the Congregation of Spanish and Portuguese Jews carries on a full round of activities comparable with those of former times. It clings to the past with great zeal, and, if no longer a major force, is treated with considerable respect.

In internal matters the Sephardim and the Ashkenazic congregations that followed them stood very aloof from each other. Nevertheless, a common Jewish solidarity demanded joint action in relation to
the government, and together they established the Board of Deputies in 1760. The multiplication of Ashkenazic congregations led to the institution of a chief rabbinate, an ecclesiastical authority common to all of them, and in London to the formation of a joint board to provide kosher meat (1804), in which the Sephardim also participated. Likewise, the multiplication of Ashkenazic congregations in London rendered it necessary to vest the relief of the poor in a joint Board of Guardians (1859). Ad hoc charitable institutions, e.g., the Jewish Orphanage (founded 1795) had already come into being, and they multiplied with the growth of the community. Schools and classes were founded either independently or in conjunction with the synagogues.

These organizations cannot be discussed in detail, but three bodies have emerged over the years as the central organizations of the community. Each has primacy in its field, but does not stand alone.

Representative Bodies

Senior among the organizations which in this Year Book would be grouped under the heading “Community Relations, Political” is the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews, generally known as the Board of Deputies of British Jews. Its long history, its continuous development, and the manner of its constitution give it a unique place in the life of the Anglo-Jewish community.

For some years after 1656 the legal position of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation was unsure. The congregation's first laws (adopted in 1664) show prudence and self-restraint in its policy towards the non-Jewish world. These laws forbid Jews to discuss religion with Gentiles, to speak offensive words against the Christian faith, or to seek proselytes. Obviously, the congregation needed to restrain individual members from speaking in the name of the Jewish community, and Law 34 declared:

No one shall set himself up, under penalty of Herrem [excommunication] to speak by himself or by others in these realms to any person in the name of the Nation or general affairs thereof, except by the said Mahamed [executive] or such as they may appoint, as it is thus more fitting.

The task of watching over political developments which might affect Jews was delegated to a group known as Deputados. This group achieved a certain permanence in 1714, though there are indications of earlier activity.

When the Ashkenazic congregation was formed, it nominated its own German Secret Committee for Public Affairs. The origin of the Board of Deputies can be traced back to the resolve of these two
groups to cooperate in external affairs. In 1760 King George III ascended to the throne, and the Sephardim sent their own deputation to express homage to the new sovereign. The Ashkenazim complained at not having been invited to join this deputation, and out of this complaint there arose an arrangement for joint action in such matters.

In 1836 the board received statutory recognition. Parliament did not designate it in terms as the representative body of the Jewish community, but in adopting an act which set up a system of civil registration of marriages, it authorized the secretary of a synagogue certified as such by the president of the Board of Deputies to act as registrar for civil purposes. Parliament itself conferred no power on any ecclesiastical authority, but as administered by the Board of Deputies, the parliamentary marriage secretary authorization (see p. 32) has become an important link in the chain that secures the chief rabbi's position.

The great prestige of the board which qualified it to receive statutory recognition derived from the fact that in 1835 Sir Moses Montefiore became its president, an office which he retained with short intervals for forty years. In 1840 Sir Moses journeyed to Alexandria and Constantinople to intercede on behalf of the Jews of Damascus and of Rhodes, where charges of ritual murder had been raised, an action which enhanced the reputation of the board throughout the Jewish world. From 1840 onwards the Board of Deputies made representations from time to time to the British government on behalf of oppressed Jewries.

The year 1878 saw the formation of a Conjoint Foreign Committee, consisting of representatives of the Board of Deputies and of the Anglo-Jewish Association (which had been founded in 1871). From that time, approaches to the British or foreign governments on behalf of Jews in other lands were effected through this Conjoint Committee, later known as the Joint Foreign Committee, which remained in existence (with a short break in 1917), until 1943, when (in the circumstances outlined on p. 24) the Board of Deputies decided not to renew the agreement between the two parent bodies.

Together with the B'nai B'rith of the United States and the South African Board of Deputies, the Board of Deputies of British Jews constitutes the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, which has consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

From its beginnings as a committee the Board of Deputies has grown, so that today it consists of 430 members representing 124 congregations in London, 112 in the provinces and 6 in the British Commonwealth, as well as 25 institutions. Of the 242 congregations, three are Sephardic, six are Reform, and five are Liberal; the remainder are Orthodox Ashkenazic congregations. Members do not necessarily have
more than a nominal connection with the congregations whom they represent; some of the smaller congregations elect anyone who will pay the affiliation fee for them.

The full board meets in public session each month when the officers and chairmen of committees present reports on their activities since the preceding meeting. These reports the board debates in parliamentary fashion. There are (inter alia) executive, Eretz Israel, foreign affairs, Jewish defense, and law and parliamentary committees. Their titles indicate the main lines of the board's work.

The Board of Deputies is financed by affiliation fees and by a small voluntary levy on members of constituent congregations. Its annual expenditure is about £17,500 ($49,000).

Note must be taken of two clauses in the board's constitution relative to the Ecclesiastical Authorities (which means, except where a Sephardic synagogue is concerned, the chief rabbi):

37. The guidance of the Board on religious matters (inclusive of matters relating to marriages and matters involving questions affecting the religious customs and usages of the Jews) shall remain as heretofore with the Ecclesiastical Authorities, to whom all such matters shall be referred; but since Congregations and Institutions not under the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Authorities may be represented on the Board, nothing in this Clause contained, or any decision given under it, shall be taken to represent the opinion of anyCongregation not acknowledging the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Authorities, or shall abridge the rights of action of or affect in any way such Congregation.

38. In every future application to the Board to certify the Secretary for Marriages of a Synagogue, under any Act for the time being in force, for which no such Secretary has been previously certified by the President of the Board, such application shall be in writing signed by the President and not less than five members of the Congregation making application, and shall be accompanied by a certificate from the Ecclesiastical Authorities testifying that the applicants do constitute a Synagogue of persons professing the Jewish religion.

The present form of Clause 37 represents a compromise agreed upon in order to enable the Reform Synagogue to join the Board in 1885; previously the second part of the clause did not exist, and the earlier part referred to the guidance of the community on religious matters. The effect of Clause 38 is considered later in connection with the chief rabbinate.

The authority of the Board of Deputies is persuasive only. Apart from the statutory recognition accorded to the board, government departments consult with it and receive its communications with an awareness of its long history and representative character. Yet it is in
no sense the sole agency through which British Jews channel their representations to government departments. In 1856 when the Board of Deputies, under Orthodox domination, refused to allow the Reform Synagogue to have a marriage registrar, Parliament passed special legislation to give the facility to that synagogue without recourse to the board. In 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was under consideration, the government formally asked the opinion of seven leading Jews. In September 1956, when it wished to sound feeling in the Jewish community on a matter of some public importance, the government department concerned used a private channel of communication, side-stepping the board and its rivals. Apart from these exceptional cases, the growth in the area of government activity has increased the number of day-to-day contacts, the breakdown of the old unity in the field of foreign affairs has already been noted.

Allusion has been made already to the Board’s competitors. The Anglo-Jewish Association represents the old political tradition of the community, and it works closely with the American Jewish Committee and the Alliance Israélite Universelle. It still has prestige, but its resources are limited, and as it does not concern itself with domestic matters, it cannot arouse much active interest outside a limited circle. The annual expenditure of the association, other than disbursements from educational trusts, is £5,900 ($16,000).

The British section of the World Jewish Congress appears to be better endowed financially than the two older bodies and has gathered a considerable number of affiliates in all parts of the country. Its work is many sided, e.g., it includes an expanding cultural program. The older bodies are still run by their lay element; in the World Jewish Congress, on the other hand, the direction lies with the professionals, and many feel that the congress often shows itself superior in alertness and imagination. At intervals there are efforts among the Board of Deputies, the Anglo-Jewish Association, and the World Jewish Congress to achieve coordination in the field of foreign affairs. These usually end in recrimination: no long-standing agreement has ever been arrived at.

Finally, mention must be made of an offshoot of the Board of Deputies which represents an entirely new phenomenon in Anglo-Jewish life. In 1938 the board’s defense committee set up a subcommittee with the object of removing causes of friction between Jews and non-Jews in trade, industry, and commerce. This body, known as the Trades Advisory Council, emerged during the Second World War as an independent organization and recruited members directly among Jewish businessmen. It has assumed some of the characteristics of a Jewish chamber of commerce, and is an interesting example of self-segregation on an entirely secular basis.
The Chief Rabbinate

The second great central institution is the chief rabbinate. It is narrower in its range than the Board of Deputies, since there are appreciable elements outside its jurisdiction—the Sephardim, the Reformers, and the Liberals; besides, the growth of secular forms of Jewish life means that there are levels of activity in which the ecclesiastical viewpoint is of no particular moment. Nevertheless, the chief rabbi is accepted as the spokesman of the community as a whole, and the desire to obtain his support extends beyond the narrowly religious sphere. The chief rabbinate is deeply embedded in Anglo-Jewish history, and the existence of the office has meant that the community, while lacking the state-ordained ecclesiastical authority such as European rulers set up for their Jewish subjects, has avoided the congregationalism prevalent in the United States.

As we have seen, the Ashkenazim, unlike the Sephardim, multiplied their synagogues and spread from London to the provinces. The first rabbi of the Great Synagogue was Judah Leib Cohen. He retired in 1700, and his successor Aaron Hart (1670–1756) held office from c. 1704 until his death. Shortly after Hart's appointment there was a split in the Ashkenazic community. In 1707 some members of the Great Synagogue seceded and formed the Hambro' Synagogue. When Hart Lyon was appointed to the Great Synagogue in 1756, the Hambro' Synagogue recognized his authority and contributed to his salary. In 1761 there was a further split, resulting in the establishment of the New Synagogue; but again the secessionists recognized the authority of the rav of the Great Synagogue. When Hart Lyon died in 1764, there was a dispute as to the election of a successor, and for a time rabbinic authority in London was contested. This did not last long, and the authority of David Tevele Schiff (d. 1792), whom the Great Synagogue appointed in 1765, was recognized by the other two congregations.

By this time the authority of the rav of the Great Synagogue extended to the provinces. The congregations which were established outside London were composed for the most part of Jews who had passed through London, and who during their sojourn in the capital had come under the influence of the Great Synagogue—sometimes as recipients of relief. These congregations were small and unable to afford rabbis of their own. It was natural therefore that they should turn for guidance in religious matters to the rabbi of the London synagogue with which they had been connected.

The next important stage in the history of the chief rabbinate came when Nathan Marcus Adler was installed in office in 1845. His predecessors had been rabbis of the pre-emancipation school who had con-
cerned themselves with the exposition of the Talmud and the adjudication of ritual questions. While well-equipped in these fields and strictly Orthodox, Adler was the product of a German university and had wider communal interests. The community had been split by the establishment of a Reform Synagogue, and Adler exerted himself to improve congregational decorum and discipline. He played a prominent part in establishing Jews' College (1856), and encouraged the formation of the United Synagogue (1870). Adler held office until 1890. For the last ten years of his life, however, he lived in retirement, and his son Hermann, who eventually succeeded him, acted as his delegate. Both the Adlers sought to maintain as a matter of principle the centralization of religious authority in a single rabbi which, as we have seen, originated casually in the eighteenth century. The growth of the community and the more independent temper of the Russo-Jewish immigrants necessitated the modification of this extreme centralization, but the idea of a single ecclesiastical authority for the whole country, instead of for each town, as was the accepted European usage, remains firmly entrenched in Anglo-Jewry. Hence, also, rabbinical associations or conferences have been of little importance.

The establishment of the chief rabbi's jurisdiction over each new congregation as it was founded was assisted by clause 38 of the Board of Deputies' constitution relating to secretaries for marriages, on the basis of which the chief rabbi takes care that the applicant congregation agrees to acknowledge his authority. A clause is inserted in the laws of the congregation that its ritual and worship shall be under the supervision and control of the chief rabbi, and that no marriage shall be solemnized without the chief rabbi's written authorization. The constitution of the United Synagogue is rigid in its provisions—apart from the aforementioned requirements, no person may preach in any constituent synagogue without the chief rabbi's sanction. The authorization of marriages ensures that the chief rabbi's rulings in regard to the admission of proselytes, religious divorce, and personal status are observed.

Apart from these matters, the interpretation given to the chief rabbi's authority can vary according to the disposition of the congregation. Congregations which advertise for rabbis or cantors usually prescribe that the applicant shall be approved by the chief rabbi and consult him about their choice. Disputes between congregations and officials are often submitted to the chief rabbi for arbitration, as are disputes between congregations; virtute officio the chief rabbi is president of Jews' College, and thus is intimately concerned with entrants to the ministry; he presides over an examining board, which awards the rabbinical diploma, and is chairman of the statutory commission that licenses shochetim.
Naturally, communal bodies of all kinds seek the patronage of the chief rabbi and desire him to grace their public occasions. It is usual for him to perform the religious ceremonies connected with the laying of foundation stones of synagogues and their opening, and he often makes pastoral visits to provincial communities. Hertz made an eleven-month tour of the British Empire in 1920, and the present chief rabbi has paid separate visits to South Africa, Australia, and Canada.

Further, the chief rabbi is the public representative of Judaism to the outside world. On occasions of national joy or sorrow he issues formal statements in the name of the Jewish community along with other religious bodies, and his name often figures among the guests at royal and national functions.

That the office of chief rabbi, never imposed from outside, but developing with the community for several generations, has proved of decisive influence cannot be doubted. So much must be admitted even by those who deplore an enforced uniformity in ritual matters. When we come to consider the influence of the chief rabbi at any particular time, difficulties of assessment immediately arise. Other offices, far better endowed with legally enforceable powers, respond to the impact of personalities; how much more is this the case with an office that depends largely on usage.

A new chief rabbi enters upon a considerable inheritance, but it cannot be predicted whether he will add to it or suffer it to be diminished. No chief rabbi has attained the position at Buckingham Palace or the Mansion House that Hermann Adler (d. 1911) occupied. On the other hand, the fearless independence of Hertz (d. 1946) made him a force to be reckoned with inside the Anglo-Jewish community. One recent development which has affected the influence of the chief rabbi may be mentioned. In accordance with traditional Jewish law, there has always been a rabbinical court (Beth Din) consisting of the chief rabbi and (at present) four assessors (dayanim). Until recently it could never be doubted that the dayanim were definitely subordinate to the chief rabbi where matters of religious policy were concerned. For some years before his death Hertz was partly incapacitated by illness, and there was an interregnum of more than two years before his successor assumed office. At that time an exceptionally strong personality was numbered among the dayanim, and the result has been considerably to alter the balance of authority as between the chief rabbi and the Beth Din.

The holder of such an office is naturally a target for criticism. Although the chief rabbi may be criticized (in private, usually, and not in public), there is little dissatisfaction with the office; in a country which has an archbishop, it is natural to have a chief rabbi.

Of the influence of the chief rabbinate on the spiritual life of
Anglo-Jewry during the last half century, the generalization may be made that it has been negative rather than positive, i.e., it has prevented divergence from a standard pattern rather than impressed a religious idea on the community.

The position of Haham, or chief rabbi of the Sephardim, is one of dignity but naturally not of wide authority. The Reformers and Liberals have no hierarchy. Each congregation is law unto itself, but the congregations' rabbis meet together in order to discuss common problems. The Reform group has recently instituted a rabbinical court which attempts to adapt traditional rules to contemporary needs.

Synagogue Groupings

The third great central institution of the Anglo-Jewish community is the United Synagogue. It belongs to this category of a national body, though its immediate operations are confined to the London area. The United Synagogue is the main prop of the chief rabbinate, and its strength is such that it sets the tone for all the Orthodox synagogues in the country.

When founded in 1870 the United Synagogue consisted of five synagogues. It has since grown to a body of seventy-seven congregations with 32,000 members. These congregations are of various sizes and classes: the heart of the organization is the twenty-five "constituent" synagogues. Next in importance comes a group of twenty "district" synagogues, modeled in their administration on the constituents, and many of them anticipating eventual elevation to the higher rank. Lastly, there are thirty-two "affiliated" synagogues, mostly of recent formation, which are encouraged to follow United Synagogue procedures, and receive burial rights and other services from the central body.

The United Synagogue is a single entity, not an association of independent congregations, and it is governed on a federal system. Each constituent synagogue elects a local board of management and officers, and also representatives to the council of the United Synagogue; the council is superior in authority to the local boards of management, and elects officers and committees for the United Synagogue as a whole. All property belongs to the United Synagogue, and the council can close a synagogue against the wishes of its seat holders, if it considers that its continuance is unjustified.

The financial system of the United Synagogue makes elaborate provision for mutual aid between synagogues in affluent and less affluent districts. Members pay their contributions to the synagogue in which they rent pews; a proportion of the receipts is made over to the central funds of the United Synagogue, and the balance remains to the
credit of the particular constituent. But if the revenue of one synagogue is insufficient to meet its expenditure, a proportion of the surpluses of those synagogues which have an excess of revenue, is transferred to its account. Thus fairly uniform standards are maintained between synagogues of varying wealth: each synagogue is guaranteed the maintenance of its fabric and the stipends of a rabbi, cantor, and other officials. Many matters are legislated for centrally, e.g., conditions of employment, pensions, cemeteries, and burial rights. Out of its capital funds the United Synagogue makes substantial loans without security for the building of synagogues and the purchase of rabbis' residences, etc.28

To work such a system there needs to be constant and detailed financial control from headquarters. Such control is inevitably restrictive,29 and it means that finance looms disproportionately in the working of the institution.

The United Synagogue bears the greater part of the cost of maintaining the chief rabbi and the Beth Din. It does important welfare work, organizes the visitation of hospitals and institutions, and assumes responsibility for the burial of the poor. It imposes on its members a levy of one-third of their pew rentals, which is made over to the London Board of Jewish Religious Education. The existence of the United Synagogue has enabled the provision of synagogues in the metropolitan area to be planned regionally, and as a voluntary kehillah it is unique in the Jewish world. The oddity is that, having this example before it, the synagogues outside London remain single units, jealously independent of each other.

The constitution of the United Synagogue vests sole and absolute religious authority in the chief rabbi, while administrative functions are the sole province of the elected representatives of the laity. Between the chief rabbi and the United Synagogue administration the position of the ministers of the individual congregations is ambiguous: both authorities invite conformity rather than originality, and, no doubt without desiring it, they tend to make the minister into a functional rather than a spiritual leader. Further, the rigid separation of powers tends to make the lay authority religiously passive. The council of the United Synagogue is concerned only with the specific administrative problems that its officers bring before it. Neither the council nor any more comprehensive assembly is charged with general oversight of the religious well-being of the community.

Today the United Synagogue administration is called upon to manage a far-flung network of socially diverse congregations. From 1879 till 1915 it had behind it the authority of the first Lord Rothschild, and from 1919 till 1950 it was under the energetic direction of Sir Robert Waley Cohen, both of them personalities who made their in-
fluence felt throughout the Anglo-Jewish community. Now, the leadership of the United Synagogue is more narrowly based. The strain of centralized management is considerable, particularly the task of finding money to pay for new buildings and to meet the demand for higher salaries.

London has two congregational unions outside the United Synagogue, viz., the Federation of Synagogues, mentioned earlier, and the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations. The federation, which has some sixty affiliates and claims the adherence of 17,000 families, has spread beyond its East End origins, but financially, organizationally, and socially it is considerably inferior to the United Synagogue, and as a group is hardly a force in communal life. Federation synagogues are autonomous, their principal connection with the central body being in the matter of burial. They are to be found in some of the suburbs, generally as the poor relation of the local branch of the United Synagogue. The Orthodox union, which has some 3,000 members, is an outgrowth of the Adath Israel Synagogue which was established by a group of followers of Sampson Raphael Hirsch, of Frankfurt. The union continues to maintain as a principle of abiding worth Hirsch’s doctrine of separation from the main community. Its main strength is in North London. It is forcefully conducted, and its leaders have made notable contributions to the development of Jewish day schools. The serious question for its future is how far the ultra-Orthodoxy which it professes and practices will flourish in the English climate.

Outside London, the synagogues are absolutely independent. Where there is more than one congregation in a town, joint arrangements are made for shechita, but in general synagogues wax and wane without regard to the condition of their neighbors. In the absence of either regional unions or of a synagogue assembly on a national scale, the smaller communities are left to fend for themselves with little assistance from the central institutions of the community.

Outside the sphere of Orthodoxy there are two groups—the Association of Synagogues in Great Britain, with fifteen constituents (six in London), and the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues with seventeen constituents (nine in London). In each case the congregations are independent, but there is a large and powerful founder member of the group and a cluster of daughter congregations. The West London Synagogue of British Jews, which “mothers” the Association of Synagogues, was founded in 1842. The label Reform, which is popularly, though unofficially, attached to it, must not be understood in the German or American sense. Though it has on the whole lost much of its traditional background, the West London Synagogue’s contemporary position can be described as being on the left wing of
Conservatism. The synagogue is situated in the heart of London's West End; its wide range of activities distinguish it from the run of English synagogues, and its membership roll includes a considerable number of prominent personalities in the life of the country.

Despite the bitterness which accompanied its founding, there grew up a strong sense of accommodation between the West London Synagogue and the main body of English Judaism, as represented by the three central institutions mentioned earlier. One of its ministers, Morris Joseph, published in 1904 a work, *Judaism as Creed and Life*, which won wide acceptance throughout Anglo-Jewry, and may be regarded as the doctrinal formulation most characteristic of English Judaism. During the last quarter of a century this sense of accommodation has all but disappeared.

The Liberal Jewish Synagogue, which "mothers" the second group, is also a large and well-organized unit. Its religious standpoint is roughly equivalent to the Classic Reform of America, and its divergences from traditional practices have caused it to be the target for repeated bitter attacks from the Orthodox. Thus, it is characterized by a strong sense of dissociation from the main body of the community.

Both of these non-Orthodox groups are connected with the World Union for Progressive Judaism, but locally they have been unable to agree on measures for cooperation. Of the two, the Association of Synagogues appears currently to be making greatest headway. The Reformers number about 4,000 in London and 6,000 in the country as a whole; the Liberals slightly less.

**Religious Life**

Of the religious life of the Anglo-Jewish community the most outstanding characteristic is the voluntary maintenance of a non-observant Orthodoxy. Complete synagogue statistics are difficult to obtain, but it appears that more than half the adult males are members of synagogues. The great majority are attached to Orthodox synagogues, and it is common for anyone who is not a member of a Reform or Liberal synagogue to be regarded as being Orthodox. Outside the synagogue, Orthodoxy colors much of the institutional life of the community. Schools and classes conform to the chief rabbi's requirements; public banquets and wedding or bar mitzvah festivities must be strictly kosher, usually under rabbinical supervision; the Zionist Federation in starting a day school negotiates with the chief rabbi so that the school's religious background will be correct; young people in arranging their summer camps take care to see that they follow Orthodox observances. The rules of the Board of Deputies as to ec-
clesiastical authority are plain to see, and they represent the practice of other secular organizations.

The exertions that are made to preserve Orthodoxy in official life might suggest that the members of the community are personally Orthodox. Such is not the case, and the trend is in the opposite direction. Early in 1951 *The Jewish Chronicle* of London published some results of a survey of the habits of Jewish students. As the yardstick is largely subjective, the results must be treated with caution.\(^{31}\)

The following comment on the results of this study is of interest:

Religious indifference . . . is apparently twice as common in the generation of the students as in that of their parents. Two in every five of the students who answered the questionnaire were indifferent to religion, and yet the sample of students must be assumed to be biased in favor of observing Jews, since most of the forms were filled in by members of the Inter-University Federation of Jewish Students (some of whose affiliated societies provide kosher food for their members), and the respondents may be taken to have had an interest in Judaism or Jewish affairs. So that, while this information demonstrates the trend away from tradition, it probably exaggerates the role of orthodoxy and near-orthodoxy.

The trend away from Orthodox observance is confirmed by the replies to a sample questionnaire issued in the Liverpool Jewish community. Liverpool has 7,500 Jews in a total population of a little over one million, and the Jewish community maintains eleven Orthodox and one small Liberal congregation.

Out of a random sample of 500 families to whom questionnaires were sent, 272 replied. All but 14 families light candles on Friday night; 58 per cent make Kiddush, but nearly half smoke on the Sabbath. Apparently 86 per cent take kosher meat (only) in the home, but 63 per cent normally eat in non-Jewish restaurants, and 77 per cent do not use phylacteries. On the other hand, there is little mixing socially with non-Jews, for 162 out of the 270 do not visit gentile friends.

No figures are given for regular synagogue attendance, but an estimate of 10 per cent would probably exaggerate the position. Liverpool, it may be observed, is about average in the degree of religious intensity. A questionnaire taken in the smaller community of Sheffield showed similar results.

For the taking of kosher meat in the home, data exists from the days of food rationing. In 1950 it was found that 161,000 persons were registered with kosher butchers in Greater London (out of about 280,000 Jews). It is probable that, as in Liverpool, the percentage who take kosher meat is higher in most provincial towns than in London, where the sense of social discipline is less intense.

The incidence of intermarriage also suggests the slipping of tra-
ditional moorings. Again, reliable statistics cannot be produced, but one observer has estimated that of the marriages in which a Jew is concerned, one in eight is with a partner who belongs to another faith. The proportion is believed to have risen, and to affect all classes, instead of only those at the top of the social ladder, as formerly. Intermarriage is still reprobated when the matter is discussed in public, and the Orthodox authorities strongly disapprove of proselytizing. The community is far less inclined than formerly to impose sanctions, for today no rigid barrier prevents those who have married outside the fold from taking part in Jewish public life.

The overall situation indicated a striking degree of adherence to traditional ways as compared with other branches of English-speaking Jewry. But for Anglo-Jewry, which is conscious of a strongly traditional background and which concerns itself to maintain the notion of communal Orthodoxy, the figures suggest a rent in the religious fabric.

The gap between personal and official religion has grown wider for another reason. During the last quarter of a century, while the force of traditional Judaism over the lives of the members of the community, taken as a whole, has declined, within the synagogues and educational institutions that are subject to ecclesiastical control a greater rigidity prevails. Modifications in the ritual that were sanctioned sixty years ago are now frowned upon; the free discussion of religious ideas is generally disapproved. Not only, for example, does Jews' College exact a strict test of faith from its students, but it renders difficult cooperation with bodies that have a less rigid approach. Tentative approaches made since the war by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America for relations with Jews' College could make no headway, and the chief rabbi has discouraged Orthodox participation in the Society for Jewish Study, a body of mixed composition dedicated to the cultivation of Jewish scholarship on a non-party basis. Pulpit exchanges between Orthodox and non-Orthodox rabbis were always rare; today it would be difficult for a non-Orthodox rabbi to take part in a nonliturgical event organized by an Orthodox congregation.

Rabbinical pronouncements suggest that in their view the strict maintenance of ritual observance on lines approximating as near as possible to that which obtained in Eastern Europe is the goal of religious endeavor, and the branch of observance that appears to receive most concentrated attention is kashruth. Theological and philosophical problems and the ethical and mystical sides of Judaism receive scant attention as being outside the immediate ambit of halachic (Jewish legal) interest.

That some of these phenomena should arise in the midst of a society where free discussion in all matters, religion included, is taken for
granting may be susceptible of many explanations. The planting of extreme Liberalism may have provoked a reaction in the direction of extreme Orthodoxy; the destruction of East European Jewry, which had nurtured English Judaism, may have induced uncritical reverence for every iota of the local reproduction of what is deemed to be the original master copy of the Jewish religion; the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations may have exerted powerful influence as a pressure group; and the traditionalism of the pre-1914 community may have rested too much on social convention. Whatever the reason, the middle has gone out of the community.

The decline produced by the perpetuation of forms in which the actors do not believe is visible in a large part of the United Synagogue and of the provincial congregations of a similar type. Its effects are seen most clearly in the recruitment and training of ministers and teachers, the state of religious education, and the general lack of pride or fervor in the conduct of synagogue affairs.

This kind of ambivalence between commitment and practice does not affect the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations, where there is not the same gap between official and personal religion.

What is the place of Reform and Liberal Judaism in the religious life of Anglo-Jewry? They signify an element of separation from the main body of the community, and this is often reprobated on sentimental grounds by persons who have little concern for their theological differences. Reform and Liberal synagogues attract a core of earnest believers who are searching genuinely for the religious satisfaction which the conventions of the majority do not give them; but they contain a much larger element, on the periphery of the community, who obtain such nominal association with Judaism as they desire on easier terms than are granted by Orthodoxy. In particular, the Orthodox authorities admit proselytes very rarely, and conversion to Judaism through a non-Orthodox synagogue, as a preliminary to marriage to a partner of Jewish birth, is a recognized means of avoiding the Orthodox restrictions. Religious education and Hebrew knowledge are at a lower level in Reform and Liberal British Jewry than among the Orthodox. Finally, the Liberal Jewish synagogue has enjoyed the reputation of being a center for anti-Zionist propaganda. In a community with a definite Orthodox and Zionist background, these characteristics are held as suggesting a lessening of spiritual vitality.

By contrast to their Orthodox counterparts, the Reform and Liberal synagogues stress the elements of religious faith and personal piety; they encourage the free discussion of the religious problems which the modern age presents. In the past, in keeping with their protestant coloring, they have had little to say on Jewish observance outside the synagogue. But recently, as a result of pressure from below,
tentative endeavors have been made to approach this question. Liberal Judaism in particular has been the stimulus to philanthropic work of a high order: the Hon. Lily Montagu and Sir Basil Henriques, two of its leaders, rank among Britain's best-known social workers.

Education

The records of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation show that it made provision for religious education from the time of its founding. In 1674 its officers decided that the congregation needed a "Parnas of Talmud Thora [warden of the religion school] for the greater increase of this holy Law, good education of our sons, and their quiet conduct both in the Synagogue and outside it." The Ashkenazic congregation made similar provision, and the effort multiplied with the growth of the Jewish population. The story cannot be considered in relation to the internal affairs of the Jewish community alone. There is no separation of church and state in England; the state was a late starter in the educational field, and when it did take a hand the churches were already at work. Jewish effort needs to be discussed in relation to the state system, some of whose features will need to be mentioned.

A general system of public elementary education was not introduced into England until 1870, and in that year also school attendance became compulsory. Before 1870 elementary secular education was sponsored largely by the various religious denominations, and the foundation of the national system was laid in 1833, when Parliament began to vote grants to these voluntary school societies. The Jewish community established ten schools prior to 1870 (seven in London, and the other three in Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester) and from 1853 Jewish schools began to share in the parliamentary grant. When in 1870 the state began to establish its own schools it did not withdraw support from the "voluntary" schools, as they were called. This support was extended in 1902, so that in secular education equal standards could be maintained as between state and voluntary schools. In view of the superior resources of the state, denominational schools have been greatly overshadowed by the state schools—except insofar as Roman Catholics are concerned.

The regulations governing the relations of voluntary schools to the state are extremely complex. Roughly, the school will have a body of managers, of whom one-third will be appointed by the local education authority, and two-thirds in accordance with the wishes of the sponsor. The school must comply with the state requirements as to secular education, the appointment of teachers, and the maintenance of its buildings; the state meets the cost of secular education and of interior repairs. The managers must meet the cost of religious instruction, and
of maintaining the fabric of the building (apart from interior repairs).

On the construction of a new voluntary school, if approved by the ministry of education, there will be a substantial grant from state funds towards the capital cost.

The fact that support of this kind is given to denominational schools does not mean that the state's own schools are secular. The school day must begin with a collective act of worship, and religious instruction must be given, subject to the right of any parent to withdraw his child. The nature of such worship and instruction accords with Protestant requirements, and is unacceptable doctrinally to Roman Catholics and Jews. Children withdrawn from religious instruction may be allowed to go outside the school to receive instruction of the kind desired by the parent, and in certain cases provision may be made to send teachers into the school to provide such special instruction.

This system has been evolved by stages, and is now embodied in the Education Act of 1944. There were bitter interdenominational controversies between 1902 and 1908, and again in 1930. Today these have entirely subsided. Jewish opinion was little in evidence during these controversies, and the Jewish authorities take advantage, as far as the thinly spread population will allow, of the system of state support of religious education.

In 1939 ten Jewish voluntary schools were still functioning. The oldest, largest, and most famous was the Jews' Free School (1817) in East London; all the others had been founded before 1870. By the outbreak of the Second World War these schools were on the decline owing to the migration of the population, and their eventual closure was considered possible. Even in the centers where they existed, these schools gave only a fraction of the Jewish education that was being imparted. London alone had nineteen Talmud Torahs, mostly in the East End. There were also classes meeting after the hours of secular instruction in many of the state schools of London. Most synagogues had classes attached to them, some meeting on Sundays only, and others up to three times weekly. A similar pattern was repeated in the provincial communities on a smaller scale.

A striking change in the educational scene since the Second World War has been the access of enthusiasm for the Jewish day school. Though the war created a hiatus, the situation in the provinces has not altered radically. The Jewish voluntary schools which had been declining in numbers and prestige have taken a new lease of life. The Manchester school has removed to new buildings, and the Liverpool school is in process of so doing. The large Jewish community in Leeds, which has never had such a school, is proposing to erect one under the aegis of the Zionist Federation.
In London the Jewish educational system has been reorganized. During the war there was much talk of a "new deal for Jewish religious education," chiefly on the ground that the system of financing by means of appeals was undignified and uncertain, and that it should be sustained by "communal taxation." At a conference held in November 1945, the London educational organizations merged and were replaced by the London Board for Jewish Religious Education; and a Central Council for Jewish Religious Education representing the London Board and the provincial communities was also set up.

In the working out of these plans, the hopes for a "new deal" had to be compromised. The London board was not all inclusive—an important section connected with the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations (see p. 39 ante) remained outside—and, of course, the Reform and Liberal groups were never invited to join. "Communal taxation for religious education" turned out to be a levy on synagogue seat rentals, which was not completely enforced, and which was insufficiently buoyant to rise with increased costs and a growing roll of pupils. Finally, there were administrative tasks of extreme complexity to grapple with.

There has been a serious hiatus in regard to London Jewish day schools. Five out of the seven London Jewish day schools—including the Jews' Free School—were allowed to disappear during the war. Their funds have been pooled, and it is proposed to use them to establish, in connection with the London Board, a large school to serve North and North-West London; but ten years have elapsed since the end of the war, and the schools have not yet been replaced.

Entirely separate from the London board is the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement. This operates ten schools, of which two receive state support. In government and in spirit, the movement is closely linked to the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations.

In November 1955 there were 14,421 pupils attending the classes of the London board. These consisted of 86 sets of synagogue classes, with 9,772 pupils; 12 Talmud Torahs, with 1,802 pupils; and 25 "withdrawal" classes with 2,667 pupils excused from state schools. Tuition on this scale is given on an expenditure of £88,900 ($248,920).

The system is seriously handicapped by the shortage of teachers. In conjunction with Jews' College, the London board operates a faculty for the training of teachers, but it has been reported that only four full-time students take the course. As the board pays no more than £70 ($196) per annum for a two-and-one half hour session on Sunday mornings (from this the teacher may well suffer the deduction of 42.5 per cent for income tax), the inducement to teach is not strong. Further, the London board is under the jurisdiction of the chief rabbi, and the requirement that teachers should be Orthodox in character limits the group from which they can be drawn.
The financial stringencies indicated above mean that there is little available for new textbooks. Those that are produced are of a conservative character; material of a more colorful and imaginative kind is imported from the United States and Israel.

The prestige hierarchy in the English schools system also has its effect on the Jewish community. It is conventional for parents of the professional classes or above a certain income level to avoid state or state-aided schools, and to send their sons to independent foundations known as “public” schools. These are usually residential, with a strong Church of England coloring. For the past three generations there was only a comparatively limited circle within the Jewish community for which public school education was de rigueur. The priority given to Jewish religious observances was sufficiently strong to make it unthinkable, save in very assimilated circles, for sons to be sent away from the home circle, or to an establishment where Jewish influences hardly existed. Since the Second World War the number of Jewish would-be entrants to these schools has increased considerably. Their religious requirements vary considerably—in some attendance at Church of England services are compulsory; in others (and the various groups overlap), there is a readiness to receive regular visits from tutors provided by the Jewish community. In one school there has been a Jewish “house” for the pasty sixty years.

Each of the Reform and Liberal congregations runs a Sunday school. Their regular educational system has yet to advance beyond that stage, though in September 1956 the Association of Synagogues opened a small theological college.

Higher education is provided by several yeshivot. There is also a seminary for the training of ministers, Jews’ College, founded in 1855. More committees of inquiry have deliberated upon the state of Jews’ College than upon any other Jewish institution in England, but there has emerged no figure capable of giving it spiritual vitality or firm material foundations. The college has pulled round from the extreme disorganization caused by the Second World War; it has instituted a successful class to train students for the rabbinical diploma, and expects shortly to move to new premises. However, the fundamental problems of public apathy and lack of support remain unsolved. The college is administered on a narrow basis: it operates on a budget of £15,000 ($42,000) per annum, and for its centenary rebuilding and endowment fund has collected less in five years than the British Friends of the Hebrew University raise in a single year.

This position is of course bound up in part with the attitude of the community to the ministry. Many leaders long assumed that young men would appear from the East End, of Orthodox outlook and possessed of a background of traditional Jewish lore, to whom the college
would give the polish necessary for them to function as preachers and pastors to English congregations. In those sections of the community which respected the talmudical learning that flourished in Eastern Europe, there was both a tendency to write off England as a *treyfe* place that could never produce worthy spiritual guides, and a conviction that a rabbi needed the stamp of a great European yeshiva. These two divergent attitudes have joined to militate against the building up of a native seminary.

Further, the college as an institution which purports to approach Jewish learning scientifically has a difficult course to steer in view of the current of obscurantism that has gained strength.35

The desire to repair the deficiency in higher Jewish education was among the reasons for the establishment in Manchester in 1954 of an Institute of Jewish Studies. This was designed as a *Lehranstalt* for adult education rather than a rabbinical seminary.

In certain technical fields well-known contributions have come from the direction of Jews' College. The English translation of the Talmud edited by the present principal of Jews' College was largely the work of its alumni, as were the Soncino Books of the Bible.

What is the effect of the community's effort in the field of religious education? As in other branches of religious life, it is possible to discern a strange polarization. Facilities for yeshiva education are greater than ever before, and day schools with a strongly Orthodox spirit now cater to an appreciable number of children. The greater part of the population, however, appears to be giving a lower priority to Jewish education. Figures for attendances at the classes of the London board have been quoted, but an over-all assessment, in terms of quantity or quality, is difficult to come by. It is believed, however, that between 60 and 70 per cent of Jewish children of school age receive some Jewish education. As to quantum, the figures of the London board are again a pointer: In the Talmud Torahs and synagogue classes, 96 per cent of the boys and 95 per cent of the girls are under thirteen. For a high proportion the rite of bar mitzvah marks the purpose and end of Jewish education. Further, the hours of instruction are on the whole far shorter than they were—the days when throngs of pupils attended the supplementary school Talmud Torahs or unclassified *chadarim* for long hours each night are a thing of the past.

Again, the extent of the educational effort and its results must be considered in the light of the notion that the Anglo-Jewish community is a body of Orthodox Jews which must be well versed in the literature and rituals of Orthodox Judaism. There have, of course, been modifications of the *cheder* system of instruction, but the immediate goal is to give the pupils some knowledge of the prayer book and Pentateuch, and to impress upon them the importance of keeping
the Sabbath, festivals, and dietary observances. For this object the hours available are insufficient—except, of course, in the day schools. But, even more important, there is not now the background of Orthodox home life on which the cheder or Talmud Torah of old could build. The disparity between what is officially proclaimed and personally believed is reflected in the general apathy to religious education, which occupies a low position in the scale of communal values. The extreme Orthodox wing, not retarded by this disparity, shows a greater vigor and a greater willingness to experiment in educational methods. What will come of the Zionist Federation's recent interest in education cannot yet be foretold.

Anglo-Jewry can show some creditable efforts at self-education. Young Mizrachi groups and bodies of Jewish students arrange courses and summer or week-end schools that often attain a high standard. The results that are obtained come entirely from the honorary and self-sacrificing efforts of volunteer workers.

Social Service

Domestic charitable work has ceased to be in the forefront of communal activity: full employment, the provision of state social services, and the cessation of any inflow of refugees from other lands have all altered the significance of this kind of work. It was long the proud boast of the Anglo-Jewish community that it never allowed its members to be recipients of the relief dispensed to paupers by the state. The validity of the boast does not seem to have been examined, but the reasons are not far to seek. The receipt of poor relief involved a definite social stigma which Jews would not wish to see attached to any of their brethren; besides, as those who needed help had often come as refugees from abroad, the suggestion that they had become a charge on public funds might have fed anti-alien feeling. When the community was small, charity was the function of the synagogue. Ad hoc charitable bodies are found in the eighteenth century, e.g., the Bread, Meat and Coal Society (1780), and the Jews' Hospital and Orphan Asylum (1795). In London the synagogues ceased to dispense relief when the Jewish Board of Guardians was established in 1859, and this pattern was followed in the larger provincial centers. The influx from 1881 to 1914 put a severe strain on the resources of these bodies. Though the influx ceased, these charities continued to be of importance during the interwar years when unemployment and low wages brought serious deprivation to many Jewish wage earners. The Jewish boards of guardians were never all inclusive; they belonged to the anglicised section of the community, and often the immigrants felt more comfortable with their own less formal charities. Jewish hospitals were established in London, Leeds, and Manchester; in addi-
tion London had a Jewish maternity home, a home for incurables, and a tuberculosis sanatorium. One characteristic of these charitable bodies is their individualism; coordination, whether in the raising or the administration of funds, has always been difficult to achieve.

The relief given to German refugees from 1933 onwards fell into a different category. Special institutions were set up to dispense it, and the recipients belonged to the middle classes.

Since the Second World War the granting of relief in cash and kind has diminished considerably. Unemployment has virtually disappeared, and a compulsory state insurance scheme has come into operation designed to guard against the ills of unemployment, sickness, and old age; there is a National Health Service of a most comprehensive kind. If there is a single problem that is worrying social service agencies, it is the problem of old age. The population is aging, the process of inflation has caused savings to melt away, and domestic help is difficult to obtain. Hence Jewish organizations have redoubled their efforts to provide homes for the aged. Further, they concern themselves to a far greater extent than formerly with welfare and family problems. The largest body of its kind is the London Jewish Board of Guardians, whose annual expenditure amounts to about £225,000 ($630,000). It is ably administered, and has shown itself capable of adjusting its methods to the new problems.

From the end of the eighteenth century we find records of Jewish Friendly Societies, i.e., fraternal orders which provided their members with benefits for funeral and mourning expenses, sickness, and Jewish holy days. During the 1881–1914 period they played an important role in anglicising the immigrants and integrating them with the rest of the Jewish community. Several well-organized "orders" took shape, and they acquired representation on the Board of Deputies. The coming into existence of a compulsory state system of social insurance has weakened the appeal of the voluntary friendly societies, and they have lost much of their élan.

Zionism

As a political and cultural force Zionism has declined greatly since the establishment of the State of Israel, but its organizational front remains intact. The hub of the movement is the Zionist Federation of Great Britain, a General Zionist group which for many years has been closely identified with the policies of the top leadership of the World Zionist Organization. The Joint Palestine Appeal is directed by officials of the Zionist Federation, and while today fund raising takes first place, this association means that the Zionist Federation has at its disposal organizational resources for a variety of purposes,—e.g., establishing its own day schools. The Zionist organization is professionally
staffed to a far greater extent than any other branch of Jewish activity in England, and it is the only one which has a series of offices throughout the country, all closely linked to headquarters.

The Zionist Federation publishes an ably edited weekly, the Jewish Observer and Middle East Review, and has associated with it women's and youth groups, as well as the Poale Zion. There is a separate Mizrachi Organization, which has advanced greatly since pre-war days. Because of its religious coloration, the Mizrachi Organization has not suffered the same decline in fervor consequent upon the establishment of the State of Israel as have the Zionist bodies that are without this definite orientation. Though a participant in the Joint Palestine Appeal, the Mizrachi Organization lacks the authority in the disposal of its proceeds possessed by the Zionist Federation.

However, all these organizations are less important today than the fund-raising arm. According to The Jewish Chronicle for February 24, 1956, Sir Simon Marks stated that Anglo-Jewry's total financial effort for Israel during 1955 had amounted to about £2,250,000 ($6,300,000), of which the Joint Palestine Appeal (JPA) alone had raised £1,250,000 ($3,500,000). Figures alone do not indicate the impact which the JPA has on the Anglo-Jewish community. There are no Jewish federations or welfare funds in England such as exist in the United States. Each charity canvasses support on its own, and the old-fashioned and small-scale manner in which the domestic charities raise their funds contrasts sharply with the up-to-date techniques, the professional skill, and the overwhelming force of the nation-wide organization which the JPA has built up.

The JPA is organized in every locality; it also has groups in the principal trades and professions. The number of subscribers may not be large—it is said to be about 12,000—but no effort is spared to raise funds among the wealthier elements of Anglo-Jewry. As a result of the superiority of Zionist fund raising to that of domestic institutions, different standards of generosity have been built up as between domestic and Israel causes.

Apart from the JPA, the Jewish National Fund, Children and Youth Aliyah, the Haifa Technion, the British Friends of the Hebrew University, Magen David Adam, and other Israel causes make their separate appeals to the Jewish community. The British Friends of the Hebrew University have been outstandingly successful both in raising funds and in enlisting interest in the Jerusalem University from British academicians, and from Jews with intellectual or cultural interests in all walks of life.

Thus, the dynamics of Anglo-Jewish life show a considerable orientation towards Israel. With this development, all the attitudes and methods associated with large-scale fund raising have come to play a
prominent—and, it seems, permanent—place in the life of the Jewish community. The dynamism of the Zionist organization leaves the domestic institutions far behind. This dynamism must be associated with the circumstance that locally Zionism is in some respects provided with the kind of leadership that distinguished Anglo-Jewry as a whole in Victorian and Edwardian times. The very wealthy Marks-Sieff families became active disciples of Weizmann during the First World War, and their generosity and devotion to the Zionist cause has never wavered during forty years. Their example has been of great assistance in attracting the support of other persons of wealth.

Zionism, using that term to designate organized pro-Israel sentiment, must also be considered in another light. For many it is a medium of Jewish identification, the link being a phase of Israel life which they are asked to support—whether it be a university, music, the graphic arts, technical education, scientific research, or the prevention of disease. The older Zionism sprang from the wells of Jewish tradition, and in many cases the same origin is readily identifiable in support for present-day Israel causes. But for many others, the old pieties have faded. The fact that for the first time the Zionist Federation is embarking on a program of Jewish day schools seems to point to a realization of this fact. For the moment, however, the Jewish group is set in a society in which the prevailing currents are secular while its own religious life is constricted. The associations provided by Israel causes seem to gratify a sense of Jewish loyalty on another basis than that of the synagogue and its related institutions.

On the other hand, Zionism in the more restricted sense, as the cultural and political movement based on the program of the World Zionist Organization, has not recovered from the blow it suffered through its own success. In England the void is all the greater because from the First World War until 1948 the movement was involved in political work of decisive importance. Since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, discussion of the future of Diaspora Zionism has been intermittent and inconsequential.

Both the Zionist Federation and the Mizrachi sponsor chalutz farms, with the object of training agricultural pioneers for emigration to Israel. In addition, there is a body known as Professional and Technical Workers Aliyah (PATWA) which fosters the emigration of trained workers in varied fields. These activities are regarded with equanimity. England has long been a country of emigration, and there is nothing unpatriotic in encouraging it. The trickle of emigrants is small, and the majority of those who trained as chalutzim were refugees from Europe. From May 1948 to December 31, 1955, 3,227 Jews whose country of residence was the United Kingdom entered Israel.
The Jew in British Life

What of the relation of the Jews of Britain to the gentile society in whose midst they live? Anti-Semitic agitation is at a lower ebb than at any time within living memory. At the beginning of the century there was an anti-alien agitation which directed propaganda against the Russo-Jewish immigrants to Great Britain. After the First World War hostile feeling was engendered on the basis of a supposed identification of Jews with Bolshevism—during the war there had been outbreaks of xenophobia for which Jews were an obvious target. During the Thirties organized anti-Semitism took a more serious turn—stimulated from Germany, it became one of the main planks of Sir Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists.

The Second World War helped to discredit anti-Semitism. The fact that it had been made an instrument of policy by England's enemies, the fact that English anti-Semites had received support from Nazi sources, and the fact that it had been used by the Germans to weaken the unity of the states of Europe which they overran—all these facts, taken together, left an impression on the public mind. Since the Second World War unemployment has been at a low ebb, and the mass of the people have enjoyed a higher standard of living than previously. Hence the soil has remained infertile for the few anti-Semitic propagandists who continue to agitate.

Attempts to provoke incidents out of the violent conflicts in Palestine during the years 1946–48 met with little response. In the summer of 1947 a provincial newspaper carried a leading article of such anti-Semitic intensity that the government was moved to institute proceedings—which proved unsuccessful—for criminal libel; there was a sudden outbreak of rioting in Liverpool and a series of attacks on Jews in parts of London. Equally noteworthy was the frigidity towards Jews and Jewish organizations displayed by many Gentiles in positions of prominence. Where this feeling would lead to was uncertain at the time, but the clouds have since rolled away.

If overt anti-Semitic agitation is at a low ebb, its existence in the social field cannot be doubted. However, either because it is taken for granted, or because it is not serious, or because society is introvert, very little is heard about social anti-Semitism. The level at which it assumes most serious proportions is that of the suburban golf club. This has necessitated the establishment of Jewish golf clubs in London and the larger provincial centers, and has been responsible to some extent for the multiplication of Jewish groups devoted to theatricals, sports, bridge, and other diversions.

Outside this middle class level, the raising of barriers against Jews is not obvious. Relations in university and intellectual circles appear
to be easy, and in the exclusive clubs, entry to which is still coveted and guarded, the Jew has one more hurdle to surmount than the rest, but is not barred.

The participation of Jews in British public life has been a full one. At the present day (October 1956), there are nine Jewish members of the Privy Council, fourteen peers (members of the House of Lords), and nineteen members of the House of Commons. There are in all over 800 peers and 630 members of the House of Commons, so in each case the proportion of Jews is considerably higher than the proportion of Jews to the general population. By contrast, the 4,000,000 Roman Catholics count nine Privy Councillors, forty-five peers, and twenty-three members of the House of Commons.

Of the nineteen Jewish members of the House of Commons, two are Conservatives and the remainder Labor—the House as a whole contains a small Conservative majority. This disparity may be due to a weighting of Jewish political inclinations. But an even more effective cause may be the fact that the Conservative constituency organizations, which select the party's candidate for each seat, are dominated by a similar social element to that which makes up the local golf club. Especially for its safe seats, the Party looks for the hallmarks of orthodoxy—membership (however tenuous) in the Church of England, public school background, descent from an important family.

Jews have been prominent in the holding of high offices of state. The career of the first Marquess of Reading (d. 1936) is an outstanding example. The son of a family of fruit merchants, he rose to be an outstanding trial lawyer and became attorney general, Lord Chief Justice of England, ambassador to the United States, and foreign secretary. The range of Viscount Samuel's public offices has been more limited, but he has won for himself an unrivaled place as one of the country's elder statesmen, and in the later stages of his career at any rate he has publicly identified himself with Jewish causes. Reading was not the first Jew to hold high judicial office: Sir George Jessel (d. 1881) was appointed master of the rolls (which ranks next in order of precedence to the chief justiceship) in 1873. At the present day Lord Cohen of Walmer, who is a son of one of Anglo-Jewry's oldest families and who has been president of the London Jewish Board of Guardians, president of the Jewish Historical Society, and vice president of the Board of Deputies, is one of the judicial members of the House of Lords; and Sir Seymour Karminski, who succeeded Lord Cohen as president of the Board of Guardians, is a justice of the High Court.

In the civil service, whose higher ranks attract men of considerable caliber, Jews have been prominent. Humbert Wolfe, better known as a poet, was an official in the ministry of labor; Sir Jeremy Raisman, who made an outstanding career in India, is the son of a humble
provincial Jewish tradesman; Sir Leon Simon, the disciple and translator of Ahad Ha-am, worked professionally in the post office. Nor is there anything to suggest that the flow of talent to the service of the state has been halted.87

But the place of Jews in British life cannot be ascertained by cataloguing legal rights or the names of distinguished citizens: the much more difficult task of assessing attitudes must be undertaken. On the subject of gentile-Jewish attitudes, a considerable, though for the most part ephemeral, literature exists, but with few exceptions it reflects the fears and aspirations of Jews rather than the opinions of the gentiles among themselves.

It is often said that the prestige of the Anglo-Jewish community was at its height at the beginning of the present century—when Jews were distinguishing themselves in finance, in politics, and in the circle of royalty. From the position it attained during the reign (1901-1910) of King Edward VII it is suggested that Anglo-Jewry has experienced a decline both in its internal affairs and in its relations with the mass of its fellow citizens. Since that era two world wars have steamrollered society and seriously weakened Britain's financial and political position. There has been a great leveling of classes, and the tendency to make comparisons with the position of the ruling few of a past age must be resisted. Few of the objects of prestige of the Edwardian age retain their glitter, and even on the superficial view, it is not easy to see how the position of the Jews especially has declined.

It might be safer to suggest that in the intervening years there has been a certain drawing apart of Jew from gentile. The propaganda of the Nazis received no sympathy in England, but even among philo-Semites it was bound to raise questions as to the place of people whose existence till then had been taken for granted. On the Jewish side the relapse into barbarism of a civilized country was bound to produce a most profound shock and a sense of uneasiness that could only unsettle relations with gentile neighbors. The drawing apart was intensified by the British government's attitude to its responsibilities in Palestine, and the emergence of Jewry as a political pressure group attacking Britain's difficult position in the Middle East. The clouds have passed, but the recollection of the storm has not left men's minds.

In making comparisons with the Edwardian age, what is most striking is the contemporary uncertainty as to the image in which English Jews conceive themselves. The Anglo-Jewish community used to rest on the twin pillars of citizenship and religion. "Be a good Jew and a good citizen" was a platitude of the Sunday school prize distribution. Perhaps British Jewry was negligent, by traditional standards, in obeying the first part of the injunction. But the community certainly treas-
ured its citizenship, and immigrant Jews were encouraged to cherish and did in fact cherish similar aspirations. If today an outsider was to express an opinion based on a quick glance at the activities of the Anglo-Jewish community, he might form the opinion that the State of Israel was the center of its political identification. Anglo-Jewry's press is dominated by news of Israel; its organizations are largely concerned with raising funds for the State of Israel; the Board of Deputies emerges into public notice usually on behalf of the political interests of the State of Israel; advertisements appear urging young people to do a year's "national service" (the local term for the draft) in Israel.

Experience of Jewish life in England would confirm that such an impression was absolutely wrong. One suspects that the pro-Israel exhortations are received by their auditors with the same kind of silent reserve that greets rabbinical pronouncements on ritual observance. But, if the Jews of Britain do not accept this image of Israel expatriates, it is difficult to ascertain exactly what image it is they would like to project. "Englishman of the Jewish faith" no longer holds good in their minds. The decline of religion and the upheavals of the Nazi age have ended that kind of certainty.

The Tercentenary and After

During 1956 the Anglo-Jewish community devoted itself to the celebration of its tercentenary. The proceedings were carried out with considerable éclat. There was a historical exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum, and a commemorative service at the 250-year-old Bevis Marks synagogue. London's ancient Guildhall was the scene of a tercentenary banquet, where the speakers included the Duke of Edinburgh (the Queen's consort), the prime minister, the Bishop of Chichester, the Marquess of Reading, and Viscount Samuel. The Archbishop of Canterbury gave a garden party in the grounds of his official residence. Local celebrations were organized in the principal provincial towns.

One aspect of the commemoration failed to make the progress that had been anticipated. The sponsoring committee planned to raise a considerable fund as a permanent memorial of the tercentenary whose proceeds would be used to endow cultural work among Jewish youth and Jewish studies at British universities. Although a beginning was made with the collection of this fund, the appeal has not been followed through, and it is clear that its objects will never be achieved.

If the tercentenary betrays a community which shows more zest for commemorating its past than for building its future, it cannot be said to distort the picture. What does the future hold in store for Anglo-Jewry? Three years ago, the late Redcliffe Salaman, a distinguished scientist, public worker, and liberal thinker, analysed the changes
which had overtaken the Anglo-Jewish community during the preceding half-century, and suggested that the future might be seen on the following lines:

1. The Community will decrease in volume as a result of extra-marriage at an ever-increasing rate.
2. The mass of the Community will increasingly tend to pass to the left, i.e., away from orthodoxy and towards reform.
3. The number of those who silently transfer their allegiance to the general gentile community, already considerable, will steadily increase.
4. There will always be a relatively small residue of observant Jews whose natural increase may possibly balance their own loss through desertion consequent on the disintegration of a previously accepted, highly controlled pattern of life.
5. Anglo-Jewry will not maintain her position in World Jewry which her numbers, organization, and relative wealth entitle her to, unless she encourages Jewish learning with much greater zest and generosity than she is doing today, for the simple reason that she will have lost her own self-respect.
6. The degree of intimacy and interdependence between Anglo-Jewry and Israel depends largely on the world position and the attitude of England herself. If that be unchanged, there is good reason to foresee in increasing measure a spirit of trust and reciprocity between Anglo-Jewry and the people of Israel, uniting the one and strengthening the other. If England for any reason were hostile to Israel, Anglo-Jewry might well be rent in two, one part becoming assimilated and the other finding its spiritual and ultimately its physical home in Israel.39

These suggestions Salaman based on the presupposition that "external conditions remain more or less static and there is no further immigration." Such presuppositions are only reasonable. The sources of immigration have been cut off, and it is safe to assume that Anglo-Jewry, which for generations had been warmed Jewishly by the gulf stream of Jewish migration from Eastern Europe, will experience a waning of its spiritual life unless it finds sources of power within itself.

Numerically, Anglo-Jewry will be subject to attrition through inter-marriage. But it appears to be threatened for another reason. The Jewish birthrate, the average size of the Jewish family, and the Jewish reproduction rate all seem to be lower than those of the population as a whole.40 Two children per family will not in the long run suffice to maintain the strength of the population, since not all the children will themselves reproduce.

So far as the spiritual future of the community is concerned, though laments as to the inadequacy of the present situation are heard frequently, there is no sign of the greater zest and generosity in the en-
encouragement of Jewish learning for which Salaman has called. Like-
wise, although the matter is controversial, it is possible to detect a
definite current of dissatisfaction with the highly developed legalism
that dominates the rabbinate and the synagogue; but signs are want-
ing of the translation of that dissatisfaction into an effort to find a
new synthesis. It is always possible that some religious personality will
emerge who will attract a considerable following among the dissatis-
fied, but such possibilities cannot be foretold by rational means—
rather they belie most prophecy in the realm of history. The drift to
Reform and Liberal synagogues may be expected to continue, but
there is no reason to expect that it will be of such a character as to
betoken the generation of new spiritual forces in the community.

As far as can be foretold Anglo-Jewry will not encounter any new
problems in its relations with the gentile world. The community will
to a lesser extent than at present acknowledge the sovereignty of any
single group. Numerically the Anglo-Jewish community will retain its
position as the fourth largest organized Jewish community in the world;
but there is no reason to expect that it will retain the importance it
had in days when numerically it was of little significance. That im-
portance resulted from the capacity and willingness of the British gov-
ernment to intervene with effect in behalf of Jews in other lands who
suffered from oppression or inequality. The circumstances of the
world do not render such intervention likely in the future. Another
cause of that importance was that Anglo-Jewry was led by men whose
wealth and rank gave them influence with their government. The old
leadership has disintegrated, and there are no signs that its successors
will be particularly effective. The effort to link Anglo-Jewry with the
State of Israel will remain strong in the immediate future, but the
chain will not exert much pull if the anchorage crumbles at one end.

NOTES


2. The original London Jewish settlement was in the eastern part of the City,
and in this area were formed the Sephardic Congregation and the original three
Ashkenazic synagogues: the Great in Duke's Place, the Hambro' in Fenchurch
Street, and the New in Leadenhall Street, all clustered within a narrow area. Im-
mediately outside the City's borders to the east, Jews were concentrated in two
adjacent localities—Houndsditch and Goodman's Fields. In both these two latter
areas there were, from the end of the eighteenth century, small congregations of
Polish Jews.

The reason for settlement in the eastern part of the City may have been its
convenience for the financial centers. It would then be natural for those who wanted
to engage in retail trade to open shops or stalls on the eastern fringe of the City, since, not being freemen, they could not do so within it. The eastern borders of the City had long been attractive to foreigners (e.g., the Huguenots), because they contained a number of "liberties," or zones of immunity from various trade regulations and taxes; they also had been from the sixteenth century centers of the old-clothes trade, to which many Jews turned in the eighteenth century. By the middle of the eighteenth century Jews had also settled on the western borders of the City. From the early nineteenth century, however, the westward migration was swelled by the wealthy, who no longer wished to live in the City; they acquired houses, in the fashionable streets and squares in the West End. All these parts lie on the north bank of the Thames. A small settlement in South London is traditionally said to have originated in the eighteenth century in the minyan (prayer quorum) of debtors in the King's Bench prison.

The "City" is the historic City of London, of which the present English metropolis is the outgrowth. It has long ceased to be a residential area, and is the commercial and financial center of the country.

In the mid-nineteenth century the settlement on the eastern borders of the City spread into Spitalfields and Whitechapel, and a new settlement was formed around Stepney Green. The mass immigration of the 1880's brought a considerable Jewish population to these areas.

3. In 1883 there were fourteen London and eighteen provincial congregations represented on the Board of Deputies. In addition, there were three Reform congregations, one each in London, Manchester, and Bradford.


5. The Paris Rothschilds appear to have ruled French Jewry in much the same way. For comparisons with the position of Jacob H. Schiff in New York, as recalled by Morris D. Waldman, see Nor by Power, New York, 1953, p. 322 et seq.

6. Lionel de Rothschild's son Nathaniel, mentioned earlier, was the first Jew to sit in the House of Lords.

7. James Parkes, the well-known Christian student of Jewish life, has commented on the struggle in these terms:

While Jews, corporately and individually, were anxious at any moment to secure such extensions of their lives and activities as circumstances might render possible, their eyes were naturally set all the time on the ultimate destination of full citizenship in the country of their birth or residence. To understand why this struggle took so long and was not crowned with final victory before the second half of the nineteenth century in what was generally considered one of the most liberal and progressive countries of the world, we have to study not the particular situation of the Jews, but the general development of political thought in England. For the struggle for political emancipation was, almost wholly, the struggle over the form of oath to be administered to anyone occupying a position of power or importance in the country.

The medieval conception of Christendom lasted long after the disappearance of the Middle Ages. The England of the Stuarts, the Commonwealth, and the Hanoverians still considered itself a Christian country. Moreover, only slowly was it accepted that within the definition "Christian" more than the State Church could be intended. Those Protestants who accepted the doctrine of the Trinity were included within the possibility of State toleration in 1689. But Protestant Unitarians were accepted only in 1813 and Roman Catholics in 1832. Foreigners who wished to become English citizens had to take the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper from a minister of the Anglican Church as late as 1825. Any Englishman who sought public office, local or national, or any place of profit under the crown had to take the Sacrament within three months of entering on his office up to 1828, although before that certain reliefs had become customary for Protestant
Dissenters. Even then the idea itself was not abandoned. For the Sacrament was substituted a declaration "on the faith of a Christian." And these are but some of the main restrictions in a whole mass of legislation designed to keep England a Christian and Protestant country. On the other side was the conception of the secular State which had grown out of the doctrines of eighteenth-century philosophers, and which was more consonant with the ethos of the increasingly powerful industrial and middle class of nineteenth-century England, but which had to meet the ingrained conservatism and fear of revolution which were as characteristic of those classes as was their determination to secure political advantage for themselves.

In this situation Jews had to walk warily. If they might find allies at almost any point in a fluctuating and evolving situation, they might likewise encounter enemies in the most unexpected places. In 1830 a Bill was first put before Parliament for repealing the civil disabilities of the Jews. It was twenty-eight years before it was passed in such a form that Jews became eligible for the House of Commons, and eight more years were to pass before a Jewish peer could take his seat in the House of Lords. In this long struggle Archbishops and leading Churchmen, Tory and Whig statesmen, lawyers and political philosophers appeared on both sides of the contest, not according to their like or dislike of Jews, but according as to whether they sought to retain the old conception of a Christian polity or whether they had adopted the new political philosophy of the secular State, extending its toleration to all who would obey its laws and advance its interests.


8. One of the oddities created by the existence of a state church is that a Jew may hold an advowson, or right to appoint the rector of a parish.

9. As Cecil Roth wrote in Commentary (February 1954):

Though political emancipation was not yet thought of (and how could it be, with Nonconformists and Roman Catholics excluded from it?), what may be termed social emancipation prevailed from the outset. The Jews who settled in England in the middle of the 17th century onwards could live in whatever city they pleased and in any part of the place of their choice; they could dress as they pleased; they could with certain reservations engage in any calling they pleased; they were subjected to no galling special regulations or restrictions; they could employ Gentile servants and workmen; they did not have to take a degrading form of oath before the courts of law, or pay special taxation; and those disabilities from which they suffered were not directed against them but were shared by all who were not members of the Church of England.

To put it succinctly: the ghetto system (in its general rather than its literal sense: oppressive discrimination was possible even without a formally constituted Jewish quarter), which applied universally on the continent of Europe, except Holland at this time, was unknown in England, as in the English dependencies generally, after the resettlement. Here is a fundamental difference between the record of Jews and of Jewish emancipation in the Anglo-Saxon countries and in other parts of the world: a difference which Continental historians failed to appreciate, and which makes the background of Jewish history in these lands wholly unlike, in a most significant fashion, that of Central and Eastern Europe. Neither in England nor in America was it a question of "Emancipation" in the Continental sense—that is, of emergence from slavery to liberty—but rather, as in wider constitutional matters, of "freedom slowly broadening down from precedent to precedent," perhaps, to be sure, with some kind of legislative encouragement.

10. It is a matter for speculation what role imperialism played as a factor negating social segregation. A distinguished place had to be reserved for visiting Indian potentates practicing religions further removed from Christianity than Judaism; and the notion of England as the beneficent ruler of many nations and faiths did not fit in with the idea of racial exclusiveness—at any rate at home.

11. The popular image of East End Jewish life that has come down shows devo-
tion to Orthodox Judaism and fervent support of Zionism. No doubt, this image rises from a subconscious contrast with West End Jewry. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that the Yiddish-speaking secularism that undoubtedly held sway over a good proportion of the newcomers had so little impact on the future of East End Jewry. The speedy decline of Yiddish may be attributed to the small numbers of those who spoke it, as well as the attractions of a strongly entrenched native culture. The native trade union and labor movement was growing in strength, and once the language barrier had been overcome there was little inclination to maintain separate Jewish socialist groups. Moreover, the English labor movement had a partly Christian background, and neither there nor anywhere else in English life was anticlericalism prevalent.

12. Chaim Weizmann lived in Manchester from 1904 to 1916. Of his experiences as a propagandist for Zionism among the provincial Jewish communities he wrote:

> A handful of devotees to the cause among the lower middle classes, indifference or hostility among the upper classes, whether of British, German or Russian origin, but with the largest number of exceptions in the last. . . . The old English-Jewish families might just as well have belonged to another world.

(Trial and Error, New York, 1949, p. 149.)

13. Almost simultaneously, a group of followers of Sampson Raphael Hirsch were consolidating the Adath Israel Synagogue with the object of establishing a set of communal institutions of a strictly Orthodox character and entirely independent of the main community.

14. Weizmann taught chemistry at Manchester University until 1916.

15. Since 1939 the fall in the Jewish population of East London has been considerable. At present (1956) it is about 30,000. The number of Jewish school children in 1951 was 3,000—about one-tenth of the number that attended during the 1901-11 period.

16. The Central British Fund did not create its own fund-raising arm, but used the main machinery of the Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund) in return for a guarantee of its annual income. The Keren Hayesod, which till then had collected a mere £30,000 per annum, was able to acquire the technique of large-scale fund raising.

17. The right conferred by Act of Parliament to certify synagogue secretaries for the purposes of the civil registration of marriages. It is dealt with in greater detail on p. 31.

18. The samples taken were too small for the results to be regarded as giving precise information.

19. See Noah K. Barou, The Jews in Work and Trade, London, 2nd edn., 1946. It will be noted that Barou's figures include females, less of whom would be self-employed, as well as males, and that his inquiry was made during the Second World War, when many businesses were shut down.

20. The right vested in the president of the board to certify synagogue secretaries as civil registrars of marriages has already been referred to. In addition, he appoints two rabbis, representing the provinces, to the rabbinical commission for licensing shochetim established under the Slaughter of Animals Act of 1933. The board is also entitled to be consulted in connection with the establishment of a tribunal under the Shops (Sunday Trading Reduction) Act of 1956. The function of this tribunal is to inquire whether individual shopkeepers have a conscientious objection on religious grounds to carrying on business on the Jewish Sabbath that would entitle them to open on Sundays.

21. Thus, the Jewish committee for Her Majesty's Forces under the aegis of the United Synagogue deals with the service in chaplaincy matters, and various Jewish bodies concerned with education deal with the ministry of education direct. Dur-
ing the Second World War, the ministry of food appointed Sir Robert Waley Cohen as its honorary adviser on kosher food.

22. Together, these three bodies form the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations, which is recognized by the United Nations.

23. David Tevele Schiff belonged to the same family from which Jacob Henry Schiff was descended.

24. Evidently British Jews in the eighteenth century did not show the zeal for enlightenment on the intricacies of talmudic law that their chief rabbis would have wished. When David Tevele Schiff was asked why he was leaving London, he replied: "Because that is the first question anyone has asked me."

25. At one time, the chief rabbi attempted to use his power under the Board of Deputies constitution to discourage secessions from existing congregations. His right to demand the acknowledgment of his authority as the price of assisting a congregation to obtain facilities to register its own marriages has been challenged by the ultra-Orthodox, who object on grounds of religious principle. By and large, the propriety of accepting the authority of the chief rabbi is taken for granted, and any congregation that does not denominate itself Liberal or Reform usually follows the procedure mentioned in the text without question. It should be emphasized that until a congregation desires to have facilities to register its own marriages, or to send a delegate to the Board of Deputies, the question of formally submitting to the chief rabbi's jurisdiction need not arise.

26. The practice is for a detailed questionnaire to be completed by the intended parties to a marriage, and on the basis of the answers the chief rabbi's secretary forwards to the synagogue his authorization for the marriage to be solemnized.

27. In England burial arrangements for Jews are made for the most part by synagogues and occasionally by ad hoc burial societies. They are never a matter for private enterprise.

28. The following details of a constituent synagogue with over 1,000 members located in a thriving suburb of London may be of interest. Membership contributions yield £9,500 (§26,600) and offerings £700 ($1,960). The minister receives £1,300 ($3,640), the cantor £1,000 ($2,800) (each with a free residence), and the secretary £700 ($1,960). Out of the surplus, £620 ($1,736) is made over to assisted synagogues. Another constituent of the United Synagogue has as much as £2,500 (£7,000) deducted for this purpose.

29. A synagogue may find its request for an additional chorister disallowed, because such a concession might stimulate a similar request from another synagogue ten miles away.

30. In Leeds there is a United Hebrew Congregation with four constituents, but there are eleven other synagogues in the town.

31. Table 1 (p. 63) is a summary of religious trends, expressed in percentages.

32. In the Union of South Africa, where the institutional fabric of Orthodoxy is maintained fully, the degree of personal observance is less than in England.

33. By way of comparison, mention may be made of the Central Board for Hebrew Education of the Jewish community of Manchester. It is responsible for 2,500 pupils, and its annual expenditure is £13,300 ($37,240).

34. The term Yeshiva is here used in the older sense of an academy for the study of the Talmud and codes along strictly Orthodox lines.

35. Dealing with "Anglo-Jewish sacred literature" in The Jewish Chronicle Tercentenary Supplement (January 27, 1956) a writer observed:

In surveying the content of the literature, one is struck by the all but complete neglect of the perennial need to assess the significance of Jewish values in the face of the contemporary world, and conversely by the fact that the challenge of modern knowledge and non-Jewish theology to the basic ideas of Judaism, so far from having been faced and converted into a dialogue, has been virtually
TABLE 1

Survey of Religious Habits of Jewish Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Orthodox &amp; Orthodox</th>
<th>Moderately Orthodox Moderate</th>
<th>Reform &amp; Liberal</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS (Religious Outlook)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS (Religious Views)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS (Religious Observance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a study by Raymond V. Baron in The Jewish Chronicle of London, February 23, 1951.

ignored. There are, of course, notable exceptions; but in general our reading community, as reflected in the literature for which it demands ever fresh editions, has preferred to compound for Biblical study by lip-service to authoritarianism, and has substituted antiquarianism for a genuine historical consciousness. The reason is all too plain—a decline in Jewish educational standards and the knowledge of Hebrew, combined with a sentimentalism that leads us to handle gingerly traditional values for the serious appraisal of which we are too lazy to prepare ourselves competently.

36. Boards of Guardians had been set up by Parliament in 1834 to dispense relief in each locality, and the term was taken over to describe purely voluntary Jewish bodies.

37. No attempt has been made to list the names of Jews who have become prominent in various walks of British life. There is a wealth of literature on this subject, which has also been dealt with in The Jewish Chronicle Tercentenary Supplement cited in footnote 35.

38. Although the tercentenary gave rise to a considerable quantity of journalism—the most notable expression in this field being the special tercentenary supplement cited above—and a group of historians (for the most part amateurs) gave a creditable series of lectures under the auspices of the Jewish Historical Society, it has not inspired any literary memorial of a permanent character.

40. Freedman, op. cit., p. 105, et seq.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE